



**NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL**  
**COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)**  
**Charging Schedule Examination**

**Response to Key Issues Discussion Paper**

February 2017

**Issue 1: Is the charging schedule supported by background documents containing appropriate available evidence?**

**(i) Infrastructure planning evidence**

(a) *Is the Charging Schedule justified by the **appropriate available evidence**, having regard to the CIL 2010 Regulations (as amended), CIL Guidance (2014), NPPF (the Framework), National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the local economic context and infrastructure needs, including in relation to the North Somerset Local Plan (LP) and the North Somerset Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)? Is it consistent with the advice in the Harman Report?*

Yes. The Charging Schedule is justified by the appropriate available evidence and consistent with the Harman report, as set out in our submissions and in our answers to the questions below.

(b) *The main **infrastructure needs** that the Council intends to fund through the Levy are contained in the Regulation 123 List. Should this list be lengthened in response to several requests from representations?*

The Regulation 123 List submitted for examination has been amended in the light of representations made during the Draft Charging Schedule consultation.

The consultation and submission version are appended to this statement for comparative purposes as Appendices A and B.

The main changes are as follows:

- Addition of infrastructure category headings, for ease of reference.
- Exclusions relating to 'Strategic Development Areas' have been amended to refer to the Weston Villages only. This is to add clarity on S106 requirements for strategic sites. It reflects the NSC position in relation to strategic sites set out in response to Issue 2, question (iii) below.
- Specific detail of projects and typologies have been added to the more generic infrastructure listings. This is a response to the concern of some consultees that the previous headings were too vague, in particular those relating to green infrastructure, leisure and transport.
- Minor amendments have been made at the request of NSC services to clarify the intended scope or to reflect current terminology within the service. For example, 'pre-school provision' has been amended to 'Early Years' provision and children's centre services'.
- A reference to heritage schemes has been added in relation to public realm improvements, in response to comments from Historic England.

Further details of the consultation responses received in relation to the Regulation 123 List and NSC consideration of those requests can be found on pages 44 – 48 of examination submission [D/3](#).

We believe the revised draft Regulation 123 List is fit-for-purpose and does not require further amendment at this stage. It will be kept under review once the CIL is implemented and updated if required.

(c) *The **funding gap** for North Somerset is shown in the June 2016 IDP Update, which shows a cost estimate of £892.7 million, with an indicative cumulative gap of £586.5 million, presumably over the remainder of the Core Strategy period (to 2026). Would the proposed CIL charge make a significant contribution towards filling the likely funding gap? Can the Council point to other funding sources which will make good or at least significantly reduce*

*this funding gap, for example New Homes Bonus, remaining Section 106 receipts, and any other relevant considerations?*

The CIL is expected to contribute around £1 – 2m towards infrastructure each year, once operational. This is a relatively small proportion of the infrastructure gap. Additional national grants, NSC contributions and private sector investment will be required if all infrastructure is to be delivered.

NSC has a strong track record in securing such alternative funding. The IDP update tables demonstrate that funding has been secured (or is close to being secured) for all of our Level 1 priorities.

The table below updates the current funding position and adds commentary for each of the infrastructure categories detailed in the IDP.

<b>Infrastructure heading</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Funding secured</b>	<b>Funding yet to be secured</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Transport: strategic schemes 2013 - 18	£181.7m	£128.7m	£53m	£50m of the funding gap relates to the Metrowest (Portishead Rail) scheme, which has conditional funding approval as a West of England Major Transport Scheme. A proportion of New Homes Bonus is being used to help meet initial revenue costs. Once this scheme is accounted for, the funding gap reduces to £3m.
Transport: future strategic schemes	£426m	£0	£426m	These are longer-term major schemes. Delivery will be reliant on securing national funding, with CIL as part of the local match-funding. Our track record on the 2013 – 18 schemes reflects our ability to leverage such funds.
Transport: major growth areas	£33m	£14.4m	£18.7m	A significant proportion of this funding gap is expected to be closed through S106 agreements due to be concluded at the Weston Villages and in Yatton/Congresbury prior to CIL implementation. Residual funding is expected to be sourced through CIL and through national/West of England grants.
Education	£99.8 – 101.8m	£56.6m	£45.4 – 48.3m	The provision of all primary schools at the Weston Villages and Yatton, as well as much of the secondary school requirements, are expected to be provided for in S106 agreements due to be concluded over the next six months. Discussions on how best to meet residual secondary, primary and other needs are underway and are expected to be met through Academy expansions, new Free Schools and future development contributions.
Other community facilities:	£43.8m	£5.5m	£38.3m	These include a number of schemes categorised as Level 3 priorities

Infrastructure heading	Cost	Funding secured	Funding yet to be secured	Comments
strategic schemes				(‘desirable’). Since the previous update in August 2016, £2m has been secured to enable a phase 1 scheme to go ahead at Hutton Moor leisure centre, with a further £9m City-Deal EDF funding approved on a conditional basis for phase 2. The residual funding gap will be met through CIL, NSC resources, grant funding and private sector investment.
Other community facilities: Major Growth Areas	£8m	£4.8m	£3.2m	The residual funding gap is expected to be met through S106 contributions to be secured prior to CIL implementation.

(d) *Would the proposed CIL rates result in a significantly higher **overall charge for each new house**, once account is taken of the revised approach to S106 (and S278 highways) agreements that will apply once CIL is adopted?*

The DSP viability work underpinning our CIL rates assumes a residual £3,000 per dwelling (applied to all dwellings, including the affordable element) to meet other development contributions i.e. any that may be required on a site-specific basis alongside the CIL charge. This is an appropriate amount taking account of the items identified in the Regulation 123 List and our local experience of S106 and S278 agreements.

The Development Contributions SPD (examination document [C3](#), Appendix E, p90 - 93) sets out illustrative worked examples of development contributions that might apply to a typical application. These are updated below to show how the balance of contributions could work once CIL is in place.

The illustrative examples were based on the types of residual development expected to come forward through our adopted Core Strategy. They demonstrate that a £3,000 per dwelling allowance allows a degree of contingency that is certainly sufficient and if anything on the generous side.

Scheme for 12 dwellings in central urban location – assuming CIL has been implemented and in accordance with the Draft Regulation 123 List:

Where marked with ‘CIL’, this means that any previous S106 contribution that might have been expected would be replaced by a CIL contribution.

Service	S106/S278 works-in-kind	S106 residual financial contributions	S106 residual per dwelling
Affordable housing	30% on-site (subject to viability)	N/a	N/a
Community capacity & youth services	None	CIL	£0
Community, sport & leisure	None	None/CIL	£0
Economic development & employment-led	None	None/CIL	£0

<b>Service</b>	<b>S106/S278 works-in-kind</b>	<b>S106 residual financial contributions</b>	<b>S106 residual per dwelling</b>
requirements			
Education including pre-schools	None	None/CIL	£0
Emergency services	None	None/CIL	£0
Flood mitigation & sustainable drainage	On-site SUDS (part of development costs)	None/CIL	£0
Green infrastructure	On-site landscaping (part of development costs)	CIL	£0
Health	None	None/CIL	£0
Libraries & information services	None	CIL	£0
Transport, highways & sustainable travel	On-site access including provision for sustainable modes of transport (part of development costs)	None/CIL	£0
Waste management	Waste storage (development cost).	£600	£50
Fees *	N/a	£5,568	£464
Commuted sums for maintenance	N/a	£1,080	£90
<b>Total</b>		<b>£7,248</b>	<b>£604</b>

Scheme for 150 dwellings at edge of urban area or Service Village location:

<b>Service</b>	<b>S106/S278 works-in-kind</b>	<b>S106 residual financial contributions</b>	<b>S106 residual per dwelling</b>
Affordable housing	30% on-site (subject to viability)	N/a	N/a
Community capacity & youth services	N/a	CIL	£0
Community, sport & leisure	On-site play park – est. £30,000 equipment.	CIL	£200 works-in-kind
Economic development & employment-led requirements	If in Weston and meets criteria, delivery of 1.5 jobs per home.	None, or CIL if financial contributions apply.	£0
Education including pre-schools	N/a	CIL	£0
Emergency services	N/a	£1,500 (fire hydrant, if required)	£10
Flood mitigation & sustainable drainage	On-site SUDS (part of development costs)	CIL	£0
Green infrastructure	2,070 community park/Neighbourhood Open Space – est. £164,083 + equipment as above. Arguably part of normal development costs.	CIL	£1,094 works-in-kind

Service	S106/S278 works-in-kind	S106 residual financial contributions	S106 residual per dwelling
Health	N/a	None/CIL	£0
Libraries & information services	N/a	CIL	£0
Transport, highways & sustainable travel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. On-site access.</li> <li>ii. Any necessary highways/access/safety improvements in the vicinity of the site</li> <li>iii. Improvements to public rights of way, pedestrian &amp; cycle connections (on-site or connecting to local facilities).</li> <li>iv. Setting for bus stops (raised kerb, etc).</li> <li>v. Other works identified in Travel Plan.</li> </ul> <p>These costs would be variable, but in most cases would be expected to be part of normal development costs for a site, rather than 'add-on' S106/S278 requirements.</p>	<p>Bus stop shelter/flag etc: £25k.</p> <p>Travel Plan measures: est. £100/dwelling (£15,000).</p> <p>Other measures funded through CIL.</p>	£267
Waste management	Waste storage (development cost).	CIL	£0
Fees *	N/a	£33,850	£226
Committed sums for maintenance	N/a	£108,278	£722
<b>Total</b>	<b>Est. value of S106 elements is £194,033</b>	<b>£183,628</b>	<b>£2,519</b>

Note that fees may be expected to reduce in line with the reduction in overall S106 requirements (for example, supervision fees for developer build of school or community buildings would be removed).

