

## SECTION 8 - Chapter B9 - Alternative Sites

### Alternative Sites Policy - General

3275/B1 Mrs S Thomas  
3275/B3 Mrs S Thomas

#### Issue

- i) Whether sites should be identified in the R2/R3 settlements in GDS.1 to meet Structure Plan dwelling requirements.

#### Inspector's Reasoning

8.1 In order to identify the most sustainable opportunities for residential development to meet strategic housing requirements, and in accordance with the strategy of the JRSP, the plan focuses on sites within Bath, Keynsham, Norton Radstock and the R1 settlements. I have recommended modifications to Policy HG.4 which would enable some development to take place in the R2 settlements, but only where it is appropriate to the scale of the settlement in terms of the availability of facilities and employment opportunities and accessibility to public transport. Policy HG.6 allows for infilling within the R3 settlements. In addition, my recommended Policy ET.3 would deal with proposals for the redevelopment of employment sites.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### Bath - Land at Wellsway

447/B32 Wilcon Homes  
447/B37 Wilcon Homes  
2318/B1 Elisabeth M Delany

#### Issue

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### Inspector's Reasoning

8.2 This 6 acre site has been used for grazing cattle in the past and is allocated on the plan as a RIG. It is a steeply sloping site and could only accommodate housing on the lower levels. The objectors state that the site is no longer in any beneficial use and that there are problems of maintenance which cause concerns to nearby residents. However, this is a conspicuous site which forms part of the green spaces alongside Wellsway which is a main route into Bath. It could accommodate only a limited number of houses because of its steep gradients and in my view there are other sites within the city which would be more appropriate for allocation to meet strategic housing requirements.

**Recommendation: no change.**

### **Bath - Twerton Football Ground**

589/B7 Bath City Football Club  
697/B6 Twerton Park Properties Ltd

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the Football Ground at Twerton should be allocated as a mixed use development site.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.3 The Football Club is seeking to relocate for physical and economic reasons and has identified land at Newton Fields, Newbridge as a suitable site. However, the site is in the Green Belt and I consider that there is insufficient justification for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered. Without an alternative site there is no guarantee that the existing site will not continue to be required for recreational use. I therefore consider that the case has not been made for the site to be released from its current use under Policy SR.1, and an allocation under Policy GDS.1 for mixed development would not be appropriate.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath - Land North of Bailbrook Lane**

2173/B1 Mr M Swift

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.4 Although the adjoining site has been allocated for housing, in my view this site relates more to the surrounding rural area and should not be designated for residential development.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath - Greenway Lane, Beechen Cliff School**

2310/B4 Beechcroft Developments  
2310/B17 Beechcroft Developments

#### **Issues**

- i) Whether land at Beechen Cliff School, Greenway Lane should be allocated for housing.

## Inspector's Reasoning

- 8.5 In Section 5 of my report I find that there is inadequate land allocated to meet strategic housing requirements during the plan period. As a result I have recommended that the Council reconsider sites deleted from the DDLP, and other sites within Bath, the other urban areas and the R1 settlements. Land at Beechen Cliff School, Greenway Lane is one of the sites which I recommend be allocated for housing in this plan.
- 8.6 This 0.4 ha site forms a strip of land between dwellings to the north and south. Although it is raised in level above Greenway Lane, the site is lower than the larger area of playing fields which form the setting for the school buildings to the north east. Whilst the development of the site would close-off views from adjoining dwellings in Devonshire Place, these dwellings have good sized gardens and in my view a new development could be located to avoid significant harm to the amenities of occupiers. The site is relatively well contained between existing development. Whilst it can be seen from wider views across and into the conservation area, it is seen in the context of the wider areas of open land south of Greenway Lane, together with the remaining Beechen Cliff Playing Fields and Alexander Park. With the retention of these significant areas of open space I consider that the visual amenity of the conservation area would be preserved. Furthermore, the area would remain well served by a range of open space provision, including the allotment gardens and recreation ground located off Bloomfield Road/Wellsway to the west of the site.
- 8.7 The Secretary of State for Education and Skills has identified the site as surplus to requirements and whilst this is not in itself justification for its development, it is clear that the site is no longer required by the school. It is not clear whether the site could be put to good use by any other recreational organisation or school, but it is not currently in use by any other organisation and therefore its development would not represent a loss. In any event, the conditions set out by the Secretary of State for the disposal of the site require the provision of new all weather sports facilities which in my view would be of greater recreational benefit to the school, and in view of the potential for shared use, the community, than the retention of this narrow and sloping area of open space. Subject to this provision being made a requirement of any development, then the loss of this recreational space would be acceptable because of the net benefit to sport.
- 8.8 Clearly the detailed scheme would need to be of a design appropriate to the position of the site within the conservation area, and provision would need to be made for the diversion or retention of any public rights of way. The objectors put forward a scheme for 14 sheltered units at a density of 35 dwellings per hectare. However, in view of the favourable position of the site in the urban area with good accessibility to public transport, services and jobs, I recommend that a higher density is sought, with up to 18 dwellings.

