

## SECTION 7 - CHAPTER B9

### Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1*

#### Issues

- i) Is the policy unnecessarily long and repetitive, confusing strategic with minor allocations?
- ii) Does the policy pay sufficient regard to sustainability issues?
- iii) Is more clarity required on phasing and the way allocated sites would contribute to housing supply?
- iv) Is the policy appropriate in relation to affordable housing?
- v) Should opportunities for meeting housing requirements on sites within the Bath area be highlighted?
- vi) Should the Green Belt around Keynsham be reviewed to identify sites to be safeguarded for future development.
- vii) Is there an appropriate level of development proposed at Norton Radstock?

#### Inspector's Reasoning

##### *Issue i)*

- 7.1 Sections A and B of GDS.1 list matters which are covered by other policies in the plan, and a number of objectors are seeking the addition of references to other matters such as the Green Belt which are also the subject of other plan policies. As I have stated elsewhere in this report, the plan, with all its policies, stands to be considered as a whole when any development proposal, including one which is the subject of a Local Plan allocation, is to be assessed. In consequence, the inclusion of GDS.1 sections A and B is unnecessary since it simply draws attention to certain policies of the plan. Indeed, to some extent these sections of the policy create confusion since it does not (and could not realistically) refer to every policy which may be relevant to a proposal, and therefore creates the implication that some policies may be more relevant (and important) than others. I recommend that Sections A and B of Policy GDS.1 be deleted, and amendments be made to the preceding text to reflect this change.

##### *Issue ii)*

- 7.2 The selection of development sites is founded on sustainability criteria since it is based on the adopted JRSP locational strategy which in turn

follows Government advice in PPG3. Furthermore, the Local Plan strategy seeks to identify potential mixed use and residential sites in the main towns and settlements. I therefore consider that sufficient attention has been given to sustainability issues in the selection of sites, and it is not necessary to refer to the Sustainable Development Assessment criteria.

***Issue iii)***

- 7.3 I deal with phasing in relation to Policy HG.3 of the DDLP in Section 5 of this report. To clarify the way in which sites would contribute to housing supply, I also recommend the introduction of a table of the relevant allocated sites in the housing Chapter of the plan. I consider that the table would improve the clarity of the plan in terms of the way allocated sites would contribute to housing land supply.

***Issues iv)***

- 7.4 The target for the provision of affordable housing, and the issue of tenures is dealt with in Section 5 of my report in relation to Policy HG.8. With regard to the need to secure a mix of types of housing, PPG 3 is concerned with avoiding the creation of large areas of housing of similar type, and I have recommended a change to Policy HG.1 to reflect this.

***Issue v)***

- 7.5 The importance of making the best use of opportunities for residential development within the principle urban area of Bath is recognised in the strategy of the plan and there is no need to set it out in this Chapter.

***Issue vi)***

- 7.6 The need for changes to the Green Belt around Keynsham is dealt with in Sections 5 and 9 of this report.

***Issue vii)***

- 7.7 The question of what would be an appropriate level of housing at Norton Radstock will need to be reviewed as a result of my recommendations in relation to meeting housing land supply requirements. As one of the urban areas within the District, it falls to be considered after Bath and Keynsham in the sequential approach to housing provision.

***Other matters***

- 7.8 In setting out a detailed list of requirements for all the GDS allocations in this Chapter, the Council has included a number of matters which would be dealt with through the normal process of development control, or which are in any event covered by other policies in the plan. These include such matters as access for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, foul or surface water drainage, archaeological investigations, flooding, pollution control, air quality and nature conservation. The plan would be greatly improved if unnecessary detail is taken out, and in relation to the

allocations the policy should focus on matters which are unique to that particular site and which are not adequately covered by policies elsewhere in the plan. Where an issue has been raised in relation to such clauses I have recommended their deletion.

### **Recommendations:**

R7.1 Modify paragraph B9.2 by deleting the last sentence and inserting:

“As with all development proposals, planning applications for the development of the allocated sites will be assessed against all the Local Plan policies which are relevant to the scheme.”

R7.2 Modify the plan by deleting paragraphs B9.3 and B9.4.

R7.3 Modify Policy GDS.1 as follows:

Delete sections A and B.

Review the list of clauses in each allocation and delete requirements which are covered by policies elsewhere in the plan.

---

## **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B1 - Western Riverside**

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1*

### **Issues**

- i) Whether the scale of residential development identified in the policy and the timescale for development identified in paragraph A4.26B are appropriate.
- ii) How would delivery be monitored and what measures are in place if the site fails to produce the levels of housing expected by the Council?
- iii) Could a comprehensive development be successfully delivered by individual land owners on a site by site basis and should the wording of the policy be amended to reflect this?
- iv) Is the scale and type of retail provision proposed in the consolidated version of the plan appropriate, and should provision be made for a new and larger replacement foodstore?
- v) To what extent does the policy protect the interests of existing businesses and should the area identified in the plan for comprehensive redevelopment be amended to exclude those who wish to remain?

- vi) Is the policy over prescriptive or should the following additional elements be included:
  - the Twerton on Avon footbridge which requires renovation;
  - new Council offices having regard to the high level of congestion in this area;
  - more through paths and access over the river;
  - performance arts centre;
  - major sports stadium;
  - employment, leisure and recreation uses;
  - detail of how yield assumptions have been calculated.
- vii) Is there adequate protection to existing local shops if more small shops are provided within the BWR scheme?
- viii) Does the policy provide adequate protection to the historic and natural environment?
- ix) Retail proposals, road improvements, route for integrated transport system for BWR should be shown on the Proposals Map.
- x) Is it appropriate to displace land uses at BWR to the Green Belt at Newbridge?

## **Inspector's Reasoning**

### ***Issue i)***

- 7.9 Clearly this is a very substantial site within an urban location where a high density of development can be expected to be achieved. The policy makes no reference to the overall level of housing which the site could accommodate and I consider this to be appropriate. Bearing in mind that the development of the site will continue beyond the plan period, at this stage the most important information is the level of housing which can be achieved by 2011, and that figure is included within the policy. I consider it is quite appropriate for the level of provision to be made on the whole site to be resolved in the master planning process which has yet to be completed. However, the number of dwellings identified in clause 2 to be provided in the plan period needs to be amended.
- 7.10 I consider the scale of development likely to be delivered on this site during the plan period under the heading of Housing Need in Section 5 of my report and conclude that it would not be prudent to rely on the delivery of more than 450 dwellings at BWR by 2011. I also emphasise that this assessment is based on the evidence before me at the close of the Inquiry in May 2005. By the time the Council receive this report it will be more apparent whether sufficient progress is being made on the

production of the master plan SPD, and the timetable for delivering a comprehensive development, for the site to deliver more or less than this number of dwellings by 2011.

- 7.11 The actual density to be achieved on the site is likely to vary according to the location and type of development proposed. In this urban location it should clearly be at the higher levels, and I consider that this is adequately addressed by Policy HG.7 as I recommend it to be modified.
- 7.12 As to the timescale for the actual development of the site, the period of 10 – 15 years referred to in paragraph A4.26B seems reasonable. In Section 1 of my report I recommend that paragraphs A4.26A – C be deleted from Chapter A4 of the plan, but that the Council may wish to import some of the text into Chapter B9 where I consider it would be more appropriately located. I recommend that the text be edited to avoid any repetition of matters dealt with under B1, and inserted under the heading “BATH” and before the box for Western Riverside.

***Issue ii)***

- 7.13 The Council has no sites identified for release as a contingency in the event that BWR does not deliver the 800 units expected by the Council by 2011, and in these circumstances it becomes even more important to ensure that the plan accurately reflects the level of housing which is likely to be delivered. In my view this should not be an optimistic assessment, but should adopt a “worst case scenario”. Subject to any modification to the numbers as a result of the progress made on the site since the close of the Inquiry, my recommendation that the site should be expected to deliver no more than 450 dwellings during the plan period should meet this requirement.

***Issue iii)***

- 7.14 I have indicated my view in Section 5 of this report that the Council should place a high priority on securing a properly planned and co-ordinated development of BWR. Some areas of the site are more constrained than others so the costs of development will vary across the site. If the less constrained sites were to be released before the future has been secured of those sites which are likely to be more costly to be developed, many of the benefits of a comprehensive scheme could be lost.
- 7.15 Annex 2 to B&NES 12.4 sets out all the elements of the BWR SPD and it seems to me that the agreement between all the relevant parties of the Implementation Plan is fundamental to the achievement of a comprehensive approach to the development of the site. Although the Council has agreed to the appointment of Crest Nicholson alongside Grosvenor as joint Master Development Partner, without the use of CPO powers there is no guarantee that other landowners will make their sites available to the Council's preferred developer. However, once the SPD is in place and the Implementation Plan agreed, it is difficult to see any

reason why individual developers/landowners should not bring forward their sites to be progressed in accordance with the principles of the strategic framework and spatial masterplan, having made a commitment in terms of their contribution to the overall site costs.

- 7.16 To ensure that all the relevant parties can be confident that they can progress development once the SPD is finalised, the wording of GDS.1/B1 needs to reflect these particular circumstances. Various forms of words were discussed at the Inquiry, including my own suggestion. The Council identified three preconditions which would need to be met by any individual scheme, but it seems to me that provided the SPD is in the format set out in Annex 2 to B&NES 12.4, and that the development accords with the SPD, it would meet those preconditions in any event. I therefore recommend a form of words which requires a proposal to be in accordance with the SPD in order to secure the comprehensive development of the site.

#### ***Issue iv)***

- 7.17 I deal with the principle of allocating BWR for “High street” comparison retail floorspace in Section 4 of my report. In my view the development of Green Park station as proposed would introduce a separate shopping destination which would compete with shops in the existing historic centre and with the new units to be constructed in the redevelopment of Southgate. Although the Lichfield study identified overtrading within the existing city centre together with the potential for a significant level of growth in expenditure to support new floorspace, I identify other issues which need to be taken into account, not least of which is the need to secure the successful implementation of the Southgate scheme and to avoid any risk of harm to the historic city centre. I recommend the deletion of BWR as a retail allocation from Policy S.3.
- 7.18 With regard to the accommodation of bulky goods at BWR, this is also dealt with in Section 4 of the report. Whilst Sainsbury’s and Homebase are both large stores located within the BWR site, I have expressed my sympathy for the view that the addition of a large area of warehouse sheds surrounded by car parking would not be an appropriate use for a site which has the potential to be a high quality urban development area enhancing the unique character and status of the WHS. There is some retail warehouse development at the Weston Lock Retail Park in Lower Bristol Road and I consider it more appropriate to investigate the potential for bulky goods development there.
- 7.19 I note the criteria which are listed by the Council under 2A and 2B which are intended to avoid any harmful consequences from the development of large scale retailing at BWR, but agree with objectors that the criteria are vague and imprecise and would provide inadequate protection to guarantee the level of commercial confidence required for Southgate to be delivered. Conditions to restrict the range of goods sold at retail warehouse type development have been widely used and shown to be effective. However the application and enforcement of such conditions as

suggested to high street type comparison shopping at BWR to prevent it from competing with city centre shopping is not so straightforward. I therefore recommend the deletion of 2A and 2B from B1.

- 7.20 I support the provision of additional convenience floorspace in response to forecast additional expenditure and to take pressure off the Sainsbury's store. However, although reference was made to viability issues at the Inquiry, I have no evidence to indicate that there is a positive requirement for additional convenience floorspace to be located at BWR. Indeed, I acknowledge the benefits in meeting the need in South Bath and recommend the allocation of a site in that area. In these circumstances there is no basis for a requirement for additional convenience floorspace in GDS.1/B1.
- 7.21 Clearly the deletion of a major quantum of retail development from the BWR regeneration will have significant implications for the project as a whole. The Council refers to the impact on the quality and delivery of the scheme. However, it seems to me that the main effect must be in relation to its scale. If the consequence of the loss of the retail element is the retention of Sainsbury's and Homebase on their existing sites, then the overall scale of the redevelopment will be reduced and confined to a residential and business redevelopment of the remainder of the site. This would be a less ambitious scheme than envisaged in the RDDLP, but in my view that is preferable to any risk to the historic shopping centre of Bath and the success of the Southgate scheme. What is important is that the BWR scheme addresses the redevelopment of former employment sites, and the overall environmental improvement of the riverside area. I have no evidence to suggest that the retention of Sainsbury's and Homebase should prevent that from being achieved.
- 7.22 I recommend in Section 4 that the Council develop retail policy beyond the plan period by working up a shopping strategy for the city centre in the form of an Area Action Plan with measures for the planned implementation of retail development. In my view significant retail development at BWR should not be envisaged before that shopping strategy has been properly worked up and sequentially preferable sites such as Avon Street car park have been developed.