(e) *Do the figures demonstrate the need to levy CIL?*

Yes. The answer to (c) above demonstrates a funding gap of around £587.5m. Much of this is expected to be met through national or regional grants, however local contributions of up to 30% would normally be expected.

## (ii) Economic viability evidence

Is the **CIL Viability Study** (VS) and the **methodology** it uses, robust and suitable for the purpose of setting an effective CIL charging rate for North Somerset? In particular:

(a) *Is the standard **residual valuation approach** used in the VS appropriate?*

Yes. The approach to the calculations undertaken for the viability study uses well established principles and methodological details. It is consistent with the approach used by the Council's consultants to inform and support the development of a CIL through the consultation and examination stages for a wide range of local authorities since the introduction of CIL. The approach is continually evaluated and adjusted as needed by the consultants in response to further developing experience of CIL and Local Plan Viability, as well as to their day to day workload on site-specific viability. The consistent endorsement of the approach through the Examination process continues to support the Council's view that it remains suitable for the purpose of informing the CIL charging rates proposed in North Somerset.

(b) *Are the **assumptions used** for the range of factors included in the VS, such as benchmark land values, building costs, infrastructure costs, Code for Sustainable Homes (or Building Regulations equivalent) and profit levels, in addition to the percentage of affordable housing (AH) provision, reasonable?*

Yes, the viability assumptions inevitably involve judgements but have been placed with reference to recognised sources, considered in light of the viability consultants' wide experience of both strategic level and site-specific review and appraisal experience (using an approach as supported at numerous examinations) and confirmed to be reasonable and appropriate for the purpose. The Council considers that they are also supportable from its local experience of dealing with planning application stage viability submissions. The assessment reporting makes clear the assumptions and their source, for example as follows.

- **Benchmark land values**  
The assessments used a range of viability tests aligned to potential land values levels that are considered to be realistic in the local circumstances, particularly bearing in mind that the methodology means carrying the cost of providing the affordable housing, CIL and other costs and obligations within the appraisal – i.e. land value is considered in net terms - after meeting all relevant costs that in practice should influence its level. Land values levels from potential minimum greenfield option prices through PDL levels have been considered in this context, and from the results it will be seen that in many instances even the higher viability tests are reached or exceeded – in scenarios where those are more likely to be relevant.
- **Building and related costs**  
BCIS sourced build costs have been used, appropriately selected and updated between the assessments. This is consistent with established and accepted practice – appropriate for the purpose. No economies of scale have been assumed with increasing site size / likely nature of involved developer and within the smallest scenario appraisals the BCIS Report for The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) August 2015 has also been reflected. Additionally, external and site works have been allowed for separately. Fees, contingencies and other costs / enhancements are also reflected through particular additional allowances again also reflecting market norms and good practice.
- **Sustainable Construction**  
Consistent with wider experience, as an additional contingency, a 2% allowance (reflecting Building Regulations requirements through equivalence to former Code for Sustainable

Homes Level 4 energy efficiency standards) has been added to the base build cost assumptions. Whilst, as reported, this reflects the DCLG information, experience shows that this that is not always sought or considered necessary to be explicitly reflected as an additional cost in scheme specific viability reviews. This is as to be expected over time with the settling-in of new standards. Nevertheless, the contingency approach as part of the overall assumptions set has been considered appropriate bearing in mind the need not to set CIL at the margins of viability.

- Profit levels

Similarly, whilst experience shows that typically a range of sub-20% GDV profit positions are currently being put forward and agreed at delivery stage viability reviews, the study assumption has been left at what might be regarded certainly a more comfortable rate in line with experience of the higher-end of the range of developers' initial targets. Again, this accords with the over-arching principles involved in considering and setting CIL charging rates.

- (c) *How effectively has the VS methodology adapted itself to 'real world' conditions in North Somerset? [For example, how effectively does it pick up on relevant local data on existing land values; likely sales prices based on a range of sites across the area; housing densities; and gross to net ratios?*

Yes, as is necessarily the case in all such assessments, the principles and judgements are applied with the local characteristics, market and available information kept in close view. This is demonstrated by the extent of local research undertaken both at the earlier study and 2016 update – as per Appendix III to the VS in each case, and as referred to in the reporting of the methodology (assumptions information – as set out within each report section 2 and Appendix I overview; with the research outlined at Appendix III).

*The varying densities reflect a range a scheme types, looking at the developable areas that create the value and ranging from those containing all houses at 30 dph to mixed schemes including flats at 50 dph. These are considered reasonable assumptions, with the results for the all-flatted scenarios reviewed in the context of densities at 75 to 150 dph again depending on scale and context (in the case of these higher densities, related for example to Weston town centre regeneration related development). The Council notes that in the case of lower density development (i.e. where the "land take" would be greater to achieve the same dwelling numbers) the results are strong enough to support this at the CIL levels proposed in many cases, where it can be seen that greenfield land values aligned to typically lower Viability Tests 2 to 3 (indicative range £250,000 – 500,000/ha) would be exceeded with densities taken very much lower. For example, a halving of the RLV £/ha figures in the more rural and other greenfield scenarios would still indicate potential or often very clear viability. Review of the range of results in this way, including consideration of such factors, also further illustrates, why it has been considered necessary to advance the differential charging rates proposals, including the increased higher rate scope (from £60 to £80/sq. m) whilst maintaining the nil and lower rates.*

- (d) *Is the **sampling**, both in its size and range, sufficient to ensure a robust VS? Does the VS reflect the advice of the PPG (ID 25-019-20140612) to sample an appropriate range of sites reflecting a selection of the different types of site included in the Local Plan?*

The PPG at Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 25-019-20140612 says: (Extract) 'The outcome of the sampling exercise should be to provide a robust evidence base about the potential effects of the rates proposed, balanced against the need to avoid excessive detail'. The Council is of the view that the approach taken to the assessment is consistent with expectations and appropriate in this respect. The current stage prospective CIL Charging Schedule will primarily respond to and support a range of smaller developments coming forward in North Somerset under the adopted development strategy to which this is aligned. Whilst it is acknowledged, as considered elsewhere,

that the consideration of a local CIL may well differ in some respects in the context of any future strategic scale development identified through the Local Plan review process, those particular considerations have not needed to be included in the Council's current proposals to the extent of specific review treatment and targeted zoning.

(e) *How realistic is the **sensitivity testing** in the VS, for example in relation to alternative AH targets and tenure splits, and higher and lower sales values and build costs?*

The additional sensitivity testing on affordable housing targets and tenure splits (i.e. tests varying the policy targets on a trial basis only) was carried out to inform the development of a separate Weston Town Centre SPD and is included in the VS as contextual information only. It has not influenced the proposed CIL rates, the viability testing for which assumes the full policy compliance, i.e. 30% on-site provision for sites of 11 dwellings or more.

(f) *In the **changed economic circumstances** since the latest Viability Study was published in [July 2015], is there now a case for extending the categories of development which are subject to CIL in North Somerset, for example in employment areas, hotels, and leisure?*

(The Council notes that the date reference here should be to August 2016 – VS update report.)

No, following further review, it is considered there is no case at this point for extending the proposed scope of CIL Charging in North Somerset, in terms of the range of development uses to which positive charging rates should apply. Consistent with the methodology and outcomes explained in the (base) VS, the consultants have revisited the assumptions base. They found that there has not been enough positive movement in those figures (the strength of the development value to cost relationship) bearing in mind that build costs have increased and that any upward movement in investment values (as underpinned by the rental and yield % assumptions) has not been sufficient to move the outcomes into positive viability and particularly to the extent that would support clear, consistent CIL charging scope. A considerable positive swing in the assumptions and outcomes remains necessary before that becomes supportable through appropriately prepared CIL viability assessment work.