- 8.9 The Council object to the allocation of the site on the grounds of highway safety, having regard to the narrowness of the lane and the poor junctions to either end. However, in my view this number of dwellings is unlikely to add significantly to the level of traffic using the lane and its junctions and this issue would need to be discussed and resolved in relation to any future planning application. I set out below the matters which would need to be included in a new allocation under Policy GDS.1.

### **Recommendations:**

- R8.1 Modify Policy GDS.1 by adding a new site in Bath as follows:

“BEECHEN CLIFF SCHOOL, GREENWAY LANE – site area 0.4 ha.

Development requirements:

- 1 About 18 dwellings.
- 2 Safe and adequate highway access to be provided from Greenway Lane.
- 3 Any planning permission to be linked to a legal agreement for improvements to educational and sports facilities, including shared community use of the sports facilities.
- 4 Provision for the accommodation of public rights of way within the site.”

- R8.2 Modify the Proposal Map to accord with new allocation.

---

### **Bath - Land Rear of 64-92 London Road West**

2647/B1 Mr & Mrs Griffiths  
3230/B3 Countryside Residential (South West) Ltd

### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.10 Although the objectors state that this is former nursery land, the site has the appearance of an unused greenfield site. Located between the rear gardens of dwellings fronting London Road West, the rugby pitch to the south east and the bypass to the south west, the land forms part of the slope down into the valley and in my view relates more to the open valley than to the adjoining built up area. In these circumstances I do not recommend the site be considered for development in the current plan.
- 8.11 The site is not currently within the Green Belt, but in view of its relationship with the wider open area, its designation should be

considered as part of any review of the Green Belt in the next round of development plans.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Bath - Old Fosse Road**

3003/B1      London Baptist Property Board Ltd  
3305/B3      W Reed (Builders) Ltd

**Weston Farm Lane, Off the Weal, Weston**

3087/B1      Mrs S Sparrow

**Batheaston - Avondale, London Road East**

2602/B1      Mr M J T Arrowsmith

**Batheaston - Poplar Nurseries**

2625/B2      Poplar Nurseries  
3251/B1      Prospect Land Ltd  
3251/B9      Prospect Land Ltd

**Clutton - Maypole Close, Land North of Clutton**

2684/B1      Mr M G C Tucker

**Combe Hay - Land at Combe Hay Lane**

2707/B2      Crest Strategic Projects Limited  
2707/B4      Crest Strategic Projects Limited

**Farmborough - Land Between Manor Gardens and Tilley Close**

2683/B2      Diocese of Bath & Wells

**Farmborough - Land South of Love's Lane**

2973/B2      Mr & Mrs A W J Champion

**Odd Down, Bath - Land South of Odd Down, South Stoke**

485/B11      Prowting Projects Ltd

**Peasedown St John - Land Adjacent to Julian's Farm, Shoscombe Vale**

3284/B1      Messrs D G A, P J A & A G Weeks

**Saltford - Manor Road**

3023/B1      Mr & Mrs D Hawkes

### **South Stoke - Land Between Packhorse Lane and Midford Road**

3285/B1      Countryside Properties

### **Whitchurch - Land Between Church Road and Maggs Lane**

542/B7      Mr D R Osbourne

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the above sites should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.12 These sites are within the Green Belt, and are located outside any HDB so would not constitute infilling within an existing settlement. There is no provision in the JRSP for the release of sites from the Green Belt for residential development apart from land at Keynsham. RPG10 refers to the need to review the boundaries of the Green Belt to assess whether alterations are needed to allow for long term sustainable growth and it is in the next round of development plan preparation that this exercise should be carried out.
- 8.13 There are a number of sites put forward by objectors for exclusion from the Green Belt in order to provide for additional residential development in the plan period. However, in Section 5 I have identified those sites which I consider to accord with the policies of the JRSP and the strategy of the plan, and which would be sequentially preferable. There are a number of options for the Council to consider which could more than adequately meet the strategic housing requirement that I have identified without the need for any further release of Green Belt sites. In these circumstances I am not considering any of the Green Belt sites put forward for residential development in any further detail.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath - Weirside Works, Lower Bristol Road**