### ***Issue v)***

- 7.23 There are a number of sites within the boundary of BWR as identified on the PM which are in active occupation and use. These include Sainsbury's, Homebase, Renrod car dealerships, Bath Press, Railtrack and businesses in James Street West. These businesses seek protection of their operational interests through the wording of the policy, or removal from the boundaries of the site.
- 7.24 Although the policy refers in 4 to relocation of other uses, the examples given are all uses which the Council would prefer to see relocated away from BWR in any event. In relation to this issue, the objectors are concerned to protect their location within BWR or to be allocated an

equivalent location in the vicinity. They have thriving businesses which they seek to protect, and as stated by Renrod, sites for car dealerships are not easily identified within Bath. I have some sympathy with their concerns. The inclusion of active businesses within an area identified by the Council for redevelopment, inevitably leads to uncertainty as to the security of their future. There is no indication in the policy as to whether the intention is for existing businesses to remain where they are, to be relocated within the site, or to be moved out altogether. Furthermore, for a business wishing to develop its own site as in the case of Renrod, the plan provides no indication of whether such a scheme could be acceptable.

- 7.25 It seems to me that this situation should be improved to provide a clear indication to existing businesses what they might expect as a result of the proposals for BWR. I appreciate that the policy cannot recognise the circumstances of every business which might be affected by the redevelopment. The modifications suggested by Renrod would address the issue in regard to their sites but would be less certain for other existing businesses. I therefore agree with the Council that this is a matter for the master plan SPD. However, having regard to the sites which would come forward for development during the plan period, it is unlikely that any existing business will be affected before 2011, so this should be spelled out. Furthermore, in the interests of local employment, businesses wishing to remain within the BWR site and which are compatible with the redevelopment scheme should be accommodated within the redevelopment. I recommend a modification to the policy to reflect this.
- 7.26 For Renrod and Bath Press the preferred solution is to be excluded from the boundary of the redevelopment site, and in my view this is a matter to which the Council needs to give more thought.
- 7.27 The Bath Press site is separated from the main BWR site by the Lower Bristol Road. It is substantially taken up by the main building and evidence is submitted of the costs of equipment which would make it difficult for the company to relocate, and of the numbers of employees which make it one of the City's larger employers. I note the Council's concern that it should remain within the BWR boundaries to ensure any future redevelopment accords with the master plan principles, but in view of the physical separation of the site from the remainder of the BWR area, I consider that the other policies of the plan would provide sufficient control to ensure that any future redevelopment accords with the character of the area as it is regenerated. Bearing in mind the nature of this business and its location away from the main BWR site, and in the absence of any good reasons for including it within the redevelopment site, I recommend that it is taken out.
- 7.28 The Renrod sites lie to the north of the Lower Bristol Road facing the Bath Press site. The northern boundaries of the sites abut the Transco gasholder site. The Council's concerns are that if the site was vacated it should be included in a comprehensive scheme, but there is no evidence that its exclusion would compromise the achievement of a comprehensive



scheme. As in the case for the Bath Press site I consider that the policies of the plan should ensure any redevelopment by the site owner would accord with the character of the regenerated area. Furthermore, in the event that part of the site is affected by transport requirements in the future, it is not necessary for the site to be within the BWR boundaries for that part to be acquired. Thus I find no good reasons for including either the Bath Press or the Renrod sites within the BWR boundaries. The sites accommodate thriving businesses and could be taken out of the redevelopment area with no harm to a future comprehensive development scheme. I recommend they should be excluded from the BWR site.

- 7.29 With my recommendation to delete the Council's proposals for new retail development at BWR, an important reason for including Sainsbury's and the Homebase site within the area for redevelopment is lost. These uses take up large areas of land and their deletion from the BWR site would need to be given very careful consideration. This was not a matter for debate at the Inquiry and I have insufficient evidence to assess whether or not Sainsbury's and Homebase should continue to be included within the BWR regeneration area. I therefore make no recommendation in this regard.

#### ***Issue vi)***

- 7.30 Far from being unduly prescriptive I consider that B1 is broadly drafted. For example, it does not specify the quantum of business development, and only gives the level of residential development to take place during the plan period. No change is required in response to this objection.
- 7.31 Other objectors have sought the addition of detailed matters which I list above. Taking the last in the list, in my view the plan is not the place for detailed calculations of yield to be set out. There are challenges to the level of housing which can be built on the site during the plan period which I have considered, but no other issue has been raised for which evidence on yields would be required. I fail to see the relevance of this objection.
- 7.32 With regard to the other matters listed, these are details which would need to be addressed in the master planning process. Pedestrian links remain to be assessed in detail, and the provision of community facilities such as a sports stadium and performance arts centre will depend on the availability of appropriate sites and funding. The policy should outline the broad principles for the scheme. Inclusion of these matters would require an inappropriate level of detail.

#### ***Issue vii)***

- 7.33 Policy S.4 as recommended to be modified would require the effects of any new retail development to be assessed and Twerton is one of the local centres listed under Policy S.1. The provision of small shops within the development site would therefore need to have regard to any impact on existing local centres.

***Issue viii)***

- 7.34 Although B1 does not specifically include a reference to nature conservation and the protection of the historic environment, proposals for the site are subject to all the other policies of the plan and there is adequate protection for these matters in Chapters C2 and C3.

***Issue ix)***

- 7.35 I recommend against large scale retail development at BWR, but if it were to be planned, the locations for retail proposals are not yet available and would more appropriately be included within the master plan. I deal with issues concerning the rapid transport system in Section 13 of my report, but there are no firm proposals which should be shown on the Proposals Map.

***Issue x)***

- 7.36 I deal with this issue in my consideration of B1A – Newbridge where I recommend against the release of the site at Newbridge from the Green Belt.

**Recommendations:**

- R7.4 Modify the plan by inserting edited paragraphs A4.26A – C under the heading “BATH” before policy B1.

- R7.5 Modify Policy GDS.1/B1 as follows:

in 2 delete “800” and insert “450”.

delete clauses 2A and 2B.

add after 10: “There will be no requirement for existing businesses to be relocated during the plan period. Those business uses wishing to remain within the site and which are compatible with the redevelopment scheme, will either remain in their current locations or be relocated within or adjacent to the redeveloped area.”

Delete final sentence and insert: “Any planning application will need to demonstrate that it is consistent with and contributes to the comprehensive development of the whole site by reference to the Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document which accords with this policy.”

- R7.6 Delete the Bath Press site and the area which includes the Renrod sites from the BWR allocation on the Proposal Map.

- R7.7 Review the need to include Sainsbury’s and Homebase within the BWR allocation on the Proposals Map.

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B1A - Newbridge

42/C19	CPRE	GDS.1/B1A/A
110/C24	Sport England South West	GDS.1/B1A/A
120/C263	Ms Helen Woodley	GDS.1/B1A/A
686/C172	Bath Preservation Trust	GDS.1/B1A/A
686/C179	Bath Preservation Trust	GDS.1/B1A/A
695/C30	Society of Merchant Venturers	GDS.1/B1A/A
697/C7	Twerton Park Properties Ltd	GDS.1/B1A/A
2987/C6	Royal United Hospital Bath NHS Trust	GDS.1/B1A/A
3098/C55	George Wimpey Strategic Land	GDS.1/B1A/A
3347/C2	Mrs R le Huray	GDS.1/B1A/A
3390/C1	Mr M Stockley	GDS.1/B1A/A
3427/C1	Mr R M Ball	GDS.1/B1A/A
3438/C3	Mr R V Garroway	GDS.1/B1A/A
3463/C2	Stothert & Pitt Sports Club	GDS.1/B1A/A
3511/C12	British Waterways	GDS.1/B1A/A
3547/C2	Mr & Mrs D F Bye	GDS.1/B1A/A
3626/C6	Bath Friends of the Earth	GDS.1/B1A/A
589/C10	Bath City Football Club	GDS.1/B1A/B
686/C171	Bath Preservation Trust	GDS.1/B1A/B

### Issues

- i) Whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of 10.5 hectares of land from the Green Belt in this location.
- ii) Whether the site should be used for sports facilities, as well as a Park & Ride and civic amenity facility.
- iii) Whether Policy GDS.1/B1A should include:
  - A clause on flood risk and the use of SUDs to safeguard water quality.
  - Reference to the nature conservation policies of the plan.
  - Details of the implementation of the facility and its relationship to the proposals in the plan.
  - Requirement for enhancement of the riverside for the benefit of users and passing boaters.
- iv) Whether the Proposals Map should include details of the development with the location of transport interchange and WTS.

### Inspector's Reasoning

#### *Issue i)*

- 7.37 This proposal is for the removal of 10.5 hectares of land from the Green Belt at Newbridge. The greenfield site to the north of the A36 would be used as a park and ride and rapid transit terminus, and the land south of the A36 would be developed as a civic amenity facility, cleansing depot and salt depot. The land south of the A36 is partly in use as playing fields

and the remainder was shown on the DDLP as a Visually Important Open Space.

- 7.38 The Council seeks support for the removal of the site from the Green Belt from Policy SS.4 of RPG10 which advises local authorities in preparing development plans to critically review the Green Belt to examine whether boundary alterations are needed to allow for long term sustainable development needs, and remove land from the Green Belt for development if on balance this would provide the most sustainable solution for accommodating future development requirements. However, the RPG states clearly in paragraphs 3.10 and 3.11 that the boundaries of the Green Belt should be reviewed in the next round of structure plans so that development to meet requirements for housing, employment and other uses may be accommodated in urban extensions. It is therefore as part of a comprehensive review of development requirements and of the Green Belt boundary that RPG10 allows for land to be released on the periphery of Bath. Understandably there has been no such review in this Local Plan.
- 7.39 Whilst RPG10 is a material consideration to be taken into account, this plan is founded in the policies of the JRSP, and there is no policy in the JRSP to support the release of land from the Green Belt at this location. I therefore consider there is no policy basis for the release of land at Newbridge in this Local Plan. With no strategic policy to support the release of the site, PPG2 requires there to be exceptional circumstances to justify a change in status.

*Park and ride and rapid transit terminus*

- 7.40 Taking first the arguments advanced in support of the park and ride and rapid transport interchange, the guidance in PPG13 recognises that there may be conflict between the delivery of appropriately located park & ride schemes and Green Belt policy. In this respect Annex E provides a five criteria test to determine whether a scheme would represent appropriate development in the Green Belt. As proposed the scheme would provide for 1500 car parking spaces, which could only be accommodated through the development of a decked car park. Such a structure would clearly affect the openness of the Green Belt and as such it would fail criterion (c) and constitute inappropriate development. The Council proposes to take the site of the park and ride out of the Green Belt in recognition that the development would be inappropriate.
- 7.41 The Council argue that the increase in park & ride capacity is a major aspect of the transport strategy and essential to achieving significant progress towards modal shift. The park & ride is part of an integrated package of improved public transport options combined with demand management measures. Furthermore, the additional park & ride capacity will play an important role in achieving the redevelopment of central areas of Bath in particular Bath Western Riverside.