(g) *Is the **CIL zoning map** appropriate, or does it result in anomalies and a perception of unfairness?*

The differential CIL zoning, with mapping reflecting it, is supported by the viability evidence, although under the guidance within the PPG that does not have to be followed precisely. The picture was informed by the earlier VS and the boundaries, particularly in and around the most critical and sensitive areas of Weston, have been reassessed with reference to latest values research and reaffirmed based on the available information. Alternatives would always be possible, and it is acknowledged that the nature of CIL and the principles involved in setting a charging regime that is justified and not overly complex means that there are bound to be imperfections in mapping and seeking to represent varying characteristics on the ground. This will always be the case – a strategic approach is required, but that reflects the broad values, patterns and local characteristics influencing those. These principles have been followed here and after careful consideration the Council considers that an appropriate and fair approach has been arrived at.

(h) *Has an allowance been made for a '**viability buffer**' within the modelling? Should this be applied across all typologies, and what should it be?*

The established methodology used in the assessment, as supported through the Examination process, is to avoid the putting forward of CIL charging rates at the margins of viability through the use of appropriately set, prudent assumptions. The approach then continues through to the review

of results where it can be seen that although a gradually increasing CIL charging rate has a small incremental impact on viability, the proposal for North Somerset has been kept well away from maximum levels and particularly as the values increase and viability scenarios generally improve moving away from Weston town centre - where the outcomes illustrate inherent likely viability issues before considering CIL charging (hence the Council's subsequent further consideration of particular strategies for the town centre, including on affordable housing).

Buffering is therefore built into the whole approach, since the Council's consultants Dixon Searle have significant reservations about what may be learnt from deriving maximum theoretical CIL charging rates and then applying an essentially arbitrary discount ("buffer") factor to that. The approach appears unreliable, and removed from the idea of considering the range within which realistic assumptions apply and results are seen. Maximum charging rates can considerably overstate the realistic CIL scope, leading to adjusted (buffered) figures that may still be unrealistic. A flat rate of adjustment may also be used, which could be inappropriate.

However, from the range of results generated, and as discussed in relation to land value, it can be seen that if for example a minimum possible view on land value were taken, then the rates except for the proposed nil rate charge zone could be set higher or considerably higher than proposed levels, even following a buffer adjustment route. Using the consultant's experience of CIL viability assessments applied to the North Somerset characteristics, it was not considered necessary or appropriate to trial CIL charging rates at levels beyond £120/sq. m (residential) and £140/sq. m (commercial). These certainly do not represent maximum theoretical CIL charging rates but nevertheless at rates of £40 to £80/sq. m the proposals are at 33 to 66% of the maximum levels tested for residential. For commercial, viewed in an equivalent way, the Draft Charging Schedule rates place the CIL at 0 to 85% of the maximum rate considered appropriate to test.

As will be seen below In response to question ii(j), there are also a range of other factors that are likely to come into play and have a positive influence on overall scheme viability that have not been factored in and relied upon in informing and supporting the proposed levels of CIL charging. These are relevant when considering a buffered type approach – likely viability cushioning.

*(i) Should an allowance be made for **abnormal costs**?*

No – the assessment appropriately assumes the usual costs of development. It is considered that there are no sufficiently regularly occurring site constraints in the area so as to warrant the inclusion of "standard abnormal" that could be expected to impact across a wide range of sites. Instead, as is more often the case, any abnormal issues are likely to be highly variable on a site-specific basis. It is considered inappropriate to pull-down all results on a notional basis, particularly in these circumstances. The avoidance of CIL rates at the margins of viability should help ensure workable collective costs overall, along with well-established practice of operating planning policies (for example on affordable housing context and tenure, or in other respects on s.106) with flexibility in response to demonstrated and verified viability pressures at a scheme specific (pre-application or planning application level).

*(j) Are there any other relevant viability considerations?*

Yes. A viability assessment of this nature appropriately relies on forming an overview, based on a prudent approach to the range of market norm type assumptions, and the judgements made on results review.

A continued rising market and / or a period of reduced rises in build costs compared with those seen in the recent period strengthens the relationship between the development values and costs. Appropriately, there is no projection made on this. A guide to the trial CIL rates as a %GDV was

provided at section 3.10 (Figures 13 and 14) of the earlier, base, viability assessment and more overview guidance will be provided on this in response to Issue 5 (v) below.

The potential downside influences on viability tend to be in focus, and appropriately so given the fixed non-negotiable nature of CIL charging. However, there are a range of positive influences on viability that will potentially impact across a wide range of schemes, but which have not been factored in and therefore have not been relied upon in developing the North Somerset proposals.

Examples of these include:

- Netting-off within the CIL payment calculations to reflect existing space that may either be re-used or redeveloped – no allowance made (assumed all space as chargeable added new-build);
- Reintroduction from May 2016 of the Vacant Building Credit that will in numerous cases result in an effective lowering of the affordable housing policy target to be applied to developments – no allowance made (full affordable housing policy compliance assumed for CIL rates setting);
- National level changes to the understanding of what constitutes affordable housing. At the point of updating the evidence and in the run up to examination, the Government Housing White Paper is expected. Whilst the viability update information provided some initial indications, the potential viability uplift seen from the introduction of Starter Homes in place of some affordable housing as currently understood could be significant in a positive sense. However, this has not been carried into the Council's consideration of its CIL charging proposals at this stage. In the meantime, the longstanding approach to affordable tenure has been assumed, with it being important to note that in North Somerset's case the policy target approach seeks a high level - 82% -rented affordable accommodation from the proportion provided; reflected in the viability assessment. The Council's full current affordable housing objectives, including on tenure, have been factored-in.

### (iii) Conclusion

*Is the draft charging schedule supported by detailed evidence of community infrastructure needs? Is the evidence which has been used to inform the charging schedule robust, proportionate and appropriate?*

Yes, for the reasons set out above.

\*\*\*

### Issue 2: Is the residential charging rate informed by and consistent with the evidence?

- (i) *Is the **rate for residential development** (£0 psm within Weston town centre and gateway; £40 psm in outer Weston; and £80 in the rest of the District) reasonable and realistic in relation to achieving an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential impacts on economic viability? Should the rate for the rest of the District be based on a density of 30 dph rather than a range of 30-50 dph as some respondents suggest?*

Informed by both the earlier viability assessment and recent update, the Council is satisfied that the proposals strike the appropriate balance required, taking account of the viability work and reflecting the varied local circumstances.

In respect of the nil (£0/sq. m) rate for Weston town centre and gateway, the inherent viability issues have been acknowledged and local experience borne out through the viability assessment research and findings. Essentially the selected rate here goes as far as possible within the remit of the CIL principles to responding to the typical nature of scenarios, with the balance needing to be set in favour of respecting viability as far as possible through this route – in order not to add to the collective costs of development that will very often struggle to be met through the available development values. Of course this, as with all other aspects currently under Examination, will be monitored and reviewed in future.

The £40/sq. m and £80/sq. m proposed charging rates are considered to both reflect the available information and an appropriate balance between infrastructure provision and viability i.e. deliverability.

In the case of the £40/sq. m rate this is considered likely to have a relatively minimal effect on viability overall on a range of scenarios where the strength of the relationship between development values and costs is not often likely to be amongst the strongest available in the district and yet which are not considered sufficiently poor as to warrant a lower of £0/sq. m zoning as per Weston town centre. Development here is considered likely to continue to be sufficiently viable to support the CIL element of the overall planning obligations liabilities and so contribute in this way to infrastructure provision without seeing viability unduly prejudiced. As noted in response to ii (i) above, there are also the usual checks and balances available to the Council and planning applicants in terms of negotiation of the wider obligations package where necessary.

As the results show, the £80/sq. m rate could have been set higher whilst remaining consistent with the evidence, but on balance the Council has considered it best to remain mindful of the possibility that some instances of higher land value or other pressures on viability may inherently flow from the nature of some higher value schemes – a prudent approach is again relevant, including recognition of the buffering type principles. In looking at its proposal in the wider context, the Council has also been aware of adjoining Charging Authorities CIL rates. Whilst the key considerations are the local characteristics within North Somerset, where practical the avoidance or limiting of a “cliff-edge” type effect in charging rates across boundaries, and particularly where similarities where noted, has also been looked at in high level terms.

(ii) *In the light of the representations from the specialist housing sector, should **specialist housing for older people** be subject to the same charging levy as the rest of class C3 residential?*

Yes. The Council considers that there are many forms of development within the wide spectrum of market housing (C3), and that in fact it would be inequitable to support a reduced or other differential rate for this particular form of C3, with reference to sheltered / retirement / age restricted housing. This is generally no less viable per se than general market (non-age-restricted housing) and the CIL charges should be consistent accordingly. This issue has been considered at each stage of the CIL-setting process, most recently as set out in paragraph 3.3(i) of the report to NSC Executive dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016 (examination submission [D3](#)). The viability assessment and its findings are consistent with that conducted by the Council's consultants and supported at Examination in other instances.