3007/B1      Grant Thornton

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.14 The objection site lies within GDS.1/B12 Land at Lower Bristol Road which is allocated in the RDDLP for a mixed use development including the various uses proposed by the objectors. I therefore consider that the objection is met.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath - Hampton Row**

3103/B1 Ms D E Emery

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.15 In view of the limited scale of this site it is not necessary for the site to be allocated in the plan. Any application for residential development should be considered under the plan's policies as recommended to be modified.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath - South of Bailbrook Lane**

3195/B1 Mr J E Davis

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.16 The site lies to the south of the allocation B6 in the DDLP which now has planning permission. However, Bailbrook Lane is narrow and rural in character. The land to the south has a number of trees and slopes down towards the open college grounds to the south. I have little information on which to judge the impact of a development of the site, and on which I could make a recommendation for it to be allocated for development. However, residential development is likely to be harmful to the rural character of this part of the lane. I therefore recommend no change to the plan.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath - Gammon Plant Hire, Rock Hall Lane, Combe Down**

3208/B1 Gammon Plant Hire

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.17 This 0.14 ha site is too small for an allocation in the plan and any proposals for residential development would fall to be considered against the employment and retail policies of the plan.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath - Lansdown View Allotments**

3235/B2 Mr I Betts & Mr A Perry

#### **Issues**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.18 This site is within the urban area; it is not in any beneficial use and makes no significant contribution to townscape or the character of the area. It is said to be former allotment land and therefore the Council should consider whether it is required for reinstatement to allotment use. Otherwise it could be considered for residential development.

#### **Recommendation:**

R8.3 The Council to consider any need for the reinstatement of the site to allotment use; if not required then consideration be given to development of the site for housing.

---

### **Bath - St Martins Hospital**

3261/B9 Bath & North East Somerset Primary Care Trust

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.19 This site has been allocated in the RDDLP in response to the objection which has therefore been met.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bath – Lower Bristol Road and Land Between Roseberry Road/River Avon and Unigate Land**

3276/B5 Temra of Bath  
3276/B7 Temra of Bath



### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.20 This site is within the area which has been allocated under Policy GDS.1/B12 in the RDDLP and therefore the first objection has been met. In these circumstances I see no reason to connect the site with the redevelopment of BWR.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Batheaston - Northend Joinery**

685/B18 Batheaston Parish Council

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.21 Although there are a number of buildings within this site, it is within the Green Belt and there is no justification for any change to the Green Belt boundary in this area. Any re-use of the existing buildings would fall to be considered against Green Belt and employment policies.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Batheaston - Elmhurst; Catherine Way**

685/B19 Batheaston Parish Council

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.22 This is a small site within the HDB for Batheaston and any proposal for residential development would fall to be considered under Policy HG.4 as recommended to be modified.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Bathampton - Junction Bathampton Lane and Warminster Road**

3207/B3 Cindabi (International) Ltd

## Issue

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.23 Although the site lies within the developed area of the village, it performs an important function as an attractive open area on the approach to the historic core of the village, important to the setting of the conservation area. As a sloping site it is highly visible in longer views, including views from the footpath which links the village to the open landscape of Bathampton slopes and Down.

8.24 In view of the harm to the character of the area which would result from the development of the site, I make no recommendation for its allocation.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Charlcombe - Sites at Lansdown

3275/B2 Mrs S Thomas

## Issue

- i) Whether sites for housing and mixed used development should be identified in the Lansdown area of Bath.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.25 The objector does not identify any specific site for an allocation. Any infill sites put forward for development would be considered in the context of Policy HG.4 which I recommend to be modified.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Chew Stoke - Land North of Bowls Club, Wallycourt Road

2977/B1 The Bear Organisation Limited

## Issue

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.26 The Radford Retail Systems Site is identified as a MEDS in which it is Government policy to allow for development within the Green Belt. The land to the south, north of the Bowls Club, remains Green Belt and in my view the potential development of the Radford Retail Systems Site does

not provide for the very special circumstances necessary for its release from the Green Belt for development.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **East Harptree - Pinkers Farm**