- 7.42 However, there is no transport modelling work available at this stage to support a proposal of this scale. I was told that it would need to be of this scale in order to be viable and to meet demand, and to support the development of a rapid transit service, but no evidence was presented to support this proposition. Although the rapid transit scheme is to be included in the next Local Transport Plan, there are currently no firm proposals, and no evidence of funding. It was the Council's case that this scale of development was required to provide off site car parking for the redevelopment of BWR, even though it was simultaneously argued that the park and ride would not be available to residents of BWR for overnight or long term car parking. However, I have no evidence to support the Council's assertion, and there are clearly transport implications arising from my recommendations to delete the large scale retail development from the BWR scheme. Without that development there may no longer be a requirement for such a high level of off site car parking.
- 7.43 Land should only be removed from the Green Belt where there are exceptional circumstance to justify its release. If the site were to be removed from the Green Belt in this plan, and the Council did not progress the decked car park it would be difficult to protect the site from other forms of development which may not be justified. Without a firm proposal and substantial evidence to demonstrate that it is both necessary and likely to be implemented, I find insufficient evidence to support the Council's proposal to remove the site from the Green Belt for a decked car park and rapid transit terminus.
- 7.44 Without the decking I was told that the site could accommodate 900 cars, which is still a substantial increase over the capacity of the existing park and ride at Newbridge. With parking at ground level, the openness of the Green Belt could be maintained and there would be no need to remove the site from the Green Belt. Thus the retention of the site within the Green Belt would not prevent the implementation of a park and ride of this scale. In the event that there is justification for more park and ride spaces, then consideration could be given to expanding the facility at Odd Down, or of taking land south of the A36 to extend the area of ground level car parking at Newbridge.
- 7.45 It was argued that a terminus, waiting facilities and associated offices would be required for the rapid transit system which would also have implications for the openness of the Green Belt. I accept that this may be the most appropriate location for the terminus, being at the edge of the city on a main access route and adjacent to the disused railway line. However, the terminus would occupy a relatively small part of the site and without a properly worked up and funded scheme there is no certainty that it would be implemented. Again I find the arguments are not sufficient to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt. Within the site of a ground level park and ride, a terminus and any other buildings required in connection with a new rapid transit system could be considered on their merits as an exception to normal Green Belt policy.

- 7.46 The principle of park & ride is generally supported in PPG13. The guidance recognises the sustainability benefits that can arise from the development of well-designed and well-conceived park & ride schemes. Indeed, paragraph 59 states that schemes which accord with the advice in the guidance “should be given favourable treatment through the planning system”. Objectors argued that this was not the best location for a park and ride, and an option would be to expand the number of spaces at Odd Down. However, this would rule out the potential for linking the park and ride with a future rapid transit system which makes use of the disused railway. I also note the popularity of the existing park & ride facility at Newbridge, and conclude that this is a desirable location for the provision of further park and ride facilities. Ideally the Council should look to expand the existing site rather than develop across the road, but in the event this is not feasible, then the land north of the A36 should be considered for a ground level car park which is properly landscaped and designed to maintain the openness of the site and to minimise the effect on the rural character of the surrounding area. With this approach, there is no justification to remove the site from the Green Belt.

*Civic amenity and associated facilities*

- 7.47 On the area of land to the south of the proposed park and ride and separated by the A36 the Council proposes to locate a civic amenity facility and street cleansing depot currently located at Midland Road, together with a salt depot currently located at Braysdown and Clutton. The Midland Road Depot is located to the north of the river within the BWR regeneration site. At present it also accommodates a recycling depot, a waste transfer station and a refuse collection depot. These uses are to be relocated in Keynsham. The Council wishes to clear the site of existing uses to enable a redevelopment as part of a mixed use scheme and argues that this is consistent with RPG10 where it requires optimum use to be made of any opportunities, including the reassessment of existing sites allocated for other uses, for residential or mixed use development. Clearly this approach accords with Government policy, but neither Government policy nor RPG10 provide support for the relocation of existing uses into the Green Belt. The salt depot is not currently at BWR and the main reason for seeking a location at Newbridge is that it would be convenient. In my view the Council's convenience is not an “exceptional circumstance” of the sort required to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt.
- 7.48 I accept that the civic amenity facility and street cleansing depot need to be located as close as possible to the population which they serve and therefore it would not be sustainable to locate them at Keynsham. However, there is no clear link between the provision of a park and ride and these facilities. A number of alternative sites have been considered and in operational terms it is clear that the site south of the A36 is well suited to meet the Council's requirements. However, this does not justify the removal of the land from the Green Belt. In my view the Council needs to reconsider the use of a brownfield site within the confines of the City rather than move the uses onto Green Belt land in order to enable

higher value land uses at Midland Road. Bearing in mind the scale of the BWR site and its proposed use for business as well as residential development, it may even be possible to locate the facilities within the scheme. I appreciate the environmental issues which arise, but such uses are frequently located in the vicinity of residential or business development within dense urban areas and with careful management and screening there is no significant harm to residential amenity as a result. The retention of these facilities which are essential to the city within the scheme would not in my view conflict with Government policy to make the best use of brownfield land.

### *Conclusion*

- 7.49 My conclusion on this issue is that there are not the exceptional circumstances sufficient to justify the release of Green Belt land for the development of a decked park and ride together with a rapid transit terminus, and a civic amenity facility. However, the land north of the A36 could accommodate a ground level park and ride without any need to remove its Green Belt designation, and in the event of a firm proposal for a rapid transit terminus this should be considered on its merits within the context of Green Belt policies.

### *Issue ii)*

- 7.50 Policy GDS.1/B1A seeks the replacement of the existing sports facilities at Newbridge. In view of my recommendation not to relocate the civic amenity and associated facilities to Newbridge, a relocation would not be necessary. I deal with the issue of a new stadium at Newbridge in Section 3 of my report.

### *Issue iii)*

- 7.51 Part of the park and ride site is in the River Avon flood plain and as a result any development would be considered against Policy NE.14. Sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems would be required under Policy ES.5. There is no need to include these requirements as criteria to Policy GDS.1/B1A.
- 7.52 Since the plan is considered as a whole in relation to any proposal, there is no need for the policy to include a reference to the nature conservation policies.
- 7.53 Whilst it would be reasonable to include details of the implementation of the site within the plan, I am content that such details should be reserved for the matter to be dealt with as part of the SPD for BWR.
- 7.54 There is no evidence to suggest that the park and ride would affect river navigation, and in any event details of the scheme will be addressed in the BWR SPD.

### ***Issue iv)***

7.55 The changes to the Proposals Map show the site allocation and it would be inappropriate to include any further detail. However, the designation will require further change to reflect my recommendations that the site be retained within the Green Belt, with the northern area allocated for a park and ride scheme of 900 spaces under policy GDS.1/B1A.

### **Recommendations:**

R7.8 Retain the established Green Belt boundary at Newbridge as shown on the Proposals Map of the DDLP.

R7.9 Modify Policy GDS.1/B1A as follows:

amend site area to that of the land north of the A36.

delete 2.

delete 13.

---

## **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B2**

42/B3	CPRE	GDS.1/B2
485/B17	Prowting Projects Ltd	GDS.1/B2
695/B11	Society of Merchant Venturers	GDS.1/B2
725/B3	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	GDS.1/B2
1427/B85	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B2
1857/B1	Mr D B Meakin	GDS.1/B2
3023/B4	Mr & Mrs D Hawkes	GDS.1/B2
3233/B21	Mr & Mrs M Williams	GDS.1/B2
3278/B17	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/B2
3299/B11	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/B2
2707/C7	Crest Strategic Projects Limited	GDS.1/B2/A

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

7.56 The main issues relating to this allocation are the number of houses the site could accommodate, whether the site should be retained for employment uses and whether the site could genuinely deliver the number of houses allocated in the plan. I have considered the availability of this site in Section 5. As I have stated in that section, sites should only be allocated for development in this plan if they are genuinely available. The plan now covers only a short period and there will not be a readily available five year supply of land if sites which are not immediately available are included as part of the strategic supply. In view of the evidence submitted by objectors that Defence Estates has not yet taken any decision as to the future of the site, I have concluded that it should not be included as an allocation in the plan. In the event that the site should be released by MOD before 2011, it will be no different from any other large windfall site that comes forward, and the new LDF system



provides the mechanism to update the development plan in response to any major changes in circumstances.

### Recommendation:

R7.10 Modify the plan by deleting policy GDS.1/B2 and from the Proposals Map.

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B3

2/B50	T2000/Railfutures	GDS.1/B3
120/B93	Ms Helen Woodley	GDS.1/B3
120/B94	Ms Helen Woodley	GDS.1/B3
696/B35	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B3
1427/B86	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B3
3271/B1	Bellwish Limited	GDS.1/B3
3299/D87	Bovis Homes	PIC/B/56 (GDS.1/B3)
3599/C2	Linden Homes (Western) Ltd	GDS.1/B3/A
3605/C6	Nicholson Estates	GDS.1/B3/A
3605/C16	Nicholson Estates	GDS.1/B3/A
3116/C90	Bath & North East Somerset Allotment Association	GDS.1/B3/C

### Supporting Statement

696/C82	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B3/A
---------	------------------------------------	------------

### Issues

- i) Whether the site will achieve the allocated number of dwellings in the plan period.
- ii) Whether there is an appropriate balance between residential and business and community uses proposed.
- iii) Whether there should be a requirement for the provision of allotments as part of the development.
- iv) Should the allocation include a requirement for the use of SUDs; for key worker's dwellings; and for a small retail unit?

### Inspector's Reasoning

#### Issue i)

7.57 Outline planning permission has been granted with an indication that the site could accommodate 130 dwellings. The reserved matters application is for 135 dwellings. I have no evidence to support the contention that this level of housing cannot be provided within the plan period. In any event, the site is part of the contribution to housing land supply from sites with planning permission and I have recommended that there is a 10% discount provided to take account of any failure to implement these sites.

***Issue ii)***

7.58 I consider the requirement for employment land in Section 2 of my report, and Rush Hill is included as a one of the sites available in the plan period for new employment development. The policy requires at least 2 hectares of land for business development and this appears to me to represent a reasonable mix for a site of this scale. The type of community facilities to be sought are not specified in the policy which makes for uncertainty but I have no evidence on which to base a recommendation for a specific form of provision. The policy would be improved if the type of provision was specified in the policy, and in the event that this is known, I recommend the Council modify the policy accordingly.

***Issue iii)***

7.59 Objectors assert that the site includes some land last used as allotments but the Council do not agree and I have no basis on which to make a judgement. There is no requirement for allotments to be provided at present in the policy, but this could be included under the heading of community provision. Without evidence as to need for allotments in this particular locality together with opportunities to meet that need, I am not in a position to recommend that the provision of allotments be required as part of the policy.

***Issue iv)***

7.60 The requirement for sustainable foul and surface water drainage systems is covered by Policy ES.5 to which any development proposal is subject. It is not therefore necessary to include any reference in the policy.

7.61 The site is also subject to the policies of the plan on affordable housing which could be available to key workers. It would be inappropriate to require any further provision.

7.62 It is unlikely that a development of this scale would be able to maintain a viable small retail unit as a part of the scheme, although there is nothing in the policy to rule it out if the developers sought to include one. I find no justification to include such a requirement in the policy.

**Recommendations:**

R7.11 Modify the policy to provide an indication of the community facilities required under 3 if known.

R7.12 Review the allocation if the base date of the plan is amended.

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B4**

2/B31 T2000/Railfutures  
1427/B87 Environment Agency

GDS.1/B4  
GDS.1/B4

2965/B11	Morley Fund Management Limited	GDS.1/B4
2965/B17	Morley Fund Management Limited	GDS.1/B4
3126/B44	Bath Friends of the Earth	GDS.1/B4
3299/B13	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/B4

## Supporting Statement

2695/B8	The Springs Foundation	GDS.1/B4
---------	------------------------	----------

## Issues

- i) Whether the site should accommodate more housing, with a specification of 25% affordable housing.
- ii) Should the policy include an additional requirement to secure protection against flood risk?
- iii) Is further wording justified in item 1?
- iv) Does the allocation on the Proposals Map need to be modified to exclude the property known as Avonside?

## Inspector's Reasoning

### *Issue i)*

- 7.63 This is an important city centre site where the uses are to be predominantly retail and commercial. The provision of 90 dwellings will introduce a new residential use into the area and contribute to local vitality. I have no reason to consider that a higher level of housing would be justified in this location.
- 7.64 As for the element of affordable housing, planning permission has been granted on the basis of 25% affordable housing. This is less than the proportion I am recommending in HG.8 which is an overall average of 35%, and clearly any new application for planning permission would be subject to HG.8 as recommended to be modified. In these circumstances I see no reason to refer to the level of affordable housing in the text of the policy.

### *Issue ii)*

- 7.65 Flood risk issues are covered by Policy NE.14 and would be dealt with through the development control process, with consultation as appropriate. I see no reason to refer to this matter in the policy.

### *Issue iii)*

- 7.66 Whilst I have no doubt that the provision of comparison retail floorspace at Southgate will enhance the vitality and viability of the city centre, I find no reason to make such a statement in the policy.