Respondents to the DCS consultation raised several issues:

### Policy

Respondents argued that NSC needs to plan for an ageing population and in line with national guidance must plan for the housing needs of older people.

NSC agrees with this point. It is addressed in the North Somerset Core Strategy, for example through policy CS15 ('Mixed and Balanced Communities').

In relation to CIL, paragraph 21 of National Planning Policy Guidance states that:

*“Differences in rates need to be justified by reference to the economic viability of development. Differential rates should not be used as a means to deliver policy objectives.”*

Our understanding from this is that a preferential rate for specialist housing could not be set on policy grounds (such as meeting the needs of an ageing population). In the Council's view, the setting of a differential rate would be inappropriate, a position again consistent with the viability consultants' prior CIL Examination experience.

### Viability

Comments submitted to the Council on the viability of specialist housing schemes for older people included:

- These types of schemes have higher build costs including shared space and extra fittings such as accessibility features.
- Most such schemes are built in the form of apartment blocks, which has a negative impact on cashflow.
- Providers of specialist housing as a form of affordable housing increasingly need to cross-subsidise the affordable elements through the inclusion of market units, due to changes in national funding regimes.

These points were made in relation to both the C2 care home charge of £40/sqm as well as to the standard residential rates applied to C3 specialist housing.

Specialist housing within the C3 use class is proposed to be subject to the same rates as any other C3 housing. Advice from our viability consultants, the Dixon Searle Partnership (DSP) is as follows:

*“DSP's consistent assessment findings, are that housing-led development (including sheltered / retirement housing for independent living) should not be differentiated for in comparison with the approach to C3 in general. This forms part of the wide spectrum of market housing provision, within which there is inevitably great variety. These may or may not include an element of accommodation available for or supporting “assisted living” or similar, but in our view should in any event be CIL charged at the standard residential rate where they are commercial developments offering apartments or similar for market sale as the primary driver. In those cases the apartments would very often command premium level values as new-builds and they form part of the wide-ranging provision within the spectrum of market housing.”*

It is clear that there are balancing factors in respect of the typically higher build costs and other assumptions that are acknowledged as relevant assumptions weighing on viability, as above. The premium values as new-builds, the densities typically achieved and the usually reduced extend of external works are examples of the balancing factors usually relevant in such scenarios.

On this basis, the proposed charges are appropriate - i.e. for consistent application across C3 development.

The viability of C2 residential accommodation is considered in paragraph 3.8 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule viability report from October 2012 (examination document [A7](#)) and in paragraphs 3.2.11 – 3.2.14 of the Draft Charging Schedule viability update in August 2016

(examination document [C5](#)). These point to a lack of clear evidence on the viability or otherwise of C2 schemes.

In the absence of definitive information, NSC has proposed a 'mid-range' charge of £40/sqm for C2 accommodation as a balanced and appropriate way forward. The Council considers that at this level the charges will be unlikely to unduly impact viability overall and threaten the deliverability of any new build schemes that come forward and are therefore considered sufficiently viable to progress. The Council also notes that some schemes of this nature may use or part-use existing premises, thereby reducing the CIL liability as has been noted in response to ii (j) above.

C2 and C3 housing for older people provided in the form of affordable housing will be exempt from charges, by virtue of the rules generally applicable to affordable housing (of all types).

We agree with the observation that an increasing number of providers (including those in partnership with NSC) are providing market units alongside affordable units to provide a form of cross-subsidy. NSC supports this approach where appropriate, but such cross-subsidy is in effect universal across mixed-tenure sites. To create a differential approach for one particular type of market housing would be unjustified and likely to be in breach of State Aid regulations.

(iii) *Are the viability implications for **strategic sites/urban extensions** (say, 500 dwellings and above) different to those of smaller sites? The Council states that it is probable that further strategic sites will come forward (presumably within the life of the CIL) and several respondents consider that this should be anticipated in the CIL, principally on the grounds that the application of a positive rate of CIL has the potential to cause significant site delivery issues. Based on these considerations, should the CIL set out a clear approach to future strategic sites?*

The issue of strategic sites has been considered at all stages of the CIL-setting process, most recently as set out in paragraph 3.3(ii) of the report to NSC Executive dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016 (examination submission [D3](#)). Scenario-testing of sites of 500+ dwellings was included in DSP's viability report 2012 (examination document [A7](#)).

NSC recognises that S106-based development contributions can potentially be advantageous for strategic sites in assuring timely delivery of infrastructure and enabling delivery through developer delivery-in-kind. This is balanced by the disadvantages of the pooling restrictions on S106 obligations and that by removing CIL from large-scale sites, those sites would not be contributing towards important strategic-scale mitigations listed on the Regulation 123 List (for example, off-site transport projects deemed strategic). The pooling regulations are of particular concern to NSC, given recent experience at the Weston Villages, where initial expectations of delivery through five applications – and calculation of flood, transport and secondary education contributions accordingly – have been undermined through additional developer applications to change their proposals and/or expand the development area.

Our position on strategic sites has been informed by consideration of the sites expected to come forward through our current Core Strategy and Sites and Policies DPD.

A schedule of sites of more than 10 dwellings from our Site and Policies, Part 2, Site Allocations Plan DPD, Publication Version, October 2016 is copied for reference as Appendix C to this submission (full document available on our website at: <http://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/site-allocations-plan-publication-version.pdf>). This shows that delivery of our Core Strategy and the DPD is reliant on the following sites of more than 500 dwellings:

Site	Dwellings	Status/comments
Winterstoke Village	Total	Single ownership (Persimmon).

Site	Dwellings	Status/comments
(former Weston Airfield)	capacity 2,550	900 dwellings consented and under construction (application ref. 10/P/0756/OT2). Around 600 already occupied.  Application for additional 1,650 dwellings approved subject to S106 and expected to be consented prior to CIL implementation (ref. 12/P/1510/OT2).
Parklands Village (former RAF Locking site)	Total capacity 3,950	Multiple ownerships (NSC, Mead Realisations, HCA, St. Modwen).  Initial 250 dwellings constructed and fully occupied (applications 09/P/1614/F and 12/P/0760/F).  Consent in place for two further sites totalling 2,350 dwellings (applications 12/P/1266/OT2 and 13/P/0997/OT2 – first occupations for 12/P/1266/OT2 have taken place).  Applications registered for a further 1,261 dwellings (16/P/1881/OT2; 16/P/2744/OT2; 16/P/2758/RG4) – these were registered in 2016 and are expected to be determined prior to the implementation of CIL.  This leaves a residual 89 dwellings with no application imminent. For this relatively small number, a contribution through CIL is likely to be more appropriate than S106.
South of Herluin Way, Avoncrest site	750	No current application or consent, but located within the zone proposed to be subject to a nil rate of CIL. Owned by NSC and leased by the HCA.

None of these sites is likely to be subject to the CIL and as such we do not feel a differential CIL rate is required.

In terms of future sites, NSC is working on a West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP), details of which can be viewed at: <https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti>

The JSP Emerging Spatial Strategy consulted upon in November 2016 can be viewed at: [https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/gf2.ti/-/756738/23366789.1/PDF/-/West\\_of\\_England\\_Joint\\_Spatial\\_Plan\\_Towards\\_the\\_Emerging\\_Spatial\\_Strategy.pdf](https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/gf2.ti/-/756738/23366789.1/PDF/-/West_of_England_Joint_Spatial_Plan_Towards_the_Emerging_Spatial_Strategy.pdf).

The JSP is at an early stage of the plan making process (Reg.18) and includes three 'Strategic Development Locations' (SDLs) in North Somerset; Weston-super-Mare (1,000 dwellings); Nailsea/Backwell (up to 3,600 dwellings); and the M5 to A38 transport corridor (up to 5,400 dwellings). These SDLs are similar to 'areas of search', with no specific sites identified. The details of how these sites are likely to be delivered is not yet known, for example whether the locations/dwellings will come forward as a small number of large sites or as a large number of smaller sites. Consequently NSC is not able to determine whether an approach weighted towards CIL contributions, or one that favours S106 obligations, is more suitable. As the position becomes clearer, we will keep this issue under review and propose changes to CIL rates if appropriate.

Our proposals are based on enabling delivery of the sites within the adopted Core Strategy and Publication version Site Allocations Plan (which is about to be submitted for examination). We recognise that there may be developers proposing developments outside of these allocations

and/or the JSP proposals, but it is not our role to set rates for speculative developments that may or may not be deemed acceptable at a later stage.

- (iv) *What is the justification for reducing the percentage of **affordable housing** (AH) on sites of from 30%, which is policy compliant, to 20%? In view of the broadening of the definition of AH, is there a case for updating the VS to consider its impact?*

It is not proposed to reduce the percentage of affordable housing. The proposed rates are based on full policy compliance of 30% on-site provision for sites of 11 dwellings or more.