709/B6      Lordswood Farms Limited

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.27 The former agricultural contractor's yard and the dairy unit at Pinker's Farm abuts the residential area of East Harptree only partly and otherwise projects into the open countryside. I recommend against the extension of the HDB to include the site which would form a substantial extension to the scale of the village. Subject to the site being in employment use, any proposals for its redevelopment would fall to be assessed against Policy HG.4, which as recommended to be modified would relate to R2 settlements, and ET.3 as recommended to be modified.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Hinton Blewett - Weathers Field House**

700/B18      Chase Homes

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.28 Hinton Blewett is an R2 settlement with a limited level of services. This would be a quite substantial site to add to the village, and I have identified in Section 5 sufficient sites which would be sequentially preferable which could meet the strategic housing land requirement. Furthermore, I find that the site relates more readily to the rural setting of the village rather than the built up area and therefore I recommend no change.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## **Keynsham –Withies Farm**

- Land east of Withies Farm
- Land to Rear of 237 Bath Road
- Manor Road
- Uplands Farm
- Lays Farm and Land to North and South
- Homestead Estate
- Hawkeswell

3299/B38	Bovis Homes (South West Region) Limited
254/B35	Keynsham Town Council
254/B36	Keynsham Town Council
447/B36	Wilcon Homes
695/B14	Society of Merchant Venturers
2601/B5	Linden Homes (Developments) Limited
3233/B27	Mr & Mrs M Williams
2636/B3	The Jollands Trust
3098/B45	George Wimpey Strategic Land

## **Issue**

- i) Whether the sites should be allocated for residential development.

## **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.29 All of the above sites are within the Green Belt. In Section 5 I set out the reasons why I consider that the land to the south west of Keynsham (K2 in the DDLP) would best meet the criteria for the release of land from the Green Belt set out in JRSP policies 9 and 16. In my judgement land to the south west would not harm the sensitive gaps between Keynsham and other settlements, nor would it be intrusive into the Chew Valley, an important landscape setting for the town. As a result it would best meet the important criteria of safeguarding against the coalescence of settlements and avoiding harm to the existing character of the town.
- 8.30 Whilst I have found a shortfall in the supply of housing to meet strategic requirements in the plan, with the release of K2 together with other sites which I have identified for the Council to consider, I am confident that there will be no requirement for the release of further land from the Green Belt at Keynsham to provide for housing land during this plan period. As a result I give no further detailed consideration to the above sites which remain in the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation: no change**

---

## **Keynsham - Former Nursery Site, High Street**

398/B2                      Mr G Hobbs

## **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for housing.

## **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.31 The Council state that the site is not available for development and since it is below the threshold for an allocation, I recommend no change to the plan.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Thicketmead Bridge**

462/B26      Gleeson Homes

## **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

## **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.32 This is an overgrown area of undeveloped land on the north slope of the valley of the Wellow Brook. The objector argues that the site is surrounded on three sides by residential curtilages however, to the west are the long rear gardens of a row of cottages which are more rural in character and which act as a link to the wider undeveloped valley to the west. As a result I find the site to be part of the green finger which runs along the valley of the Wellow Brook rather than a part of the urban area.

8.33 This green wedge makes an important contribution to the character of the town, and in view of the potential of other, less damaging opportunities for residential development which I have identified in Section 5, I recommend no change in relation to this site.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Coomb End Scrapyard (Hallmark) - Coomb End**

578/B75      Norton Radstock Town Council  
3218/B2      Portland (Radstock) Ltd

## **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.34 In considering the potential of sites for residential development to meet strategic housing land requirements in Section 5, I have recommended that the area designated on the RDDLP as a Regeneration Area should be reassessed for mixed use development including housing. That includes the site of the scrapyards, but not the land to the west.

### Recommendation:

R8.4 That the Council assess the potential for the residential allocation of the area designated as a Regeneration Area in the RDDLP at Coomb End, Radstock for mixed use development with its capacity for housing to be assessed.

---

## Norton Radstock - Clandown Scrapyard (Bidwells)

578/B83 Norton Radstock Town Council

### Issue

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.35 I have recommended in Section 5 that the Council consider this site for residential allocation in the plan. I appreciate the Council's concern that such an allocation could result in the loss of the existing business, but the poor location of the use at present is such that an allocation is justified. Furthermore, an allocation of the site for residential development may encourage the identification of an alternative site.