### ***Issue iv)***

7.67 Whilst I appreciate the reasons why the Council seeks to retain Avonside within the Southgate redevelopment area, it is not included within the scheme for redevelopment of the site. Without any commitment from developers to refurbish this building it is uncertain how the Council's aim will be achieved. In my view the property should only be included within the Southgate allocation on the Proposals Map if there is reasonable prospect of it being refurbished as part of the redevelopment scheme.

### **Recommendation:**

R7.13 The Council should reconsider whether the property known as Avonside should be included within the Southgate allocation on the Proposals Map.

R7.14 Review the allocation if the base date of the plan is amended

---

## **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B5**

2/B51	T2000/Railfutures	GDS.1/B5
334/B7	Ms P Davis	GDS.1/B5
376/B5	Mr I Wallis	GDS.1/B5
1427/B88	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B5
1830/B3	Highways Agency	GDS.1/B5
3134/B2	Ms M Dorman	GDS.1/B5
3233/B22	Mr & Mrs M Williams	GDS.1/B5
3278/B19	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/B5

### **Supporting Statement**

2988/B2	Mr & Mrs J Richards	GDS.1/B5
---------	---------------------	----------

### **Issues**

- i) The effect of the development of the two sites on the adjoining Green Belt and the landscape setting of the area.
- ii) Whether there should be a requirement for surface water run off limitation and SUDs to serve the development, or for children's play space.
- iii) Whether a combined Transport Assessment should be required.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

#### ***Issue i)***

7.68 This allocation has been reduced from the original 90 dwellings proposed in the DDLP since planning permission has already been granted for part of the site east of the A46. That part of the site west of the A46 has also been granted permission subject to a S106 agreement. Land at the Elms and west of the bypass are surrounded by residential development so

there is unlikely to be any harmful effect on the wider landscape and Green Belt. Furthermore, the policy recognises the character of the surrounding area by restricting the number of dwellings to be built on the sites. Any development would also be subject to other policies in the plan such as BH.6 which controls development within conservation areas, and GB.1 which seeks to ensure that any impact on the adjoining Green Belt is taken into account. I am therefore satisfied that the allocation ensures that sufficient account can be taken of any impact on the adjoining Green Belt and landscape setting of the area.

***Issue ii)***

7.69 Policy ES.5 seeks to ensure that new development is adequately drained, and the Environment Agency is consulted on new proposals. I consider that this provides sufficient safeguarding of drainage issues without the need for an additional requirement in the policy.

7.70 The sites have been treated as one allocation and provision for children's play space is to be made on the land east of the bypass.

***Issue iii)***

7.71 A detailed transport assessment was submitted in support of the two planning applications and adopted by the Council as the highways authority. There was no objection from the Highways Agency to the allocations and therefore it is difficult to find any justification for requiring the production of a combined transport assessment.

**Recommendation:**

R7.15 Review the allocation if the base date of the plan is amended.

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B6**

581/B10	Batheaston Society	GDS.1/B6
1427/B89	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B6
1830/B4	Highways Agency	GDS.1/B6
696/C59	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B6/A

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.72 Following the grant of planning permission for 5 dwellings on appeal, the principle of residential development on this site is now established and there is little benefit in reassessing this site through the Local Plan.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B7

1427/B90	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B7
2079/B1	Mr D Roberts	GDS.1/B7
2202/B1	Ms J M Colebourne	GDS.1/B7
2357/B1	Mr & Mrs P Dorey	GDS.1/B7
2358/B1	Mr & Mrs P J Woodham	GDS.1/B7
2359/B1	Mr P M Witty	GDS.1/B7
2552/B1	Mr F J Henderson	GDS.1/B7
2624/B1	Mr & Mrs N Hall	GDS.1/B7
3199/B1	Mrs C J Mould	GDS.1/B7
3215/B1	Dr S E Brown	GDS.1/B7
3232/B1	Mrs & Mrs D Sartin	GDS.1/B7
3233/B23	Mr & Mrs M Williams	GDS.1/B7
3278/B20	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/B7
696/C60	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B7/A

## Supporting Statements

120/C180	Ms Helen Woodley	GDS.1/B7/A
2118/C4	Mr S C Banks	GDS.1/B7/A

## Issues

- i) Would the development of the site result in an unacceptable environmental impact?
- ii) Whether adequate access and surface water drainage could be provided to the site.

## Inspector's Reasoning

7.73 This site has been deleted from the RDDLP but in view of the shortfall in the housing land supply which I have identified in Section 5 of my report, I have recommended that the Council reconsider it for allocation. I appreciate the concerns raised by local residents, but the site is in a sustainable location for transport, and there would remain a substantial area of open space to preserve the amenities of the area. The Environment Agency advises that strategies would be required for surface drainage and water course treatment, but there is no suggestion that these could not be achieved. Issues related to access would need to be investigated further by the Council, and measures would be required to minimise ecological impacts.

## Recommendation:

R7.16 That the Council consider the reinstatement of GDS.1/B7.

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B8

696/B36	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B8
1427/B91	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B8
2311/B9	Somer Community Housing Trust	GDS.1/B8

3278/B21	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/B8
696/C61	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B8/A

### Supporting Statement

3116/C89	Bath & North East Somerset Allotment Association	GDS.1/B8/A
----------	--	------------

### Issues

- i) Should the site be reserved for use as allotment?
- ii) Whether development should be at a higher density or be required to provide SUDs.
- iii) The effect on the character of the residential area and adjoining conservation area.

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.74 This site was deleted from the RDDLP but in view of the shortfall in the housing land supply I have recommended in section 5 of my report that the site be reconsidered for residential development. However, I have also recommended that the need to use the site as allotments be first investigated before any decision is taken.

7.75 I am otherwise satisfied that a suitable scheme which would not cause significant harm to the character of the area could be achieved on the site. Density would need to reflect the character of the area and accord with the new policy which I recommend to replace Policies HG.7 and HG.7A, and drainage would be subject to Policy ES.5 of the plan.

### Recommendation:

R7.17 That the Council reconsider the allocation of the site for housing, subject to any need for its use as allotments.

---

### Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B9

1427/B92	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B9
3278/B22	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/B9

### Supporting Statement

696/C83	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B9/A
---------	------------------------------------	------------

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.76 Planning permission has been granted for this site and therefore the principle of development, including the number of dwellings identified in the policy, is established. I have recommended that a 10% discount be applied to all sites with planning permission to allow for any slippage in

implementation during the plan period. I make no further comment about the site.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B10**

2/B30	T2000/Railfutures	GDS.1/B10
564/B35	London Road Area Residents Association	GDS.1/B10
1909/B1	Ms S Cox	GDS.1/B10
696/C62	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B10/A

**Supporting Statement**

1427/B93	Environment Agency	GDS.1/B10
----------	--------------------	-----------

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.77 Planning permission was granted to develop this site for 24 flats in April 2002, and therefore the principle of residential development is established. I have recommended that a 10% discount be applied to all sites with planning permission to allow for any slippage in implementation, and make no further comment about the site.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B11**

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1*

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.78 Proposals for the release of land from the Green Belt and the allocation of the land for development connected with the university were the subject of an Inquiry session and I deal with all the issues raised in Section 9 of my report.

**Recommendation: see Section 9**

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B12**

725/C15	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	GDS.1/B12/A
2356/C9	The Hon W H M Jolliffe	GDS.1/B12/A
2641/C20	David Wilson Homes	GDS.1/B12/A
3004/C7	The Renrod Motor Group	GDS.1/B12/A
3023/C17	Mr & Mrs D Hawkes	GDS.1/B12/A
3098/C54	George Wimpey Strategic Land	GDS.1/B12/A



3219/C9	The Hon Andrew Jolliffe	GDS.1/B12/A
3276/C12	Temra of Bath	GDS.1/B12/A
3276/C13	Temra of Bath	GDS.1/B12/A
3276/C14	Temra of Bath	GDS.1/B12/A
3299/C64	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/B12/A
3525/C1	Merlion Capital Corporation	GDS.1/B12/A
3590/C1	G Williams & Son (Sculptors) Ltd	GDS.1/B12/A
3608/C1	Mr I Cawkwell	GDS.1/B12/A
3612/C1	BLU Securites Ltd	GDS.1/B12/A
3626/C1	Bath Friends of the Earth	GDS.1/B12/A
3627/C2	Astra Circuits Ltd	GDS.1/B12/A
3628/C1	Huggett Electrical Ltd	GDS.1/B12/A
3628/C2	Huggett Electrical Ltd	GDS.1/B12/A
3627/C1	Astra Circuits Ltd	GDS.1/B12/B
717/E6	St John's Hospital Trustees	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
747/E1	Cllr Ms C Roberts	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3116/E147	Bath & North East Somerset Allotment Association	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3126/E117	Bath Friends of the Earth	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3612/E17	BLU Securites Ltd	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3660/E18	Ms S Bones	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3662/E4	Insight Investments	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3663/E4	House of Fraser	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3664/E4	Standard Life	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3665/E4	Willats Charity	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3668/E6	Castlemore Securities Ltd	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)
3671/E6	Mr N Stubbs	FPIC/B/25 (GDS.1/B12)

## Supporting Statement

696/C74	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B12/A
---------	------------------------------------	-------------

## Issues

- i) Whether it is appropriate to seek a comprehensive approach to the development of the site, and whether the boundaries have been properly defined.
- ii) What is the scale and likely timescale for the delivery of residential development of the site?
- iii) Is the mix of uses proposed in the plan appropriate, and should the Weston Lock Retail Park be included, with new retail warehousing linked?
- iv) Does the policy need to include requirements re nature conservation, flooding, allotment provision, POS and community facilities?

## Inspector's Reasoning

### Issue i)

7.79 It is because the site is in fragmented ownerships and uses that I support the principle of a comprehensive approach to the redevelopment of this part of Lower Bristol Road (LBR). There are areas which may be contaminated within the site which could affect its potential for redevelopment, and a comprehensive approach would ensure that such

areas are not left out of the regeneration process whilst less constrained parts are brought forward. The site is in an important location on one of the main routes into the City and a properly laid out scheme developed in accordance with a master plan would make a positive contribution to the WHS. Although piecemeal development has been permitted in the past, I see no reason why this should continue into the future. Furthermore, a comprehensive scheme in accordance with a master plan would help secure appropriate contributions towards necessary infrastructure including public transport.

- 7.80 The boundaries of the site exclude the Weston Lock Retail Park and for the reasons given in relation to issue iii), I do not recommend that it be included. However, the site does include the Unite site which has been recently developed. I have no basis on which to recommend a new boundary for the site, but recommend that the inclusion of the Unite site be reviewed in the process of master planning.

***Issue ii)***

- 7.81 Although the site is allocated in the consolidated plan for 75 dwellings, objectors considered that it could accommodate a far higher number and the Council revised its assessment to a capacity of about 200 dwellings. The overall site area excluding Weston Lock Retail Park is just over 7 ha. With 3 ha retained for business use, this would leave some 4 ha for residential and retail development. Clearly the density would be in excess of 50 dwellings per ha, so the expectation of a capacity of 200 dwellings seems reasonable.
- 7.82 As to timing, as I concluded in Section 5 of this report, the promotion of a comprehensive development of this site is at an early stage. It is in a number of ownerships with a variety of active commercial operations. In my view it is unlikely that a comprehensive scheme would be achieved and progressed in sufficient time to enable 200 dwellings to be completed on the site by 2011. I have concluded that it would be prudent to expect the LBR to deliver no more 50 dwellings to the housing land supply during the plan period.

***Issue iii)***

- 7.83 I recommend significant modifications to the employment policies of the plan in Section 2 of my report, but the starting point is to concentrate employment development on land already used for such purposes, including development undertaken as part of mixed use schemes. LBR currently accommodates a number of employment related uses and in view of the limited opportunities for relocation within the city I consider that it would be an unacceptable loss for all business uses to be deleted from the site. Some objectors query whether there would be sufficient demand for 3 ha of business development whilst others seek more. In my view the split in the allocation between business and residential uses is appropriate for a mixed use scheme, and in this location I find it difficult

to believe that occupiers would not be forthcoming for the business development.