The additional sensitivity testing on affordable housing targets and tenures was carried out to inform the development of a separate Weston Town Centre SPD and is included in the reports as contextual information only.

### **Issue 3: Levy rates for other uses**

- (i) *Are the **rates for the other uses** listed in the schedule reasonable and realistic in relation to an appropriate balance between helping to fund new infrastructure and the potential impacts on economic viability?*

Yes. Consistent with the approach taken to Weston town centre residential development also placed at £0/sq. m, the results and sensitivity tests generated for the viability assessment evidence this. They show poor or at best marginal viability potential using the prudent approach to trial CIL rates testing and then considering the prospects for workable (i.e. realisable) assumptions adjustments that would be sufficiently positive to swing the outcomes far enough to support positive CIL charging. Further review of the market and the assumptions relevant to these parts of the assessment, the consultants are of the view overall that the viability of such scenarios has not improved notably. Consistent with the consultants' wider experience, the viability findings remain such that the striking of an appropriate balance for delivery determines the proposed £0/sq. rates for all other uses, as specified.

As noted above, consistent with the general principles and approach described, the Council also expects to watch the local market and to revisit this in future.

- (ii) *Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that a **zero charge is appropriate in relation to all uses other than housing, retail, student accommodation and care homes**? (Many CILs cover uses such as offices, research and development and light industry (Use Classes B1a, b and c); general industry (Use Class B2); storage and distribution education (Use Class B8); hotels and guest houses (Use Class C1). For example, is the Council confident that all the necessary increased water supply and waste water treatment capacity can be secured through S106 Agreements or other means?*

The other uses detailed above were considered as part of our initial viability testing in 2012 and as part of the updated testing in 2016. None of the uses were found to be sufficiently viable as to withstand CIL charges. Again, this is a finding that is consistent with those from most other similar assessments, and is considered to reflect the local circumstances. The viability assessment work notes the consideration that has been given to the likely strength of viability – through either full appraisals or review of the relationship between development values and costs. Again, it is considered that this picture has not changed – the proposals reflect an appropriate balance.

Commentary can be found as follows:

2012 report (examination document [A7](#)):

- Commercial (B-class) uses: section 3.5, pages 62 – 62.
- Hotels: section 3.6, p62.

- Other uses including community uses: section 3.9, pages 64 – 67.

2016 update (examination document [C5](#)):

- Commentary, p31 – 32.

In terms of major cost incurring infrastructure, such as water supply and waste water treatment, the cost assumptions made for the VS review work assumed inclusion of regular service replies. Clearly there could be instances where such provision amounts to abnormal costs to be borne by development, which could be highly variable as a potential viability influence but nevertheless can be responded to in the same way as appropriate to any other abnormal costs – as above; as knowledge of site-specific issues is developed in bringing forward proposals in the usual way.

(iii) *In relation to **retail development**, is there sufficient evidence to justify a differential rate between large scale retail development (£120 per square metre for more than 280 sm net sales area) and small scale retail development (£ 60 psm for less than 280 sm net sales area), based on reasonable assumptions about development values and likely costs?*

Yes, as is set out from section 3.3. and particularly at detailed section 3.4 of the base viability assessment report; the findings of which remain relevant and consistent with up to date experience of these matters. It is not considered necessary to reiterate this here.

(iv) *In relation to purpose-built **student accommodation**/halls of residence, is there sufficient evidence to justify a rate of £40 psm, based on reasonable assumptions about development values and likely costs?*

Yes. Whilst the relevance of this form of development to overall plan delivery may be debated the base viability assessment considered this as reported at section its 3.7 and carried through to recommendation 3.11 E. Again, whilst a higher rate might have been considered, on balance the Council's approach to align this to its mid-range CIL charging rate proposal for residential development is considered appropriate on balance. The viability finding that this use is capable of supporting CIL charging is again consistent with the consultants' wider experience of considering and appraising development of this type; and this remains the case. There is a strong investment market for it. Usually this form of development does not attract affordable housing requirements.

(v) *In relation to **care homes (C2)** (residential accommodation and care to people in need of care), is there sufficient evidence to justify a rate of £40 psm, based on reasonable assumptions about development values and likely costs?*

The viability of C2 residential accommodation is considered in paragraph 3.8 of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule viability report from October 2012 (examination document [A7](#)) and in paragraphs 3.2.11 – 3.2.14 of the Draft Charging Schedule viability update in August 2016 (examination document [C5](#)). These point to a lack of clear evidence on the viability or otherwise of C2 schemes.

In the absence of definitive information, NSC believes that a 'mid-range' charge of £40/sqm for C2 accommodation provides a balanced and appropriate way forward.

Please see also our answer to Issue 2, question (ii) above.

**Issue 4: Does the evidence demonstrate that the proposed charge rate would not put the overall development of the area at serious risk?**

(i) *Has the **appropriate balance** been struck in the following key areas:*

- (a) An appropriate balance between **maximising revenue** to invest in infrastructure as against the need to minimise the impact of **development viability**, including in relation to cumulative impacts; and
- (b) An appropriate balance between prioritising **infrastructure funding** and **affordable housing** provision?

Yes. Whilst it would be advantageous to increase rates further to support infrastructure delivery, we recognise that this would potentially place undue additional delivery risk on affordable housing and the wider Core Strategy promoted development for local growth. The rates selected are informed by the viability advice from DSP.

- (ii) **Development at risk:** Is it the case that only if development sales values are at the lowest end of the predicted spectrum would the development in some parts of the District be at risk?

Yes, but whilst this is reflected in the nil and to some extent £40/sq. m rate proposals for Weston, as has been noted the acknowledged likely viability pressures are inherent in the locations and nature of limited development finances that will be available in many of those instances. So the issues are before CIL is considered and hence the maximum that can be done in CIL viability terms i.e. nil-rating; together with subsequent consideration of additional planning guidance for Weston town centre, as was noted above. In considering the balance, the issues have been respected as far as is possible in CIL viability terms.

#### **Issue 5: Other matters**

- (i) Should there be a commitment to a review of the CIL and a suggested timescale?

The review of CIL rates would be appropriate through the Local Plan review. This will make detailed provision for the delivery of the additional growth to 2036 identified through the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (adoption anticipated late 2018). CIL review is likely to take place in 2019 following clarification of the new district housing requirement, spatial strategy and likely form, location and phasing of future development.

- (ii) Should the Council specify what criteria would be used to determine whether **exceptional circumstances** are appropriate?

NSC has considered whether or not to put in place an exceptional circumstances policy, but has decided not to implement a policy at the current time. Key reasons are the potential loss of infrastructure funding and the additional administrative work of operating the policy. The benefits are viewed as relatively limited given the regulations surrounding its operation.

The impacts of this approach will be monitored and can be formally reviewed and amended if required as part of the wider CIL review referred to in (i) above. The decision and any criteria for a future policy (if appropriate) can then be informed by any problems that have been experienced during CIL operation.

- (iii) Should the Council formulate a policy covering **instalment rates**, and if so, what criteria should be included?

NSC has considered whether or not to put in place an instalments policy, but has decided not to implement a policy at the current time. The key reason is the need to secure infrastructure funding at an early stage to assist development delivery and avoid negative impacts on local communities.

We do not feel that an instalment policy is necessary to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy at the current time. However the impacts of this approach will be monitored and can be formally reviewed and amended if required as part of the wider CIL review referred to in (i) above, or introduced sooner if it was demonstrated they were required.

(iv) *Is the proportion of CIL expenditure **allocated to the Parish Councils** at the appropriate level, bearing in mind the corporate and spatial priorities of the Council?*

The proportion allocated is in line with national guidance and in our view is appropriate.

(v) *In terms of the overall costs of the scheme, broadly what would be the **impact of CIL** in percentage terms for the various land uses?*

This needs to be considered in terms of cost and value.

The proportion of development cost may provide a less clear guide as to the comparative scale of the proposed CIL charges. This is because 'development cost' may have a different scope according to a particular viewer's understanding or approach (there may be uncertainty as to what costs are included within the view of 'development costs' – e.g. land, profit, finance; as well as build costs & fees etc. We will come back to this below, but DSP therefore provides indications based on the CIL trial rates expressed as a percentage (%) of GDV – as were set out at 3.10 (Figures 13 and 14) of the base assessment report. There we could see that in the main the selected charge rates were equivalent to around 2 to 4% GDV across the range of uses in most cases. An updated overview is provided below (with reference to the values overview at the update viability report 2016 – Appendix I).