### Recommendation:

R8.5 The Council consider Clandown Scrapyard for residential allocation in the plan.

---

## Norton Radstock - Whitelands and Old Tynning Pit Head

578/B80	Norton Radstock Town Council
2890/B1	Mr & Mrs D Rastrick
3106/B2	Mr P D Chivers
2057/B2	Bath & District Self Build Association
3027/B1	Salter Evans Associates
3176/B2	Mrs M Brooks

### Issue

- i) Whether the land should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.36 This area was considered for housing development by the Inspector at the Wansdyke Local Plan Inquiry. In his report he formed the view that there was little to distinguish the wooded and open land on the objection sites from nearby fields and woods, and they appear as part of the countryside “which encloses and penetrates into this part of the town”. Although some excavation has taken place to reveal some foundations of cottages and prefabs which were once on the site at Whitelands, I have no reason to disagree with my colleague that this site is generally open and a part of the countryside which surrounds the town.
- 8.37 In spite of the excavations which have taken place, the remains of the structures on the site have largely blended into the landscape so the status of the land as previously developed in terms of Annex C to PPG3 is questionable. However, whether or not it would fall within that definition, the site is physically separate from the edge of Norton Radstock to the west. I sympathise with the concerns expressed by some objectors regarding the uses to which this site is put and problems of maintaining the land, but agree with my colleague in his report on the Wansdyke Local Plan. Its development would constitute a substantial encroachment of building onto a prominent open part of the side of the valley and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- 8.38 Furthermore, I have identified sufficient options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a site in such a sensitive location.

### **Recommendation: no change**

---

#### **Norton Radstock - Land North of Tynning**

3304/B1 W F Wells & Sons

### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.39 The objector proposes that this site be allocated for a new school to meet the need identified in the DDLP, together with residential development. However, the site is an area of open countryside outside the limits of the existing built up area of the town. Any development of the site would therefore be an intrusion into the rural setting of the town. Furthermore, the RDDLP, paragraph B3.62 refers to the site north of Woodborough Lane (and south of the objection site) which has been identified for the new school, therefore no further allocation is required.

### **Recommendation: no change**

### **Norton Radstock – land west of Maple Heights, Writhlington**

1831/B2

Mr & Mrs V Williams

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.40 This site adjoins a recently completed housing development located at the top of the valley slope. The new development is prominent from views across the valley and in my view this is no justification to add further development in this sensitive location. I have identified sufficient options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of this greenfield site.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Land North of Maple Heights**

3278/B2

Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.41 This is a substantial area of land between development in Frome Road and Mill Lane. It is an attractive hillside with many trees and shrubs and forms part of a green finger reaching into the centre of the town. I have considered whether it should be included in the HDB in Section 5 and recommend no change. The land makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the town, and I have identified sufficient options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a site in such a sensitive location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Land to Rear of 45 Millards Hill, Welton**

3300/B8

Oval Estates (Bath) Ltd

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.



## Inspector's Reasoning

8.42 This site is enclosed within existing development on three and part of the fourth side. It lies outside the boundary of the HDB as defined on the plan. Although the Council states that this is a greenfield site, its use was not clear at my site visit, when I saw contractor's plant and temporary buildings on or adjoining the site. The scale of the site is too small for it to be included as a residential allocation, but in my view the Council should clarify the status of the site. In the event that it has an established employment use, any redevelopment would fall to be considered against Policy ET.3(3) as I recommend it to be modified. Otherwise, the Council should consider whether to bring the site into the HDB.

## Recommendation:

R8.6 The Council review the status of the site to determine whether any development of the site for housing would fall to be assessed under recommended Policy ET.3(3), or whether it would be appropriate to modify the HDB to incorporate the site.

---

## Norton Radstock - Wheelers Hill and Welton Vale

3084/B1	Richard Wood Engineering
2057/B1	Bath & District Self Build Association
2649/B3	The Duchy of Cornwall
3245/B1	The Guinness Trust

## Issue

The Wheelers Hill site has been allocated as GDS.1/NR12 in the RDDLP so objection 3084/B1 is met.

- i) Whether the remainder of the Welton Vale site should be allocated for a mixed use development.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.43 This is a substantial area of land which forms part of the north slope of the valley of the Wellow Brook. A small part of the site south of the Brook and to the west of the Midsomer Norton Enterprise Park is allocated in the RDDLP as GDS.1/NR12 for employment purposes, to which I recommend no change.