- 7.84 I deal with the level of retail provision appropriate in the plan in Section 4 of my report. There I conclude that a precautionary approach is required to the development of new floorspace outside the defined city centre shopping area in order to secure the implementation of the Southgate scheme and protect the historic core of the city. The C&CTS identified a specific requirement for large format retail warehouse stores and the plan proposes such development at BWR and at LBR. I recommend against such development within BWR for reasons of townscape, and indicate that LBR would be a more appropriate site, with such provision consolidated at the Weston Lock Retail Park. However, there is insufficient evidence for making a firm allocation for large format stores having regard to the requirements of paragraph 3.17 of PPS6. I recommend that the Council draw up a retail strategy for the city and if further development of this kind is justified in terms of the sequential approach and the impact test, then the availability of suitable sites for large format stores should be examined in the course of future master planning for the Lower Bristol Road area. In the interim there should be no firm proposal on this site and I recommend the deletion of 2A from Policy GDS.1/B12. Clearly this would not however preclude the consideration of proposals under my recommended Policy S.4.
- 7.85 In view of my conclusion I make no comment on the call for priority to be given to local traders, but competition between traders is not a matter to be resolved through planning policy.
- 7.86 The Weston Lock Retail Park lies between the east and west parts of the site and the Council indicates that it would have no objection if it was included in the regeneration area. That was on the assumption that the allocation for bulky goods retail would remain in the plan. With the deletion of that part of the policy, and since the Retail Park is relatively new, I make no recommendation to include the site. However, this would not prevent any future retail warehouse development from being considered in this location.

#### ***Issue iv)***

- 7.87 B12 specifically refers to flood mitigation measures under 7. Nature conservation issues are subject to the NE policies of the plan, whilst an appropriate provision of allotments, POS and/or community facilities could be required under Policies SR.3 and SR.6 (as recommended to be combined and modified) and CF.3. I find no reason to add further wording to B12.

#### **Recommendations:**

R7.18 Modify B12 as follows:

correct the site area from 7.2 ha to 7.05 ha;

in 2 amend 75 to 50 and add after “dwellings” “during the plan period”;  
delete 2A.

R7.19 Review the inclusion of the Unite site within the boundaries of the allocation as part of the process of master planning.

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B13

110/C25	Sport England South West	GDS.1/B13/A
686/C151	Bath Preservation Trust	GDS.1/B13/A
3116/C59	Bath & North East Somerset Allotment Association	GDS.1/B13/A
3219/C10	The Hon Andrew Jolliffe	GDS.1/B13/A
3261/D29	Bath & North East Somerset Primary Care Trust	PIC/B/57 (GDS.1/B13)
3261/C21	Bath & North East Somerset Primary Care Trust	GDS.1/B13/A
3299/D97	Bovis Homes	PIC/B/57 (GDS.1/B13)

## Supporting Statements

696/C75	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B13/A
3261/D25	Bath & North East Somerset Primary Care Trust	PIC/B/58 (GDS.1/B13)

## Issues

- i) Whether the scheme is deliverable and sustainable, and should it be for a mixed use.
- ii) Does the allocation make sufficient provision for sport and open space, allotments and flood protection, and do these reflect the planning permission as granted?
- iii) Is the density appropriate?
- iv) Is adequate protection given to nature conservation?

## Inspector's Reasoning

### *Issues i) - iv)*

7.88 Planning permission has been granted subject to a S106 agreement for 128 dwellings on the site, together with a Primary Health Care Trust headquarters and retention of the chapel. The legal agreement requires two play areas, a replacement cricket pitch and changing facilities and the provision of open space within the site. It also requires the provision and delivery of 30% affordable housing; and includes clauses which seek to ensure the adequate provision of public transport. In these circumstances I recommend no change to the policy.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B14

725/C17	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	GDS.1/B14/A
3023/C18	Mr & Mrs D Hawkes	GDS.1/B14/A
3107/C36	English Nature	GDS.1/B14/A
3116/C117	Bath & North East Somerset Allotment Association	GDS.1/B14/A
3299/C65	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/B14/A

### Supporting Statement

696/C76	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/B14/A
---------	------------------------------------	-------------

### Issue

- i) Is adequate attention given to nature conservation issues, the presence of a tree subject to a TPO, and the need for allotments?

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.89 There was a permission for 38 flats on the site which allowed for the retention of the tree. That permission has lapsed but there is no reason to consider that the site will not be developed during the plan period. Nature conservation issues would be dealt with under the NE policies of the plan, and in view of the limited size of this development I consider it would be inappropriate to include any requirement for allotments, although the policy does require provision of a community facility.

**Recommendation: no change.**

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B15

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1.*

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.90 I have considered all the objections lodged in respect of this site, but outline planning permission has been granted for up to 12 dwellings and as a result I recommend no change to B15.

**Recommendation:**

R7.20 Review the allocation if the base date of the plan is amended.

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B16

1427/E226	Environment Agency	FPIC/B/26 (GDS.1/B16)
2388/E17	J S Bloor (Sytner Properties Ltd)	FPIC/B/26 (GDS.1/B16)
3126/E125	Bath Friends of the Earth	FPIC/B/26 (GDS.1/B16)

## Supporting Statement

3658/E1

O & H Properties Ltd

FPIC/B/26 (GDS.1/B16)

### Issues

- i) Whether the policy for the Podium/Cattle Market site should require provision of a flood risk assessment, and provide further protection for open space.
- ii) Whether the allocation should include the Corn Market site.

### Inspector's Reasoning

#### *Issue i)*

7.91 Policy NE.14 deals with flood risk and the need for mitigation measures and therefore no specific reference is needed in B16. Similarly, the open space and recreational needs of visitors and residents are dealt with in other policies of the plan relating to Design, Sport and Recreation, Natural Environment and Built and Historic Environment. I therefore consider there is no need for any additions to B16.

#### *Issue ii)*

7.92 The Corn Market is a Grade 1 listed building in Council ownership. However, even if it is in need of restoration and re-use, the Council considers that it is unlikely to lend itself to the types of uses proposed for B16. It is also stated that the Corn Market is subject to a range of constraints which would make the delivery of an already difficult site more complex and that there are other interests in it. In my view it would not be desirable to add any elements to the B16 site which would delay its implementation which is clearly in the interests of the city centre as a whole. Furthermore, the Council appears to be actively seeking a solution to the problem of the Corn Market which would not require it to be included within this allocation.

### Recommendation: no change

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/B17

1427/E228  
3126/E122

Environment Agency  
Bath Friends of the Earth

FPIC/B/27 (GDS.1/B17)  
FPIC/B/27 (GDS.1/B17)

### Issue

- i) Whether provision should be made for a flood risk assessment and for an hotel.

## Inspector's Reasoning

7.93 Flood risk is dealt with under Policy NE.14 and there is no need to require one under B17.

7.94 The Avon Street car park is allocated for compatible city centre uses and although no explicit reference is made to an hotel, that would fall within the definition. Furthermore, this site is very well related to the central shopping area of the City and as such the mix of development to be accommodated should form part of the retail strategy which I have recommended should be produced by the Council.

## Recommendation: no change

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/K1

254/B34	Keynsham Town Council	GDS.1/K1
398/B7	Mr G Hobbs	GDS.1/K1
695/B13	Society of Merchant Venturers	GDS.1/K1
725/B8	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	GDS.1/K1
1427/B94	Environment Agency	GDS.1/K1
1830/B11	Highways Agency	GDS.1/K1
2466/B11	Keynsham Civic Society	GDS.1/K1
2779/B3	Mr R J McKend	GDS.1/K1
2971/B1	Mr A Lassman	GDS.1/K1
3019/B1	Mr J Gibbons	GDS.1/K1
3233/B24	Mr & Mrs M Williams	GDS.1/K1
3270/B1	Mr L L Hutt	GDS.1/K1
3278/B25	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/K1
3299/B28	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/K1
3299/B46	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/K1
3570/C12	Bath Spa University College	GDS.1/K1/A

## Supporting Statements

1427/C204	Environment Agency	GDS.1/K1/B
-----------	--------------------	------------

## Issues

- i) What level of housing can the site accommodate during the plan period?
- ii) Would an employment area be compatible with housing, and does the policy identify the appropriate amount of employment land?
- iii) Does the policy set out appropriate requirements for the development of the site?

## **Inspector's Reasoning**

### ***Issue i)***

- 7.95 I deal with this issue in Section 5 and conclude that the site should be expected to bring forward no more than 50 dwellings during the plan period. The ultimate capacity of the site will depend on the way in which the constraints on the site are managed, and on the achievement of a satisfactory mix between residential and employment development.

### ***Issue ii)***

- 7.96 There is no reason why a site of this size should not be able to accommodate residential and employment uses. The policy includes a requirement for a buffer zone to be incorporated in order to safeguard residential amenities. Although the site is allocated for B1, B2 and B8 uses and there is no reason why appropriate B1 uses should not be located adjacent to residential properties, I consider that the requirement in the policy is reasonable in order to secure the best possible environment for the residential development.
- 7.97 The overall site size is 25.3 ha and the policy requires that some 10 ha be reserved for employment development. Somerdale is a key employment development opportunity site within Keynsham, the retention and expansion of which would increase the self-sustainability of the town. The allocation of 10 ha for business uses reflects the importance of the site for employment use, and is therefore an appropriate level to include in the plan.

### ***Issue iii)***

- 7.98 The allocation includes a list of requirements to be met for the development of the site. The Council has carried out a traffic study to ensure that the road network can accommodate a development of this scale, and clause 16 of K1 provides guidance as to a safe and adequate means of access. This level of detail is appropriate to ensure that it is clear to potential developers and to the public. Clause 18 also refers to upgrading of access to public transport, but clearly the level of any contribution from the development of this site would need to be reasonably related to the actual scale and type of scheme proposed.
- 7.99 Archaeological interests would be protected by the Built and Historic Environment policies of the plan so there is no need for specific reference in K1. Part of the site falls within the flood plain and therefore it is appropriate that clause 9 is included. Any proposal would also be assessed against Policy NE.14. The site currently includes a significant area of playing fields and therefore clause 5 is appropriate. The site owner refers to clause 16 in this regard, but this is concerned with the access to the site.
- 7.100 In view of the location of the site on the edge of Keynsham and adjoining open countryside in the Green Belt and the River Avon, a requirement for



major landscaping in clause 11 is appropriate. However, in view of the distance of the site from any agricultural use, I agree that clause 13 is unnecessary and should be deleted.

7.101 As a site for employment and residential uses, it would not be appropriate to require provision for a higher education use in this location, although the policies of the plan would allow for any such proposals to be considered if they were to come forward for the site.

### **Recommendation:**

R7.21 Modify Policy GDS.1/K1 by deleting clause 13.

---

## **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/K2**

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1.*

### **Issues**

This site was not brought forward in the RDDLP, but in view of the shortfall in housing land supply which I identify in Section 5 of my report, I am recommending its reinstatement. Furthermore, I consider that the site could accommodate up to 700 dwellings.

Issues raised by objectors to the site in the DDLP include:

- i) Whether there is a need for the release of the site and whether housing would be better located at St John's Court or Somerdale.
- ii) The impact of development on the landscape and the gaps between Keynsham and Bristol and Keynsham and Queen Charlotte.
- iii) The impact on traffic through the town, and on the A4.
- iv) The distance of the site from High Street and community facilities.
- v) The potential for increased commuting.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

#### ***Issue i)***

7.102 In section 5 I deal with the relationship between the JRSP, RPG10 and the RDDLP. I take the view that the Local Plan is founded in the policies of the JRSP. Although the policies of RPG10 are a material consideration, the normal process of cascading policy from regional guidance through the structure plan and to the local plan is out of step in B&NES. The current RPG10 strategy is not the foundation of the policies of the JRSP, but those policies were in place at the time the RPG was formulated. Although

many argue that Policies SS2 and SS7 of RPG10 militate against large scale residential development at Keynsham, those policies were drafted after the policies of the JRSP had identified Keynsham for a strategic release of land for housing from the Green Belt. Thus I find that it is strategic policy to release land from the Green Belt at Keynsham to meet the housing needs of B&NES.

7.103 The Council removed the K2 designation from the RDDLP following their assessment of the potential of brownfield sites to meet the housing land supply. However, whilst there is clearly a longer term potential for significant levels of housing on brownfield sites within Bath, there is no evidence to support the contention that this housing can be completed during the current plan period. In view of the priority placed by Government on the release of land for housing which is genuinely available for development, I am unable to support the Council's approach. I have identified a significant shortfall in the supply of housing land to meet strategic requirements to 2011 and in those circumstances there is no justification not to implement the provisions of the JRSP which are to meet the housing needs of the area through a Green Belt release at Keynsham.