	VL1	VL2	VL3	VL4	VL5	VL6
	Inner WSM	Outer WSM / Lower value villages	Nailsea / Portishead / Clevedon / Villages		Higher value villages	
GDV overview £/sq. m	£2,023	£2,380	£2,737	£3,094	£3,451	£3,808
CIL rate £/sq. m	£0	£40	£80	£80	£80	£80
% GDV	0	1.68	2.92	2.59	2.32	2.10

Consistent with the earlier reporting, this is acknowledged as only another indicator. It is not part of the viability testing but nevertheless may serve as a secondary pointer towards appropriate CIL charging rates, bearing in mind that these remain within the earlier indicators and at well below say 5% GDV are considered well within the realms of suitable rates.

Looking at percentage of cost related to residential (with reference to the appraisal example with base study report Appendix IIa) we see a total area of 983 sq. m for that 10 dwellings scenario. The total development costs there are the total of the build only related costs, at £1.285m. This would not vary by sales value level (VL) or therefore be significantly different for the various CIL charging zones. At £0/sq. this represents 0% of this cost. AT £40/sq. m the proposed CIL rate amounts to say 3% and at £80/sq. m approximately 6% of this cost measure. However, if we then also consider land, acquisition and finance as development costs (taking the total cost to approximately £1.856m (equivalent to say £1,888/sq. m) these percentage of cost indications reduce to 0%, 2.1% and 4.2% respectively. Adding in the profit as a cost reduces these indications further to approximately 0%, 1.7% and 3.4% respectively.

As stated, these are example indications.

The equivalent picture in relation to commercial developments that are proposed subject to CIL charging (retail uses) is unchanged – again as broad indications – from the guides set out at Figure 14 of the earlier viability assessment report.

Looking at percentage of cost, the following indications may be useful (based on the collective assumptions for build costs, BREEAM enhancements, external works, build contingency, fees and planning, land and acquisition, finance, letting and marketing) we can see from the appraisal summary example included in the base assessment Appendix IIb a total cost of £9.45m (round figures) for the 4,000 sq. m 'large retail' unit (convenience – supermarket) viewed before the cost of development profit. As an indication, this equates to a cost overall of approximately £2,363/sq. m. Compared with this, the proposed £120/sq. m CIL charging rate represents 5.08%. On a similar basis, we can expect a broadly similar indication from a calculation on the small retail unit scenario – with significantly lower build costs and a CIL charging rate at £60/sq. m. With build costs having increased and other assumptions influencing this indication as they were, we could expect to see the proposed CIL charging rates now representing a reduced proportion of overall cost if anything.

As a further indication, if we add profit as a cost within the above measures, this will reduce the view of the CIL rate expressed as a proportion of development cost. For example, with approximately £2.55m profit allowed for in the 4,000sq. m retail appraisal as noted above, the overall cost view expands to around £12m, equivalent to £3,000/sq. m, of which the £120/sq. m proposed charging rate represents 4.0%.

*(vi) Are the monitoring arrangements appropriate?*

NSC is currently agreeing its governance arrangements for CIL, including operation, expenditure and monitoring of impacts. This will link into existing governance of financial processes and development monitoring.

The requirement to provide an annual report on CIL income and expenditure is viewed by NSC as a minimum and we intend that monitoring is carried out on at least a quarterly basis.

A more extensive review of CIL rates, policies and impacts is proposed to be carried out in the context of the new Local Plan 2018-2036, which will be prepared in parallel with the West of England Joint Spatial Plan, but finalised following JSP adoption.

**CONSULTATION VERSION: DRAFT REGULATION 123 LIST**

*Note: inclusion in this list does not entail that a given project will receive CIL or S106, only that it may do so if sufficient resources are available and the project is prioritised to receive funds.*

<b>Community Infrastructure Levy</b>	<b>S106 planning obligations</b>
Community capacity funding and youth services	Affordable housing ( <i>national regulations state that this cannot be funded through CIL</i> )
Strategic broadband schemes	
Pre-school and primary school provision, except in Strategic Development Areas	Pre-school and primary school provision in Strategic Development Areas
Secondary school and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) provision	On-site community, leisure and sports provision, e.g. playparks, sports pitches and MUGAs
Off-site community, leisure and sports provision	Employment-led direct delivery
Economic development and employment-led financial contributions	On-site / near-site SuDS and scheme specific flood mitigation
Emergency services provision	Strategic flood schemes linked to Strategic Development Areas
Strategic flood and drainage schemes, where not associated with a Strategic Development Area	On-site green infrastructure
Off-site green infrastructure and public realm	On-site access and highway provision
Public Rights Of Way improvements	Near site highways mitigations identified through Transport Assessments
Health services	On-site and near-site sustainable transport access (bus stops, foot & cycleways)
Libraries and information services	Travel Plan measures
Bus and other public transport services	Fees associated with planning obligations
Sustainable Transport Fund / sustainable transport initiatives	Committed sums for maintenance
Strategic transport schemes – including rail and cycle/pedestrian routes.	
Waste management	

Strategic Development Areas (SDAs) are proposed to be defined as a development or series of developments in close proximity to each other where the total number of new dwellings will exceed 500 or where otherwise the Council feels that the development has an exceptional impact on the local area. At the present time two areas are proposed to be identified as SDAs: (i) the Weston Villages as defined in the Weston Villages SPD; (ii) Weston-super-Mare Town Centre as defined by the Weston Town Centre zero CIL rate charging zone.

**SUBMISSION VERSION: COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) DRAFT REGULATION 123 LIST**

*Note: inclusion in this list does not entail that a given project will receive funding, only that it may do so if sufficient resources are available, it is compliant with regulations and the project is prioritised to receive funds.*

<b>Regulation 123 List: Community Infrastructure Levy</b>	<b>Exceptions (to be delivered through planning obligations)</b>
<p><u>Community and leisure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community capacity funding, community development and youth services.</li> <li>• Leisure Centres, swimming pools and fitness gyms.</li> <li>• Libraries and information services.</li> <li>• Off-site play areas, MUGAs and skate parks.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Community and leisure</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site play areas, MUGAs and skate parks.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early years’ provision and children’s centre services except at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Primary school provision, except at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Secondary school provision, except at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) provision.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early years’ provision at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Primary school provision at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Secondary school provision at the Weston Villages.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Green Infrastructure &amp; Public Realm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal parks and public gardens.</li> <li>• Community parks, except at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Off-site woodlands and woodland areas.</li> <li>• Off-site conservation sites and biodiversity improvements.</li> <li>• Public realm improvements, including heritage-related schemes and parking schemes, except where part of a development site.</li> <li>• Off-site allotments.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Green Infrastructure &amp; Public Realm</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site general green infrastructure and landscaping.</li> <li>• Community parks at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Open Spaces.</li> <li>• Green corridors at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• On-site conservation sites and biodiversity improvements.</li> <li>• On-site allotments.</li> <li>• Public realm works that are part of a development site, including heritage-related schemes and parking schemes.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Flood &amp; drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic flood and drainage schemes, except at the Weston Villages.</li> <li>• Coastal and seafront defences.</li> <li>• Moors and lowland flood defence schemes.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Flood &amp; drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weston Villages Strategic Flood Solution.</li> <li>• On-site/near-site Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and scheme-specific flood mitigation.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Transport &amp; travel</u></p> <p>Strategic transport schemes, including:</p>	<p><u>Transport</u></p>

<b>Regulation 123 List: Community Infrastructure Levy</b>	<b>Exceptions (to be delivered through planning obligations)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to junctions 19, 20 and 21 of the M5 and associated projects.</li> <li>• Rail improvements.</li> <li>• Showcase bus routes/Metrobus.</li> <li>• Improvements to routes to Bristol Airport.</li> <li>• Herluin Way/Locking Road Link.</li> <li>• Strategic Public Rights of Way and cycle, foot and bridleway routes, including the Strawberry Line, Festival Way, coastal routes and Pill to the Mendips route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site access and highways provision.</li> <li>• Near-site highways mitigations identified through Transport Assessments or Statements.</li> <li>• Measures identified in Travel Plans/Travel Statements, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Bus stops and services and other public transport provision (excluding rail).</li> <li>○ Measures to promote the use of sustainable transport by residents of the site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Road safety improvements required as a result of development.</li> <li>• Public Rights of Way, cycle, foot and bridleway routes that are provided on-site and/or to connect the site to local facilities.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic broadband schemes.</li> <li>• Economic development and employment-led financial contributions *.</li> <li>• Emergency services provision, other than fire hydrants.</li> <li>• Health services.</li> <li>• Strategic waste management schemes.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing.</li> <li>• On-site employment-led provision *.</li> <li>• Site-based broadband provision.</li> <li>• Fire hydrants.</li> <li>• Fees associated with planning obligations.</li> <li>• Commuted sums for infrastructure maintenance.</li> </ul>

Notes:

1) The “Weston Villages” are as defined in the Weston Villages SPD available at: <http://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Weston-villages-supplementary-planning-document.pdf>.