8.44 Welton Vale is an attractive area of open land which relates fully to the open countryside to the north of the built up area. The objectors argue for a mixed use development of the site. However, I have identified sufficient options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a site in such a sensitive location, and in view of my findings in Section 2 in

relation to the economy of the District, there is no evidence to support the release of any more of the area for employment development.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - The Grange**

2315/B1      Mr J R Blatchford

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.45 The Grange is at the end of a row of low density development fronting Silver Street as it makes the transition between the more densely built up area and the countryside. The site is too small to be included in the plan as an allocation, and the site is of different character to the more densely developed housing which is included within the HDB. Therefore I make no recommendation to amend the HDB to enable the site to be considered for residential development under Policy HG.4.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Charlton Lane, Westfield**

2355/B1      Lord Hylton

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for employment development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.46 Whilst I accept that there is a high level of out commuting from Norton Radstock, there are other opportunities for employment related development in the town which would meet the requirements identified in Section 2 of my report. As stated by the Council, this site is an open green plateau extensively visible from the south and the north of Norton Radstock and its development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In these circumstances I find no justification for its allocation in the plan.

**Recommendation: no change.**

---

## **Norton Radstock - Charlton's 'World of Wood' Site - Rymans Engineering Site**

2686/B2	Norton Radstock Regeneration Company
2686/B6	Norton Radstock Regeneration Company
2686/B5	Norton Radstock Regeneration Company

### **Issue**

- i) Whether the sites should be allocated for mixed use development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.47 These sites are currently in an active employment use and there is no evidence of any requirement for redevelopment at the present time. The objectors state that the sites have the potential to come forward for redevelopment in the plan period, but any scheme could be considered against the policies of the plan (as recommended to be modified) and therefore I find no reason to include either of the sites as an allocation at this time.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## **Norton Radstock - Somer Valley, Between Midsomer Norton Town Centre and Radstock Road**

3079/B1	Flower & Hayes (Developments) Ltd
---------	-----------------------------------

### **Issue**

- i) Whether part of the site should be allocated for housing with the remainder as a town park.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.48 Although the site may have been allocated as open space for some years without any implementation, this in itself is no justification for its partial development for housing. The site forms part of a wider undeveloped area shown on the Proposals Map for recreational use. It does not adjoin any existing residential development and is separated from the existing HDB. Even if the partial development of the site was to enable the formation of a town park on the rest of the land, a residential development in this location would intrude into the undeveloped area which forms an important green finger alongside the old railway through the town.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Land at Hazel Terrace/Old Pit Road**

3079/B5      Flower & Hayes (Developments) Ltd

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.49 The boundary of the HDB has been amended in the RDDLP to include the objection site which now has planning permission subject to a S106 agreement. Therefore the objection has been met.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Monger Lane**

3098/B32      George Wimpey Strategic Land

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.50 This site lies to the north of land with planning permission fronting the A362, West Road. It is a substantial area of open land, rural in character and sloping down to the south. Development would extend the built up area of the town into the countryside and would be likely to be open to longer views from the south. The objectors argue that the site is preferable to land at Charlton Park and at Folly Hill. The Charlton Park site is not proposed as an allocation in the RDDLP, and I do not recommend that it be reconsidered. The land at Folly Hill now has the benefit of planning permission and therefore the objection site could not be considered as an alternative.

8.51 In any event, in Section 5 I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a site in this location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Norton Radstock - Knobsbury Lane and Frome Road**

3118/B1      Mr J Pilling

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.52 This greenfield site is separated from the HDB by roads and schools. As a result any residential development would extend the built up area into the countryside. Whether or not a scheme was to include 30% affordable housing, I have identified in Section 5 sufficient options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a site in such a sensitive location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

#### **Norton Radstock - Manor Road, Writhlington**

3099/B30 Barratt Bristol Limited(Mr A T P Joliffe)

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential and other mixed use development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.53 This is a greenfield site located some distance from the town centre outside the built up area. Even with the siting of recreational land as suggested by the objector the development of the site would be an intrusion into the open countryside. I have identified in Section 5 sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a site in this location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

#### **Norton Radstock - Land South of Old Road, Writhlington**

##### **- Land West of Green Parlour Farm. Writhlington**

3118/B2 Mr J Pilling  
3118/B3 Mr J Pilling

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the sites should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.54 These are greenfield sites outside the HDB at some distance from the town centre. Any development of the sites for housing would result in the extension of the built up area into the countryside. Even if 30% affordable housing were to be provided, I have identified in section 5

sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of sites in these locations.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Norton Radstock - Writhlington School**

3120/B1      Writhlington School

**Issue**

- i) Whether land at Writhlington School should be allocated for residential development.