7.104 Whilst the JRSP does not identify the location for the release of Green Belt land, it does set out criteria in Policies 9 and 16 to help in its identification. In my opinion the land identified in the DDLP as K2 best meets those criteria. I accept that there are brownfield opportunities in Keynsham at St John's Court and at Somerdale. However, St John's Court provides an opportunity for new retail development and with the increase in population arising from new housing development it becomes even more important for the town to become self sufficient in shopping provision. As for the Somerdale site, in view of the constraints to its development I consider it is unlikely to deliver more than 50 dwellings during the plan period. Furthermore, that site is required to make a contribution to employment development which is also important to the provision of a balanced community in Keynsham.

### ***Issue ii)***

7.105 In terms of impact on the landscape, the Council accepts that K2 is the optimum location if land is to be taken from the Green Belt for residential development. The site is contained by existing residential development to the north, by Charlton Road to the west and Parkhouse Lane to the east. I note the comments of Wimpey in relation to the split between the two parts of K2. However, the area allocated for woodland which splits the site would give relief to the built up area and the southern boundary can be reinforced by new boundary treatment where necessary in the form of an extension to the planted area. Furthermore, pedestrian links could be provided through the woodland site. Although there are limited views of the site from the south, mainly from public highways, it is seen against the backdrop of the existing urban area.

7.106 Located as it is to the south of this part of the developed area of Keynsham, residential development of the site would not intrude into the strategic gap between the town and the edge of Bristol to the west. Whilst the western area of K2 would bring the boundaries of Keynsham towards Queen Charlotte, there would remain a significant open area sufficient to prevent any harmful coalescence. By avoiding the coalescence of Keynsham with adjoining settlements, I am satisfied that the K2 site best meets the criteria set out in the JRSP for the identification of land to be released from the Green Belt at Keynsham.

***Issue iii)***

7.107 Whilst a large residential development in the south west of Keynsham would generate an increase in traffic using the roads to and within the town centre, I have no evidence to suggest that the impact would result in unacceptable levels of congestion. Assessments have been carried out of the impact of developing the easternmost part of K2 on traffic using the A4 with the conclusion that it would be negligible. I have no reason to consider that the development of the two K2 sites would have any significant effect on traffic conditions on the A4.

7.108 The K2 sites are within easy reach of the railway station which has regular train services to Bristol and Bath. There is also a local bus service with a 15/20 minute frequency of service to Bristol and a 30 minute frequency of service to Bath. In the Local Transport Plan this part of Keynsham is identified as one where the level of bus patronage is high and I have no doubt that with the increase in population the viability of providing bus services to the area would be reinforced. Clearly the greater use of public transport would in itself relieve the level of any impact on the roads from the use of private cars.

***Issue iv)***

7.109 Keynsham has a range of local services and facilities, with two secondary schools and six primary schools. The High Street provides a good mix of shops, and there are smaller local shops at Holmoak Road and Queens Road. The K2 site is within a reasonable distance of the town centre for walking or cycling, or it can be accessed by bus. As drafted in the DDLP, the policy requires enhancement of pedestrian and cycle routes to the town centre and railway station to encourage the use of alternatives to the car. The site adjoins Castle County Primary School, and an extension to the school is one of the requirements of the policy. Provision is also required of community facilities including convenience shops. I am confident that a development in this location will help support existing services and facilities whilst contributing to new provision.

***Issue v)***

7.110 I accept that Keynsham already experiences a high level of commuting from the town, and that any increase in residential development could add to that level. However, the policy includes a requirement for 1.5 ha of

employment uses, including the retention of existing workshops, and there is potential for further employment development at the Somerdale site which would help contribute to a more sustainable balance of housing and employment development. Furthermore, with its good public transport links to the main employment destinations of Bristol and Bath I consider that the effects of increases in commuting are unlikely to be as damaging as in a location which is less accessible by public transport.

## Inspector's Conclusions

7.111 I conclude that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with the policy of the JRSP, and the K2 site provides the location best able to meet the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

## Recommendation:

R7.22 Policy GDS.1/K2 be reinstated in the RDDLP, with clause 1 amended to "About 700 dwellings."

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/K3

42/B12	CPRE	GDS.1/K3
254/B37	Keynsham Town Council	GDS.1/K3
398/B4	Mr G Hobbs	GDS.1/K3
670/B4	Keynsham Community Association	GDS.1/K3
1830/B2	Highways Agency	GDS.1/K3
1882/B2	Mr R Lainchbury	GDS.1/K3
2353/B1	Mr R E Swingler	GDS.1/K3
2389/B1	Mr A E Bone	GDS.1/K3
2567/B2	Mr J D Aldridge	GDS.1/K3
2582/B2	Mr R Wait	GDS.1/K3
2584/B1	Mrs H A Wait	GDS.1/K3
2585/B2	Wessex Water	GDS.1/K3
3019/B3	Mr J Gibbons	GDS.1/K3
3089/B2	Mrs S Kitchen	GDS.1/K3
3163/B1	The Henderson Family	GDS.1/K3
3258/B1	Mr Baker	GDS.1/K3
3272/B1	Mr & Mrs J Whittle	GDS.1/K3
3288/B1	Co-operative Group (CWS) Ltd	GDS.1/K3

## Supporting Statements

1427/B96	Environment Agency	GDS.1/K3
2466/B4	Keynsham Civic Society	GDS.1/K3
2971/B2	Mr A Lassman	GDS.1/K3

## Issues

- i) Whether the proposal is appropriate in this location in terms of nature conservation, access, the definition of the development restraint area, and air pollution.

- ii) Whether the site should be reserved for other uses such as extension to rail or sewage treatment facilities, or for general industrial uses.

## **Inspector's Reasoning**

### ***Issue i)***

7.112 The Broadmead site was identified following a sub-regional study which identified strategic sites in the Avonmouth area. It is identified as suitable for use as an integrated waste management facility. Some 4.3 ha in area, it is a former municipal landfill site adjacent to a sewage works in an area of industrial development. The northern third is located in the Green Belt, and the plan proposes an amendment to the Green Belt boundary to enable the development.

7.113 The nearest housing is some 200m from the site boundary and is separated by the railway embankment. No mass burn incineration is being proposed, and any emissions would in any event be controlled by the pollution control regime. The Council states that there is an engineering solution to the access under the railway and a strategic transport assessment has been carried out which indicates the site is acceptable in principle. A detailed assessment would need to be undertaken at planning application stage, when detailed concerns about safety at the Broadmead roundabout would be addressed.

7.114 The site has no nature conservation designations, but a full ecological assessment would be required at the application stage. The "Development Restraint Area" is defined to protect new development from nuisance from odour from the sewage treatment works. In my view this should not prejudice the development of a waste facility.

### ***Issue ii)***

7.115 Suitable sites for waste management are not easily identified in B&NES and therefore it is appropriate to reserve this site for such a use rather than indicating that other uses such as rail or general industrial development would be appropriate. Wessex Water is concerned about the need for future extensions of the sewage treatment works adjoining the site, but there is no firm proposal at present and the Council confirms there is scope for co-operation with Wessex Water on the development of the site if necessary.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/K4**

254/B38      Keynsham Town Council  
1427/B97      Environment Agency  
2403/B2      Ms C Brimson

GDS.1/K4  
GDS.1/K4  
GDS.1/K4

2414/B2	Mr K Brimson	GDS.1/K4
2801/B1	Ms S L Flook	GDS.1/K4
2806/B1	Mr J D Flook	GDS.1/K4
2971/B3	Mr A Lassman	GDS.1/K4
2972/B1	Ms R Parsons	GDS.1/K4
3269/B3	Ms I Lerpinier	GDS.1/K4
3517/C1	Deeley Freed Estates Ltd	GDS.1/K4/A
3219/C25	The Hon Andrew Jolliffe	GDS.1/K4/B
3299/C76	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/K4/B

## Issues

- i) Whether the allocation is appropriate in this location or whether it should include provision for residential development and more community facilities.
- ii) Whether there would be a harmful impact from traffic and loss of parking, and whether a surface water drainage strategy is required.

## Inspector's Reasoning

### *Issue i)*

7.116 The City and Town Centres Study 2000 identified this site as an opportunity to meet the need for new convenience retailing in Keynsham. It is in a sustainable town centre location and its development would help support the attractiveness of existing town centre shops. A resolution was passed by the Council to grant permission subject to a S106 agreement in October 2001. The scheme includes a foodstore of 1,937 sq m, a community building, car parking and civic space. There is no residential development included in the scheme, but the Council has amended the policy in the RDDLP to include an element of residential development in order to satisfy Government policy on mixed use development.

7.117 Although the Council considers that a small amount of housing could be accommodated within the site without prejudice to the retail scheme, the agents seeking an occupier for the site do not agree. In my view there may be scope for a very small amount of housing, but the requirement of the policy is not clear as to the location and amount of housing that should be provided. However, retail is an important town centre use whereas housing can be accommodated elsewhere. In view of the benefits that would arise from the provision of a convenience store on this site, I consider that any potential for prejudice to the attractiveness of the site to a future occupier should be avoided. I therefore recommend the deletion of clause 15 in the policy, although this would not preclude the incorporation of some housing in a future revision to the scheme or in connection with the redevelopment of the cinema site should it prove viable.

7.118 The scheme currently before the Council includes a community facility and having regard to the need to attract a retail occupier to the site, it would be unreasonable to require a larger community hall. As the Council

states, the proposed facility would help overcome some of the current shortfall in community hall provision.

**Issue ii)**

7.119 The current scheme was the subject of a traffic assessment by the Council which indicates that the local highway network has the capacity to take the additional traffic which would be generated by the development. The scheme also provides for an increase in the number of pay and display parking spaces on the site. Satisfactory access provision, including pedestrian and cycle routes and public transport provision would be required through the normal process of development control and therefore clauses 4, 13 and 14 are unnecessary.

7.120 The outstanding permission includes a condition requiring provision of foul and surface water drainage, and such a condition could be imposed on any amended scheme. Any off-site foul and surface water improvements could be required through the process of development control and therefore clause 8 is unnecessary.

**Recommendation:**

R7.23 Modify Policy GDS.1/K4 by deleting clauses 4, 8, 13, 14 and 15.

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/K5**

3299/C77	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/K5/A
3299/D104	Bovis Homes	PIC/B/60 (GDS.1/K5)

**Supporting Statement**

696/C78	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/K5/A
---------	------------------------------------	------------

**Issues**

- i) Whether the site should be retained for employment use.

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.121 This is a former car garage which the objectors claim should be retained in employment use. However, planning permission has been granted for its residential development and therefore it should remain as a housing site in the plan.

**Recommendation: no change.**

---

## **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR1**

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1.*

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

7.122 This site was deleted from the RDDLP. In Section 5 of my report I have considered all the sites which were put forward in the DDLP and subsequently deleted in the RDDLP and their potential for reinstatement in order to make up the strategic land supply to 2011. I have concluded that this site should not be reconsidered since there are a number of sequentially preferable options.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR2**

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1.*

### **Issues**

- i) Whether the allocation provides for an appropriate mix of development whilst protecting the nature conservation value of the site.
- ii) Should the site be required to accommodate public transport service vehicles and a public transport interchange?
- iii) How far should the potential for reinstatement of the railway and station be protected?
- iv) Is the wording of the policy appropriate?

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

#### ***Issue i)***

7.123 I considered this site in Section 5 of my report where I formed the view that more weight should be given to the nature conservation value of the site in view of the presence of four nationally scarce species of flora and 21 species of nationally rare, scarce or vulnerable invertebrate fauna. The 1999 report from Wessex Ecological Consultancy identified three areas which could be developed without significant biodiversity losses given appropriate management of the rest of the site, and it is on these areas that the NR Regeneration Company needs to look to concentrate any development. I have concluded that the site should not be expected to deliver more than 50 dwellings during the plan period.



7.124 As to the mix of development, Streetly Developments and Morrisons see the site as an opportunity to provide a large retail foodstore. However, whilst I see some merit in a development which could bolster the vitality of Norton Radstock as a shopping centre and contribute to its increased self-sufficiency, the C&CTS assessments indicate that it would be appropriate to distribute only a limited part of the projected growth in quantitative retail capacity to Midsomer Norton and Radstock during the plan period. This would not support a foodstore of the scale envisaged. Furthermore, it is far from clear whether the site would support such a development without harm to its ecological value. The allocation has been amended in the RDDLP to allow for a mix of development which includes retail uses within the Town Centre Shopping Area and I consider there is no evidential basis for that to be changed to provide for a large scale foodstore as suggested. Nevertheless, the issue should be considered as part of the preparation of a DPD for Midsomer Norton and Radstock town centres. In the meantime any such proposal would fall to be considered against Policy S2 as recommended to be modified.