2) Guidance of on-site and off-site employment-led requirements and when they would apply is available at: <http://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/employment-led-delivery-supplementary-planning-document.pdf>

## SITES AND POLICIES, PART 2, SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN DPD

## Schedule to Policy SA 1

## Proposed large sites for residential development (over 10 dwellings)

Sites marked \* are the residential element of a mixed use scheme and are subject to Policy SA 3

Development on these sites will need to conform to the Core Strategy, Sites and Policies Plan Part 1: Development Management Policies, relevant Supplementary Planning Documents and Neighbourhood Development Plans

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
<b>WESTON-SUPER-MARE</b>				
Winterstoke Village (former Weston Airfield) *	Part full consent, part outline, part approved subject to legal agreement	10/P/0756/OT2 12/P/1510/OT2 13/P/0834/RM 14/P/2723/RM	2233	Major strategic mixed use allocation from Core Strategy. Further details in <a href="#">Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document</a>
Parklands Village (former RAF Locking site) *	Part full consent, part outline, part no consent	09/P/1614/F 12/P/0760/F 12/P/1266/OT2 13/P/0997/OT2	3700	Major strategic mixed use allocation from Core Strategy. Further details in <a href="#">Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document</a>
Land at Atlantic Road South	Full planning permission	14/P/1210/LDE	23	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Site H14
Land at Milton Hill	Full planning permission	08/P/0570/RM	12	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Site H15
Land adjacent to Plum Tree Farm, off Summer Lane	Full planning permission	08/P/0626/RM	8	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Site H27
Brimbleworth Farm St Georges	Full planning permission	11/P/2214/F	14	Current permission, new allocation
Ebdon Court, Trenleigh Drive	Full planning permission	14/P/0617/F	65	Current permission, new allocation
Scot Elm Drive	Outline planning consent	13/P/2409/O	72	Current permission, new allocation
Land at Wellsea	Full planning	14/P/0156/F	34	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
Grove	permission			
Royal Pier Hotel	Full planning permission subject to legal agreement	11/P/0006/F	63	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Site H65
Dorville Hotel	Full planning permission	12/P/2268/F	20	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Site H70
85-89 Bristol Road Lower	Full planning permission	12/P/1053/F	10	Current permission
Lynton House Hotel	No current consent		41	New allocation. Capacity based on past consent
The Bayside Hotel	Full planning permission	14/P/1791/F	15	Current permission
Westacres Caravan Park	No current consent		130	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – H20b A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Orchard House, Ebdon Road	No current consent		12	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – H29 A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Land to the rear of Locking Road	No current consent		24	New allocation A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Former Weston Library and adjacent BT building , Boulevard	No current consent		70	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conversion of Weston Library ( Listed building ) 20 units</li> <li>• Flat development on former BT building (50 units )</li> </ul> A Flood Risk Assessment, sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Lawrence Court, Lawrence	Full Planning Permission	15/P/1616/F	14	Current permission, new allocation

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
Road				
Former TJ Hughes Store, High St	No current consent		18	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail/ restaurants on ground floor</li> </ul>
Walliscote Place*	No current consent		70	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key Town Centre site</li> <li>Landmark high rise buildings may be appropriate</li> <li>Demolition of former Police Station building</li> <li>Conversion of Magistrate Courts ( listed building )</li> <li>Some commercial development on the footprint of Roselawn/Central Chambers buildings</li> </ul>
Dolphin Square*	No current consent		220	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase 4 of the redevelopment scheme</li> <li>Includes land/buildings fronting Sea Front</li> <li>Pedestrian link required between Carton St Car Park and Oxford St</li> <li>Development to have regard to and relate well to Phase 3 development ( leisure )</li> </ul>
Land to the west of Winterstoke Road*	No current consent		70	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of sports pitch needs to be addressed</li> <li>Layout to have regard to industrial units to the south and railway line to the west</li> <li>Access off Winterstoke Rd</li> <li>0.5 ha employment on northern boundary</li> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC (North Somerset and Mendip Bats Special Area of Conservation)</li> </ul> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application</p>
Land to the	No current		89	Carried over from North Somerset

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
north of the A370, Summer Lane	consent			<p>Replacement Local Plan – Sites H17 &amp; M2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application</p>
Bridge Farm, Bristol Road*	No current consent		73	<p>Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Sites H63 &amp; M4 Mixed use site to include 0.5 hectares employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone has been reassessed and site is in Flood Zone 3 – Flood Risk Assessment sequential and exception test required</li> <li>• Layout to have regard to proximity of railway line</li> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Birnbeck Pier*	No current consent		50	<p>New allocation for mixed use scheme. Residential, leisure, hotel and tourism, ancillary retail, cafés, bars and restaurants and community facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not include 63 dwellings on Royal Pier Hotel, Dorville or Lynton House Hotel</li> <li>• Prince Consort Gardens to be kept free from development</li> <li>• Madiera Car park has potential for development</li> </ul>
Gas Works, Winterstoke Road	No current consent		240	<p>New allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contamination study required</li> <li>• Access off A370</li> <li>• High quality design required on key approach to Town Centre</li> <li>• Landmark buildings facing Drove Road roundabout</li> <li>• Pedestrian access to Rectors Way footpath( to the south ), Newlands Road and</li> </ul>

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
				<p>Marchfield Way</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health and Safety Executive to be consulted</li> </ul> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application</p>
Nightingale Close, Mead Vale*	No current consent		40	<p>New allocation for mixed use scheme, redevelopment to include retail, restaurant/cafe uses, 40 residential units, community uses and car parking</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application</p>
South of Herluin Way, Avoncrest Site*	No current consent		750	<p>New allocation for mixed use scheme to include the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spine road with access off Aisecombe Way to the east and Winterstoke Rd to the south</li> <li>Site for Primary School</li> <li>Remediation work to eliminate risk of contamination</li> <li>Noise buffer alongside railway line</li> <li>Safeguarding of Airfield bridge link</li> <li>Open Space</li> <li>2.5 ha of Employment land on western part of site</li> </ul>
Former Bournville School Site, Sellworthy Road	No current consent		45	<p>New allocation</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Former Sweat FA Site, Winterstoke Road	No current consent		45	<p>New allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vehicular and pedestrian access off Bridge Rd</li> <li>Layout and design to have regard to working garage to the west</li> <li>Health and Safety Executive to be consulted</li> </ul>

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contaminated Land Assessment Required</li> </ul> A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Station Gateway *	No current consent		300	New allocation. Includes Sunnyside Road, Locking Road Car Park, Station Approach and part of Tesco car park. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Quality Design on key approach to Town Centre</li> <li>Design standards to be set out in Town Centre Regeneration Supplementary Planning Document</li> <li>Retention of public car parking levels through multi storey development</li> <li>Improved pedestrian links to and across railway station</li> <li>Area included in the “area of search “ for a new Primary School site</li> <li>Area suitable for office development</li> </ul> A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning applications
Land at Bridgwater Road	No current consent		70	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hedge/tree boundaries to be retained wherever possible</li> <li>Highway access to be delivered south of site onto Bleadon Hill Transport Assessment to assess safety aspects of increased vehicular and pedestrian movements at the A370 junction</li> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
<b>TOTAL FOR WESTON-SUPER-MARE</b>			<b>8640</b>	
<b>CLEVEDON</b>				
Royal Pier	Full planning	10/P/2083/F	17	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Site H68

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
	permission			
Clevedon Hall Estate	Full planning permission	12/P/1539/F 15/P/2135/F	42	Current permission
Highcliffe Hotel	Full planning permission	12/P/0430/F	14	Current permission
Marine Hill House, Marine Hill	Full planning permission	11/P/2183/F	9	Current permission
Moor Lane	No current consent		10	Carried over from North Somerset Replacement Local Plan – Site H87 A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Yeolands Farm	No current consent		15	New Allocation A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
North of Churchill Avenue	No current consent		44	New Allocation . . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of site to be given over to improved play/POS facilities.</li> <li>Access via Wordsworth Rd</li> </ul> A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Millcross site	No current consent		70	New Allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previously proposed as a new hospital site</li> <li>Site large enough to accommodate some health/care facilities</li> <li>Mix of 2-3 storey development appropriate</li> </ul> A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
<b>TOTAL FOR CLEVEDON</b>			<b>221</b>	
<b>NAILSEA</b>				
Sycamore House	Full planning	14/P/1844/F	30	Current permission