**Inspector's Reasoning**

8.55 Writhlington School is located some distance from the town centre and outside the HDB. The open areas of the school grounds provide a transition between the built up area to the north and the open countryside to the south. Development of the land, whether or not it is required for school playing fields, would consolidate the school site so as to extend the built up area into the countryside. Furthermore, I have identified in Section 5 sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of sites in these locations.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Norton Radstock - Welton Packaging, Station Road**

3247/B1      Scott & Robertson Limited

**Inspector's Reasoning**

8.56 Although this objector states that the site owners have no plans to rationalise the use of this site, representations submitted by Welton Bibby and Baron Ltd (3629/C4) state that the owners are currently considering the rationalisation of the use of the site and in Section 5 I have recommended that the Council consider its potential for a mixed use redevelopment of residential and employment uses.

**Recommendation:**

R8.7 The Council consider the potential for the residential development of the Welton Packaging site as part of a mixed use scheme.

---

## **Norton Radstock - Jewsons Site**

3300/B6      Oval Estates (Bath) Ltd

### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.57 In Section 5 have I considered the issue of employment sites within Norton-Radstock. I take the view that redundant or under used industrial or commercial sites which may be costly to redevelop as modern employment sites are unlikely to attract new commercial occupiers. This is in view of the findings of the BLRR in relation to the level and type of demand for employment sites and premises in the area. Rather than retain such sites in employment use therefore, I have recommended that consideration should be given to their release for residential or mixed use development, with the residential element providing a cross subsidy for the development of employment units.
- 8.58 However, I have no evidence that the Jewson site is redundant or underused. Furthermore whilst it adjoins residential development, it fronts a busy main road and there are unlikely to be any significant environmental gains as a result of its redevelopment.
- 8.59 I do not therefore recommend that the site be allocated for redevelopment, but clearly any future scheme would fall to be considered under Policy ET.3 as recommended to be modified.

### **Recommendation: no change**

---

## **Paulton - Old Mill Site**

1948/B1      Mr M R Carver  
3079/B3      Flower & Hayes (Developments) Ltd

### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for employment development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.60 This is a substantial area of undeveloped land west of the Old Mills industrial estate. Although it is largely enclosed within high hedges, it remains part of the rural surroundings of the town, at an important entrance along the A362. Any development of the site would therefore be an intrusion into the open countryside.
- 8.61 I deal with the provision of employment development in Section 2 of my report. It is clear from the findings of the BLRR that there is no significant requirement for new employment development in this area, and I support

a strategy in the plan which focuses on the regeneration of existing employment sites, where appropriate through a mix of development including residential where this would provide a cross subsidy for new employment units. In these circumstances I find no need to release a greenfield site in this sensitive location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Paulton - Bath Road**

1949/B1      Mr & Mrs Mills

**Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

**Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.62 This site was considered in detail by the Inspector in his report on the Wansdyke Local Plan where he found the land to form part of the open countryside fronting a stretch of road which is rural in character. Development of the site would therefore be an intrusion into the countryside which surrounds and contains this part of the village. I agree with his findings.
- 8.63 The site has never been allocated in an adopted Local Plan for development, and would not be a suitable alternative to V3 which is a brownfield site. In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in a location which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

**Paulton - Ham Grove**

2380/B1      Mr M McGibney

**Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

**Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.64 Although this site adjoins the main built up area of Paulton to the north and west, it is a greenfield site and its development would represent the extension of the urban area into the countryside. In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the



Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in such a location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Paulton - Land to West of St Julian's Close**

3079/B4      Flower & Hayes (Developments) Ltd

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.65 This site was considered in detail by the Inspector in his report on the Wansdyke Local Plan where he concluded that the allocation of the site would result in a very substantial extension of the built up area into the surrounding countryside. I agree with his findings.

8.66 In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in such a location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Peasedown St John - Land at Wellow Lane**

2641/B1      David Wilson Homes  
2641/B5      David Wilson Homes

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.67 I deal with this site in section 5 where I recommend that the Council consider it for residential allocation in the plan.