7.125 Some objectors also argue for an increase in the proportion of employment and community facilities to be provided, with a consequent reduction in residential development. The Business Location Requirements Study 2003 identified a need for a modest increase in office floorspace (Class B1a & b) in Norton-Radstock during the plan period. In view of the location of the site within and adjacent to the town centre, such development would therefore be entirely appropriate within a mixed scheme. However, there is no evidence to support the allocation of the major part of the site for employment uses. The site is also clearly well located for community uses. I am satisfied that, with the modifications which I recommend below, clause 1 of the policy sets out an appropriate mix of development that would be desirable on the site. However, the extent to which this could all be achieved must depend on the actual area that can be developed without harm to the areas which are most important to nature conservation, and on the viability of any scheme having regard to the potential costs of decontamination.

***Issue ii)***

7.126 In view of the physical constraints to the development of this site I consider that it would not be realistic to expect the site to provide for full access to public service vehicles and a public transport interchange. I agree the suggestion for rewording put forward by the NR Regeneration Company.

***Issue iii)***

7.127 I have some sympathy with the views of a number of objectors who wish to see the potential for the restoration of the railway line and station protected within the site. However, as I have stated in Section 5, whilst the provision of a sustainable means of transport is a cause worthy of support, without any demonstration of viability or indication of funding which would enable its implementation it is not a matter to which priority

can be given in this plan. Nevertheless, the policy does require provision of a sustainable transport corridor, so it does not entirely preclude the possibility of a rail link.

- 7.128 Although the Brunel shed and railway turntable may not be available for use for railway purposes, I do see benefit in retaining it within the site and am concerned by the deletion of clause 10 as proposed in the RDDLP. Even if the structures are not kept in their existing position, their retention within the site would ensure that its historical significance is not lost.

***Issue iv)***

- 7.129 A number of objections are made to the wording of the policy in the DDLP, and the amendments put forward in the RDDLP now meet many of the issues raised. However I consider that there is a need for further modifications to ensure that the importance of the site for nature conservation is adequately reflected in the policy, and that the aspirations for development within the site are realistic.
- 7.130 Taking first the mix of development defined in clause 1. The site is some 4.8ha in area. Parts of the site are subject to contamination, and there are areas of high nature conservation interest which English Nature confirmed in 1999 to be of county importance. Bearing in mind these constraints, and having regard to the irregular shape of the site, it seems to me that the list of uses set out in clause 1 are over ambitious. Clearly it is an important opportunity for development close to the town centre and as such some retail and office uses within or adjoining the town centre shopping area would be appropriate. In addition, I support a reference to community uses. However, rather than include a requirement for leisure uses it would be of more value to have a local nature reserve within the site in recognition of its nature conservation importance.
- 7.131 For the reasons which I set out in Section 5 of my report, Clause 2 should refer to about 50 dwellings during the plan period.
- 7.132 There are policies in the plan which require provision of amenity and public open space of a scale which is appropriate to a particular development. Similarly other policies deal with matters covered by clause 4. Clauses 3 and 4 should be deleted
- 7.133 Having regard to the constraints to development within the site, its scale and shape, I find the requirements of Clause 5 to be unduly onerous and this should be deleted. The wording suggested by NRRC would secure an adequate public transport service for the site.
- 7.134 It is proposed to safeguard the former railway corridor for sustainable transport incorporating the National Cycle Network. However, the ecological evidence suggests that the former rail track provides some of the most valuable parts of the site for nature conservation, and the use as

a cycle route may not be compatible with the protection of species of national significance. Therefore I consider that Clause 6 needs to be qualified by a requirement to have regard to the nature conservation value of the trackbed.

7.135 Clause 7 places emphasis on compensation and management. To give more weight to nature conservation interests I consider that this wording should be changed to ensure the identification and retention of areas of significant nature conservation value, together with a scheme for management and mitigation of the effects of development, and for compensation where the loss of areas of nature conservation value cannot be avoided.

7.136 To secure the historic significance of the site, I also recommend the reinstatement of the original clause 10, with a modification which would allow the engine shed and turntable to be relocated within the site if necessary.

7.137 I recommend no additional clause to deal with surface water drainage since this is a matter which would be subject to Policy ES.5 of the plan.

### **Recommendation:**

R7.24 Modify GDS.1/NR2 as follows:

Delete clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

Insert new clauses:

- "1. Residential development with retail and office uses within or adjacent to the Town Centre, with community facility and local nature reserve.
2. About 50 dwellings in the period to 2011.
3. Provision for safe movement of public transport service vehicles in and around the site."

Modify clause 6 by adding at the end:

"where this is compatible with the safeguarding of trackbed which is of significant nature conservation value."

Add new clause:

"Identification of areas of significant nature conservation interest to be retained, with a scheme for their management and the mitigation of any effects of development; together with a programme for compensation where the loss of areas of ecological importance cannot be avoided."

Retain clauses 8, 9 and 10.

Add new clause:

“Retention (with relocation if necessary) within the site of engine shed and nearby turntable.”

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR3

1427/B100	Environment Agency	GDS.1/NR3
-----------	--------------------	-----------

### Supporting Statements

644/B6	Mr D A Rastrick	GDS.1/NR3
652/B4	Mrs V G Rastrick	GDS.1/NR3

### Issue

- i) Whether the policy should include a requirement for a flood risk assessment.

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.138 Clause 5 of NR3 requires protection of the floodplain, and the mechanism for achieving such protection would be secured through the development control process.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR4

578/B66	Norton Radstock Town Council	GDS.1/NR4
1427/B101	Environment Agency	GDS.1/NR4
3300/B9	Oval Estates (Bath) Ltd	GDS.1/NR4

### Supporting Statements

2360/B3	Landray Will Trust	GDS.1/NR4
1427/C203	Environment Agency	GDS.1/NR4/A

### Issues

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for mixed uses to include residential development.
- ii) Whether the wording of the policy is appropriate.

## **Inspector's Reasoning**

### ***Issue i)***

7.139 This is a substantial but underused industrial site within the urban area which is currently allocated as an employment site. It is clear from the Business Location Requirements Study 2003 that there is a declining demand for industrial type floorspace in Norton-Radstock and as a result there is little justification for the reservation of the whole of this site for such use. However, the Study does identify some need for smaller scale modern employment units in the area. In accordance with the advice in PPG3 paragraph 42(a) I have recommended in Section 5 of my report that the Council consider the potential of this site for a mixed use development such that the residential development could provide a cross subsidy for the development of modern business premises.

7.140 Oval Estates (Bath) also seeks the extension of the allocation to include land to the west of Lincombe Road. The Council oppose this on the basis that employment development close to the houses could be harmful to residential amenity, but with a mixed use scheme, any conflict between uses could be avoided through careful design and layout. I have recommended in Section 5 that this area be incorporated into the allocation.

7.141 Whilst I have no other evidence on which to make an assessment of the level of housing which could be accommodated within the enlarged site, the existing site is some 8 ha and with the additional area of land I consider there is likely to be scope for about 150 dwellings whilst providing for a significant quantum of employment floorspace.

### ***Issue ii)***

7.142 With a change to mixed use the wording of the policy will require amendment to include residential in clause 1, and this should include an indication of the level of housing that might be provided during the plan period.

7.143 Clause 2 would provide an improvement in public access to the countryside and should be retained.

7.144 The loss of sports facilities is covered by Policy SR.1A and therefore there is no need for clause 3, and clause 8 is unnecessary since drainage is covered by Policy ES.5.

## **Recommendation:**

R7.25 Modify Policy GDS.1/NR4 as follows:

insert in clause 1 before "Development" "Mixed use" and after "for" "residential and";

insert new clause 2 "About xx houses can be accommodated, with xx before 2011";

delete clauses 3 and 8.

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR5

696/B37 South West RSL Planning Consortium  
2311/B10 Somer Community Housing Trust

GDS.1/NR5  
GDS.1/NR5

### Issue

- i) Whether the density is appropriate.

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.145 This 0.3 ha site is allocated for about 10 dwellings. This is at the minimum density recommended in PPG3, and I see no reason why more than 10 dwellings should not be accommodated, subject to careful design. I therefore recommend clause 1 be amended to require at least 10 dwellings.

### Recommendation:

R7.26 Modify Policy GDS.1/NR5 by deleting "About" in clause 1 and insert "at least".

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR6

696/C65 South West RSL Planning Consortium

GDS.1/NR6/A

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.146 This site has been deleted from the RDDLP as an allocation since planning permission has been granted and the development is complete.

### Recommendation: no change

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR7

1427/B102 Environment Agency  
721/C60 Government Office for the South West

GDS.1/NR7  
GDS.1/NR7-REG24(9)

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.147 This site now has planning permission subject to a legal agreement and has been retained as an allocation because of the base date of the

housing figures in the plan. Clearly if the base date is amended to April 2004 its inclusion should be reviewed.

**Recommendation:**

R7.27 Review the allocation if the base date of the plan is amended.

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR8**

1427/B103 Environment Agency  
696/C66 South West RSL Planning Consortium

GDS.1/NR8  
GDS.1/NR8/A

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.148 Planning permission has been granted on this site and it is deleted as an allocation in the RDDLP.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR9**

1427/B104 Environment Agency  
721/C61 Government Office for the South West

GDS.1/NR9  
GDS.1/NR9-REG24(9)

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.149 This site now has planning permission subject to a legal agreement and has been retained as an allocation because of the base date of the housing figures in the plan. Clearly if the base date is amended to April 2004 its inclusion should be reviewed.

**Recommendation:**

R7.28 Review the allocation if the base date of the plan is amended.

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR10**

696/C67 South West RSL Planning Consortium

GDS.1/NR10/A

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.150 This allocation is deleted from the RDDLP since planning permission has been granted and the development is complete.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR11

2356/C8	The Hon W H M Jolliffe	GDS.1/NR11/A
3219/C18	The Hon Andrew Jolliffe	GDS.1/NR11/A
3299/C78	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/NR11/A

### Supporting Statements

S696/C79	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/NR11/A
3079/C8	Flower & Hayes (Developments) Ltd	GDS.1/NR11/B

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.151 The site has been given full planning permission and is only included as an allocation because of the base date of the plan. The position should be reviewed if the base date is amended.

### Recommendation:

R7.29 Review the allocation if the base date of the plan is amended.

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/NR12

508/C1	Cllr J Lewis	GDS.1/NR12/A
696/C80	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/NR12/A
2429/C2	Mr & Mrs D Chalk	GDS.1/NR12/A
2432/C3	Mr D Benson	GDS.1/NR12/A
2456/C2	Mrs I Benson	GDS.1/NR12/A
3630/C1	Welton Vale Protection Group	GDS.1/NR12/A
3084/C2	Richard Wood Engineering	GDS.1/NR12/B

### Issues

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for employment purposes.
- ii) Is reference required to drainage and nature conservation?

### Inspector's Reasoning

#### *Issue i)*

7.152 This site comprises 0.84 ha of undeveloped land south of Wellow Brook and west of the existing industrial area. Although it is a greenfield site, it relates closely to the existing industrial area and makes little contribution to the surrounding rural area. Access can be from the road which serves the existing units.

7.153 The site is appropriately located to provide new employment development to meet the demand for small scale units in this area and hence to provide local jobs without significant harm to residential or rural amenity.