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
	permission			
Trendlewood Way	No current consent		30	New allocation. Was previously proposed as mixed development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of wooded area fronting Trendlewood Way required</li> <li>Land to be made available for local shop unit</li> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> <li>Coal Mining Risk Assessment Required</li> </ul>
Police Station	No current consent		40	New allocation
Land at West End	No current consent		20	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
West of Engine Lane	No current consent		195	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access off Engine Lane</li> <li>Strong hedge boundaries to be retained</li> <li>Footpath on western side of Engine Lane</li> <li>Full Transport Assessment required</li> <li>Replacement or improved sport facilities required</li> <li>Housing mix to meet local needs</li> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Land south of The Uplands	No current consent		50	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access off The Uplands ( to be widened )</li> <li>Requires retention of strong hedge boundaries especially on southern boundary</li> <li>Housing mix to meet local needs</li> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Land at North West Nailsea	No current consent		450	New allocation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity of 450 dwellings considered a maximum</li> <li>Spine Road running through</li> </ul>

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
				<p>site (from Pound Lane to Watery Lane) required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pylons to be removed</li> <li>• Undergrounding of 132kv line on northern boundary</li> <li>• Transport Assessment required</li> <li>• New Primary School to be included as part of development</li> <li>• Relocation or replacement of Fryth Way sports pitch</li> <li>• Where possible retention of Tree Preservation Order trees</li> <li>• Retention of strong hedge boundaries especially to the north</li> <li>• PROW links to Causeway View</li> <li>• Coal Mining Risk Assessment required</li> <li>• Housing mix to meet local needs</li> <li>• Protection of adjacent Tickenham, Nailsea and Kenn Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest</li> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
<b>TOTAL FOR NAILSEA</b>			<b>815</b>	
<b>PORTISHEAD</b>				
St Josephs RC School, West Hill, Portishead	Full planning permission	13/P/1809/F	11	Current permission
Elm Walk, Battens Orchard	Outline planning permission	14/P/2348/O	14	Current permission . Capacity updated to reflect new registered application
Severn Paper Mill	Full planning permission	14/P/1186/RM	117	Carried over from Replacement Local Plan – Site H65
South west of Severn Paper Mill	No current consent		70	New Allocation – previously allocated employment site A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
				application
Old Mill Road*	No current consent		20	<p>New allocation. Proposed as a mix of employment uses, retail, leisure, café's, bars and restaurants and 20 residential units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian/cycleway links to dockside development, adjacent supermarket and proposed rail station required</li> <li>• Existing businesses to be relocated or incorporated into redevelopment scheme</li> </ul> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application</p>
Land south of Downside	No current consent		23	<p>New Allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access through Downside</li> <li>• Requires retention of strong hedge boundaries and trees to the west</li> </ul>
Marine View, Harbour Road	Full planning permission	14/P/2570/F	118	Current consent for retirement complex
<b>TOTAL FOR PORTISHEAD</b>			<b>373</b>	
<b>SERVICE VILLAGES</b>				
The Chestnuts, south of Sidcot Lane, Winscombe	Outline planning permission	10/P/0592/O	24	Carried over from Replacement Local Plan – Site H41
Woodborough Farm, Winscombe	No current consent		175	<p>New allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main vehicular access onto Woodborough Rd</li> <li>• Secondary vehicular access to Church Rd</li> <li>• Footpath links to Strawberry line and other surrounding Public Rights of Way</li> <li>• Central Open space feature</li> <li>• Retention of mature trees/TPO's and hedge boundaries</li> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Land to the east and	No current consent		24	Carried over from Replacement Local Plan – Site H43

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
west of Wemberham Lane, Yatton				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul> A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
Oxford Plasma, Yatton	Full planning permission	14/P/2468/RM	51	Carried over from Replacement Local Plan – Site H86 Capacity updated to reflect current application
Arnolds Way, Yatton Phase 1	Full planning permission	15/P/1498/RM	150	Current permission. To include site for new Primary School
Yatton Station	No current consent		21	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved capacity of existing railway car park required as part of development proposal</li> </ul>
Moor Lane, Backwell	No current consent		65	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vehicular access through The Briars</li> <li>Landscaping/buffer strip/POS alongside railway boundary</li> <li>Requires retention of strong hedge boundary to Moor Lane and on western boundary</li> <li>Balancing pond required in NW corner</li> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> <li>Coal Mining Risk Assessment required</li> </ul>
Cobthorn Way, Congresbury	Outline planning consent subject to legal agreement	15/P/0519/O	38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access off Cobthorn Way</li> <li>Traffic Management/Calming/Pedestrian safety measures on Wrington Lane</li> <li>Open Space on southern boundary</li> <li>Existing hedgerows to be retained</li> <li>Removal of overhead pylons</li> <li>Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Venus Street, Congresbury	Full planning	16/P/0147/F	14	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vehicular access onto Venus</li> </ul>

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
	permission			Street
Pudding Pie Land (West), Churchill	No current consent		35	New allocation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access off Pudding Pie Lane</li> <li>• Retention of existing hedgerows required</li> <li>• Layout to address overlooking issues from neighbouring properties</li> <li>• Links to Public Right of Way on eastern boundary</li> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Pudding Pie Lane (East), Churchill	Outline planning consent subject to legal agreement	15/P/1414/O	141	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular Access off Stock Lane</li> <li>• Central open space</li> <li>• Retention of existing hedgerows required</li> <li>• Landscape buffer on Jubilee Lane boundary to the north</li> <li>• Cycleway/Pedestrian link onto Pudding Pie Lane and Stock Lane in north eastern corner of site</li> </ul>
Says Lane, Churchill	Outline planning consent subject to legal agreement	15/P/1313/O	43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian crossing across A38 required</li> <li>• Speed limit reduction on A38</li> <li>• Retention of existing hedgerows required</li> <li>• Central open space feature</li> <li>• Swales fronting A38</li> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Land at North End, Yatton	Outline planning consent subject to legal agreement	15/P/0946/O	170	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires retention of existing hedgerows / Tree Preservation Orders</li> <li>• Vehicular access off roundabout</li> <li>• Open Space required in north eastern corner of site</li> <li>• Contribution required to comprehensive Surface Water Strategy</li> <li>• Contribution required to road safety/ congestion solutions in the wider area</li> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation</li> </ul>

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
				zone for Bats SAC
Arnolds Way, (Phase 2) Yatton	Outline planning consent subject to legal agreement	15/P/1488/O	200	<p>New allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires retention of existing hedgerows</li> <li>• Continuation of pedestrian/cycleway links through consented housing site to the south</li> <li>• Footpath/Cycleway Links to Strawberry Line required</li> <li>• Access off roundabout through consented housing site to the south</li> <li>• Primary School reservation</li> <li>• Landscape buffer to existing development on eastern boundary</li> <li>• Contribution to comprehensive Surface Water Strategy</li> <li>• Contribution to road safety/ congestion solutions in the wider area</li> <li>• Consideration of fact that site is within 5km consultation zone for Bats SAC</li> </ul>
Land to the east of Wolvershill Road, Banwell	No current consent		44	<p>New allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bungalows on north east corner</li> <li>• Limited pedestrian access to bridleway to the north</li> <li>• Open space through centre of site following water main</li> </ul>
Moor Road, Yatton	No current consent		60	<p>New allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Layout to respect Grange Farm (Listed Building)</li> <li>• No development in the orchard apart from access road</li> <li>• Landscape Buffer alongside Stowey Rhyne</li> <li>• Contribution to comprehensive Surface Water Strategy</li> <li>• Contribution to road safety/ congestion solutions in the wider area</li> <li>• Replacement/relocation of rugby playing pitches</li> <li>• Site is within 5km</li> </ul>

Schedule 1 Site Location	Status at April 2016	Relevant planning permission ref	Capacity remaining (at April 2016)	Site specific details//notes
				consultation zone for Bats SAC
<b>TOTAL FOR SERVICE VILLAGES</b>			<b>1,255</b>	
<b>INFILL VILLAGES</b>				
Bleadon Quarry, Bleadon*	Planning permission subject to legal agreement	14/P/0687/O	42	New allocation for a mixed use scheme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 500 sq metres of employment floorspace at entrance of the site</li> <li>• Traffic Calming measures on Bridge Rd</li> <li>• Pedestrian link along Mulberry Lane</li> </ul>
Jackson Barstow House, Uphill	No current consent		20	New Allocation A Flood Risk Assessment ,sequential and exception test will need to accompany any planning application
<b>TOTAL FOR INFILL VILLAGES</b>			<b>62</b>	
<b>OTHER SETTLEMENTS AND COUNTRYSIDE</b>				
Barrow Hospital, Barrow Gurney	Full Planning permission	13/P/0749/RM	35	Previously proposed to be allocated for 215 units as part of a mixed use residential and care scheme. Only consented open market dwellings retained within this allocation
Redwood Lodge, Failand	Full Planning Permission	15/P/0574/F	124	New allocation. Only suitable for care village as consented.
<b>TOTAL FOR OTHER SETTLEMENTS AND COUNTRYSIDE</b>			<b>159</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>11,405</b>	