#### **Recommendation:**

R8.8 That the Council consider land at Wellow Lane, Peasedown St John for residential allocation in the Local Plan.

---

### **Peasedown St John - Land off Church Road**

2802/B1      Mr C A James

## Issue

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.68 This is a substantial parcel of land which acts as a green gap between housing development off Church Road and the older terraced property at Hillside View. The development of this greenfield site would consolidate the built up areas to the detriment of the rural character of the area. In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in such a location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Peasedown St John - Land Between Church Road and New Buildings

3237/B3      Octavian Development & Construction

## Issues

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

## Inspector's Reasoning

8.69 I consider this site in relation to Policy HG.4 and the definition of the HDB. I find that the land separates New Buildings from the edge of the main built up area and as a result it performs an important function in maintaining the separation of New Buildings as an independent group of houses rather than an extension of the larger built up area into the countryside.

8.70 In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in such a location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

## Peasedown St John - Land East of Carlingcott Lane

3237/B4      Octavian Development & Construction

## Issue

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.71 In considering whether the HDB should be amended to incorporate this site, I find that it forms part of the open countryside north west of Bath Road. As a result any development would be a harmful intrusion of the built up area into the countryside.
- 8.72 In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in such a location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Peasedown St John - Land Between Greenlands Road and Hillside View**

3241/B8      Edward Ware Homes Ltd

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.73 In considering this site under Policy HG.5 in relation to the HDB, I find the site to be visually contained but that it is a substantial area of undeveloped land which brings rural character to the centre of Peasedown, and provides a gap between the older terraced housing at Hillside View and the modern development to the south. As a result I recommend no change to the HDB.
- 8.74 In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in such a location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Stowey Sutton    - Land South of Stitchings Shords Lane                              - Land to West of Cappards Farm**

2976/B1      Mrs Marlene Maud Baker  
2976/B4      Mrs Marlene Maud Baker  
3241/B9      Edward Ware Homes Ltd

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the sites should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.75 These are substantial greenfield sites outside the boundaries of the built up area of the village. Any development of these sites would extend the village into the open countryside to the detriment of its character. In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a greenfield site in such a location.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

#### **Whitchurch - Haulage Yard, Staunton Lane**

2959/B3      Mr L F James

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning**

8.76 The site is in employment use, and partly safeguarded for the Whitchurch bypass under Policy GB.4. The objector considers that it should be released from the Green Belt in this plan and allocated for residential development. However, whether or not the bypass is to be pursued, apart from land at Keynsham, there is no other provision in the JRSP for the release of land from the Green Belt for residential development in this plan. Furthermore, I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of a Green Belt site at Whitchurch.

8.77 Any proposals for the redevelopment or reuse of existing buildings within the site would fall to be assessed against the Green Belt and Employment policies of the plan, as recommended to be modified.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

#### **Outside Plan Area - Underhill Farm**

715/B3      Lord Rees-Mogg

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.78 Although this site is within Mendip District, it lies immediately to the west of Midsomer Norton, and is contained within woodland to the north and west, and existing residential development to the south and east. The land is of no significant agricultural value, and the objector considers that the only reason it has not been identified for development is its location within a separate District from B&NES, and compares it with the allocation in the DDLP of land at Charlton Park.
- 8.79 However, the Council has indicated its willingness to discuss the potential release of the site with Mendip District, provided there was a need for the release of a greenfield site in the area. It is Government policy to take a sequential approach to the identification of land for housing, with the selection of brownfield site and sites within the boundaries of settlements before greenfield sites which would extend the built up area into the countryside. In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of Charlton Park or this greenfield site.

**Recommendation: no change**

---

### **Outside Plan Area - Land South of Fossefield Road**

2360/B4 Landray Will Trust

#### **Issue**

- i) Whether the site should be allocated for residential development.

### **Inspector's Reasoning**

- 8.80 This is a greenfield site within Mendip District but on the southern edge of Norton Radstock. The Council has agreed a joint approach with Mendip District Council to consider the appropriateness of allocating sites which lie in Mendip but which relate to Norton Radstock.
- 8.81 However, it is Government policy to take a sequential approach to the identification of land for housing, with the selection of brownfield sites and sites within the boundaries of settlements before greenfield sites which would extend the built up area into the countryside. In Section 5 of my report I have identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of this greenfield site the development of which would extend the built up area into the countryside.

**Recommendation: no change**

---