### **Issue ii)**

7.154 Drainage provision is covered by Policy ES.5 and nature conservation is dealt with under a number of NE policies. I find no reason to add these as matters to be covered within the policy.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V1**

298/B4	Mr Ian Cannock	GDS.1/V1
365/B5	Ms Trudi Cannock	GDS.1/V1
578/B77	Norton Radstock Town Council	GDS.1/V1
1427/B105	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V1
2262/B1	Wellow Parish Council	GDS.1/V1
2303/B1	Wellow Residents Association	GDS.1/V1
2388/B4	J S Bloor Ltd (Sytner Properties Ltd)	GDS.1/V1
578/C102	Norton Radstock Town Council	GDS.1/V1/A
696/C68	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/V1/A
721/C66	Government Office for the South West	GDS.1/V1/A
2388/C8	J S Bloor Ltd (Sytner Properties Ltd)	GDS.1/V1/A

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

7.155 Planning permission has been granted for employment development on this 11 ha greenfield site, and the allocation has been deleted from the RDDLP. J S Bloor, the owners of the site, are seeking an allocation for a mixed use development of housing and employment uses, and the inclusion of the site within the HDB. I set out the reasons why the site should not be included within the HDB and developed for housing in Section 5. In the event that there is insufficient demand for the employment development of the site, I consider that it would be preferable to leave the site undeveloped.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V2**

1427/B106	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V2
3023/B13	Mr & Mrs D Hawkes	GDS.1/V2
696/C69	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/V2/A
721/C65	Government Office for the South West	GDS.1/V2/A

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

7.156 The allocation is deleted from the RDDLP since planning permission has been granted and construction is underway.

**Recommendation: no change**

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V3

2/B47	T2000/Railfutures	GDS.1/V3
725/B12	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	GDS.1/V3
1427/B107	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V3
2416/B1	Mr & Mrs E C Milton	GDS.1/V3
3009/B2	Polestar Properties Limited	GDS.1/V3
3023/B14	Mr & Mrs D Hawkes	GDS.1/V3
3278/B30	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/V3
3299/B33	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/V3

### Issues

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for housing beyond the area with planning permission for residential development.

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.157 Paulton is one of the larger R1 settlements with a good level of facilities and access by public transport. The factory site is closely integrated with the village, and has large areas which are currently little used. The site is some 17.8 ha in total, and planning permission has been granted for housing on the south eastern part of the site. There is some debate as to whether this part of the site could accommodate a higher level of housing and I have agreed a capacity of 150 dwellings for this part of the site in Section 5. Polestar Properties are seeking further residential development to the north of the existing housing area. In section 5 I conclude that it would be appropriate to allocate the site for further housing, but only if that housing was linked to further employment development within the site, either for the existing printing company or for other occupiers. There is scope for such development in the north west part of the site.

7.158 There is concern about the additional traffic which might be generated as a result of further development at the site, and of the pressure on existing services from further residential development. However, the site has the benefit of a number of planning permissions. Whilst it will be necessary to carry out detailed traffic impact assessments, traffic generation from a mixed use scheme is unlikely to have significantly more impact on the surrounding roads than traffic from the site if it was used to its full potential under existing permissions. As regards the pressure on existing services, the increase in residential development would bring more custom to local shops and general support for local services. I have no evidence to suggest that such pressure would be harmful.

### Recommendation:

R7.30 Modify GDS.1/V3 as follows:

delete clause 1 and insert:

"Development for residential and business use. Residential development beyond the south eastern part of the site to take place only as part of a mixed use scheme which includes employment development."

delete clause 11 and insert:

“Some 350 dwellings to be accommodated within the factory site, with no more than 150 to be constructed unless linked to a scheme for the development of employment floorspace.”

The Council to review the detail of the remaining clauses in the policy and amend where necessary to reflect the change in the allocation.

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V4

2/B52	T2000/Railfutures	GDS.1/V4
715/B4	Lord Rees-Mogg	GDS.1/V4
1427/B108	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V4
1986/B1	Ms D Barton	GDS.1/V4
2009/B2	Mr J Harvey	GDS.1/V4
2156/B1	Ms A G Pascoe	GDS.1/V4
2249/B1	Mrs M V Flower	GDS.1/V4
2253/B1	Mr & Mrs C A J Margary	GDS.1/V4
2317/B1	Cllr P Hogg	GDS.1/V4
2463/B1	Mr & Mrs D Parfitt	GDS.1/V4
2464/B1	Mr & Mrs M Fitzpatrick	GDS.1/V4
2614/B1	Mr B R Pullsford	GDS.1/V4
2619/B1	Mr M E Carey	GDS.1/V4
2649/B1	The Duchy of Cornwall	GDS.1/V4
2896/B1	Mr D Lane & Ms K Newberry	GDS.1/V4
2907/B1	Ms A Ottaway	GDS.1/V4
3031/B1	Ms J Deacon	GDS.1/V4
3066/B5	Mr L Knowles	GDS.1/V4
3136/B1	Miss D Somers	GDS.1/V4
3174/B1	Mr K Walker	GDS.1/V4
3192/B1	Mr A J Frost	GDS.1/V4
3319/B2	Ms S A Woodbine	GDS.1/V4

## Supporting Statements

2617/B1	Mrs A E Lye	GDS.1/V4
2910/B1	Mr J Gentle	GDS.1/V4
3047/B1	Mrs E W Styles	GDS.1/V4
1427/C181	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V4/B
1427/C182	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V4/C

## Inspector's Reasoning

7.159 In Section 2 of my report when dealing with employment policies I conclude that there is insufficient demand to justify the release of this greenfield site.

## Recommendation:

R7.31 Modify the plan by deleting Policy GDS.1/V4.

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V5

334/B8	Ms P Davis	GDS.1/V5
581/B9	Batheaston Society	GDS.1/V5
1427/B109	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V5
1975/B1	Mr R Holder	GDS.1/V5
1975/B2	Mr R Holder	GDS.1/V5
1975/B3	Mr R Holder	GDS.1/V5
2913/B1	Mr J R Dickens	GDS.1/V5
2968/B2	Countryside Residential (South West) Ltd	GDS.1/V5
3020/B1	Mr & Mrs W Beese	GDS.1/V5
3020/B2	Mr & Mrs W Beese	GDS.1/V5
3109/B1	Mr M Veal	GDS.1/V5
3109/B2	Mr M Veal	GDS.1/V5
3140/B1	Ms C van de Steen	GDS.1/V5
3253/B1	Mr K Wright	GDS.1/V5
2968/C5	Countryside Residential (South West) Ltd	GDS.1/V5/B
581/C26	Batheaston Society	GDS.1/V5/F
685/C47	Batheaston Parish Council	GDS.1/V5/F
2968/C6	Countryside Residential (South West) Ltd	GDS.1/V5/F

## Supporting Statements

2968/B3	Countryside Residential (South West) Ltd	GDS.1/V5
3109/B3	Mr M Veal	GDS.1/V5

## Inspector's Reasoning

7.160 Objections to the DDLP relate primarily to the principle of development of the allocation, and the partial closure of Bannerdown Drive. In the RDDLP the latter has been deleted, and planning permission has now been granted for 7 dwellings on the northern part of the site. That permission is subject to a legal agreement which addresses traffic management and nature conservation issues.

7.161 The other issues of concern in relation to the RDDLP is the deletion of Victory Gardens from the allocation because the Council considers it unlikely to become available in the plan period. Objectors have mixed views as to the development of the site, but it remains within the HDB and with the changes I recommend to Policy HG.4 it could come forward for residential development without the need to be allocated in the plan. The concerns of objectors would then be considered as part of the development control process.

7.162 It would in any event be appropriate to delete this site as an allocation should the Council change the base date of the plan, but I recommend its deletion on the basis that with 6/7 dwellings it is too small to be included as an allocation.

## Recommendation:

R7.32 Modify the plan by deleting Policy GDS.1/V5.

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V6

2/B53	T2000/Railfutures	GDS.1/V6
322/B15	Greenvale Residents Association	GDS.1/V6
322/B16	Greenvale Residents Association	GDS.1/V6
696/B38	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/V6
1427/B110	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V6
2804/B3	Mr G Stewart	GDS.1/V6
696/C70	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/V6/A
721/C67	Government Office for the South West	GDS.1/V6/A

### Inspector's Reasoning

7.163 The allocation is deleted from the RDDLP since planning permission has been granted for 28 dwellings.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V7

721/B42	Government Office for the South West	GDS.1/V7
1427/B111	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V7
3278/B32	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/V7

### Supporting Statements

696/B39	South West RSL Planning Consortium	GDS.1/V7
2311/B12	Somer Community Housing Trust	GDS.1/V7

### Issues

- i) Whether a development of this scale is appropriate to High Littleton.
- ii) Whether the policy should include reference to the need for a surface water drainage strategy.

### Inspector's Reasoning

#### *Issue i)*

7.164 High Littleton is designated as an R1 settlement in the plan, with reasonable access to facilities and employment either within the village or by public transport to nearby centres. This is a small site well related to the village and its development would contribute to rural sustainability in particular through the provision of some affordable housing.

#### *Issue ii)*

7.165 Policy ES.5 deals with drainage issues which can effectively be covered in the development control process.

**Recommendation: no change.**

## Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V8

725/B14	Redcliffe Homes Ltd	GDS.1/V8
1427/B112	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V8
2597/B1	Dr R C Rafferty	GDS.1/V8
2977/B3	The Bear Organisation Limited	GDS.1/V8
3023/B16	Mr & Mrs D Hawkes	GDS.1/V8
3213/B1	Chew Stoke Parish Council	GDS.1/V8
3267/B4	C S J Planning Consultants Ltd	GDS.1/V8
3278/B33	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd	GDS.1/V8
3299/B43	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited	GDS.1/V8

## Supporting Statement

1427/C205	Environment Agency	GDS.1/V8/A
-----------	--------------------	------------

## Issues

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for mixed use development and if so, the scale of housing that would be appropriate.
- ii) Whether the allocation should provide for a doctor's surgery.
- iii) Whether further land should be allocated to provide an alternative access.

## Inspector's Reasoning

### *Issue i)*

7.166 This is a site of some 3.2 ha occupied by a significant level of vacant commercial/industrial buildings and a large area of hard standing and located on the edge of the settlement of Chew Stoke. The site is within the Green Belt, and has been identified by the Council as a Major Existing Developed Site (MEDS) in accordance with Annex C of PPG2. The redevelopment of a MEDS can be appropriate in the Green Belt provided the openness of the Green Belt is maintained, and in this case the Council identifies an opportunity for the site to be redeveloped in a way which reduces impact on the Green Belt of the existing development, and benefits the community by contributing to the future social and economic vitality of the rural area. I have no reason to disagree with this view.

7.167 Although Chew Stoke is an R3 settlement in the plan, this is primarily to reflect its status as a village washed over by the Green Belt. It has a number of local facilities, including a primary school, and is adjacent to the Chew Valley Comprehensive School. Further shops and services are available in the nearby village of Chew Magna. Although the Parish Council is concerned that the schools are oversubscribed, there are other policies in the plan which seek to ensure that educational facilities are provided for. As a result I consider that further residential development adjacent to the village would be sustainable.

7.168 Westbury Homes argues that in view of the area of built development on the site, and the lack of demand for employment, the site could

accommodate 50 dwellings with some employment or community uses. Furthermore, the village has a population of 900 people housed in about 320 dwellings and with its good access to local services, the village could sustain more houses on this site. However, I agree with the Council that this is a sensitive location in a rural area within the Green Belt and a larger number of dwellings would not be appropriate.

***Issue ii)***

7.169 One objector states that the site is being considered by the Chew Magna doctors as a potential location for a new surgery. Clause 7 of the policy requires provision of community facilities which could include such a use. However, without firm proposals it would be inappropriate to be more specific in the policy wording.

***Issue iii)***

7.170 The site proposed for allocation to provide an alternative means of access is primarily green field within the Green Belt. It is therefore very different in status from the brownfield Radford's site. Any development of the Radford's site would need to provide an adequate means of access, and having regard to the previous use of the site I have no reason to consider that this could not be achieved.

**Recommendation: no change.**

---

**Chapter B9 - Policy GDS.1/V9**

*There are large numbers of representations to this policy; details are listed at Appendix 1.*

**Inspector's Reasoning**

7.171 This site was deleted from the RDDLP. In Section 5 I identify a shortfall in the supply of housing to meet strategic requirements and recommend that this site is reconsidered by the Council as an allocation. Further work will be required to assess floodrisk and access, and impacts on the adjoining school, but the site relates well to the developed area of the village, and it is well enclosed such that its development would not be unduly intrusive in the countryside. Farmborough is an R1 settlement with a reasonable level of local services and facilities, and a development of this scale (about 30 dwellings) which would include an element of affordable housing would contribute to the maintenance of these local facilities.

**Recommendation:**

R7.33 The Council consider the reinstatement of this allocation having regard to floodrisk, access, and any impact on the adjoining school.

---