

North Somerset Council
Local Development Framework

Sites and Policies Plan Consultation Draft

Schedule of Comments from Consultation

Sites and Policies Plan – Summary of responses

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
SP1: Presumption in favour of development	<p>25 comments received. Objections to prematurity of document due to Core Strategy re-examination. Strategy is not sustainable. Repetition of NPPF.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for document • Issues regarding prematurity in terms of Core Strategy re-examination • Mobile Operators Association would like the inclusion of a telecommunications policy in the DPD • Objection to the Sites and Policies Plan in that it fails to comply with the NPPF in failing to address appropriately all dimensions of sustainable development. In particular it fails to address issues related to Development, Green Infrastructure and Health, a component within the Social dimension of sustainable development, but related to both Economic and Environmental dimensions • The fundamental message in the NPPF is clear that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This is not translated into the Sites and Policies Plan. • Definition of sustainable development needed. • This policy has little value if the rest of the development plan includes negative and inappropriate policies. • There are only a handful of truly sustainable locations in the entire district. Everywhere else has to rely on the car to drive to giant supermarkets while town centres are dying. This is not sustainable at all. • This Policy is a repetition of the NPPF and the “presumption” is set out in the NPPF to enable development to come forward in the absence of proper provision through an up to date local plan. The plan should make provision that delivers the most sustainable strategy and would support sustainable forms of development. This would be development which has a mix of uses, is designed to facilitate the most appropriate movement mode for all types of trip, and which can incorporate community based energy generation.
DM1: Flooding and drainage	<p>16 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 15 additional comments. Generally, there was concern over comprehensiveness of approach, in relation to sources of flood risk, time horizon for planning, practicality of solutions and integration of development with existing arrangements.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood mapping used is out-of-date • Proposals map is inaccurate in respect of the extent of the strategic flood solution at Weston Airfield and adjacent land • Sequential Test treats infill sites unfairly compared to large developments with mitigation measures that may prove inadequate • Concern that settlement may mean drainage does not function as planned • Highlight biodiversity enhancement/tree-planting • Identify the maintenance responsibility as part of the planning decision • Wording: clarity of terms / flexibility of means / detailed assessment process / recognition of council's and other agencies' roles • NW Nailsea needs further investigation in respect of flooding and drainage • Specific reference/policy needed for surface water flooding, with areas at risk mapped • Reference needed to groundwater protection. Permeable paving may not be appropriate where groundwater pollution is an issue. • Climate change horizon to be considered material – 100 years? Flood risk mapping should include climate change extents. • Planners and developers should work with statutory undertakers to confirm how development will integrate with existing infrastructure
DM2: Renewable and low carbon energy	<p>There are 10 comments relating to this policy. 3 were supportive, 2 are not supportive and 5 request some alteration.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact is subjective – conserving finite resources is so important we need to consider all renewable options • A review of economic, social and environmental implications of tidal power of Severn Estuary is needed • Its inconsistent with para 97 of NPPF • Support criteria for preserving views from AONB • Doesn't agree that Weston village development should be separate to rest of North Somerset • More detail on landscape restrictions is required • Need to add requirement for the removal/ disposal of equipment at end of life • More positive policy on low carbon development generally

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
DM3 – DM8: Heritage	<p>10 representations were received relating to these policies. No clear overall objections or representations in support. The points are varied, including points of detail regarding wording, and suggestions for some assets to be designated as heritage assets.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding Policy DM7 on archaeology: Field evaluations are costly and should not be required as a matter of course. The existing policy approach could result in field evaluations being done without due cause, with delays in determining applications when conditions would be appropriate. The policy should state that a field evaluation will be required where a desktop assessment has established that significant archaeological resources are present. • Suggest that the area around Holy Trinity Church and the Tithe Barn at Nailsea becomes a conservation area. • Regarding policy DM3, the 1st bullet under the part on alternative uses of a historic asset should be amended to read “where applicable <u>continue its current use</u> for a purpose sympathetic to conservation” • Request that relevant NPPF guidelines (paragraphs) are mentioned in addition to relevant core strategy policies, in the table in front of each policy. • Policies DM4, 5 and 6 seem a little thin. Will there be more detailed guidance in SPDs? If not applicants should at least be referred to English Heritage for such guidance. • Please add Clevedon Hall garden and north field to the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, and investigate the potential for Clevedon’s heritage seafront to be put forward for consideration as a World Heritage Site • Archaeological remains may be preserved by waterlogged ground, and where a flood risk solution could lead to such sites drying out causing their destruction there will be a requirement to assess the impact on buried archaeology.
DM9: Nature conservation	<p>10 representations were received relating to this policy. Varied points of detail, including some seeking strengthening of the policy but one suggesting it is too onerous</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For consistency, the following should be added to the 5th para of the policy, after “substantive interests present”:...“and will not be permitted unless the harm can be avoided or mitigated by appropriate ecological mitigation measures provided or incorporated within the development”.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy refers to a “full ecological survey”. In most cases planning applications will only need to be accompanied by a desk based survey and Phase 1 ecology survey, although in some cases further surveys may be needed before planning permission is granted. • The policy should be reworded to reflect the balanced approach necessary towards reconciling the objective to protect biodiversity with meeting the need for development. A negative presumption against development is implied by the requirement to demonstrate “overriding need for development” where significant adverse impact occurs, which should not necessarily be the case, as for overall sustainability it may be that the development should proceed. The 5th para of the policy is too onerous and inconsistent with the requirement for the plan to be positively prepared, justified and effective. • The policy needs to recognise the international importance and high level of protection afforded to the Severn Estuary, a SPA, SAC, Ramsar and SSSI. • The policy should be strengthened by seeking net gains in biodiversity in line with NPPF para 9. • Developers need to know early on what features of development are likely to weigh against their proposals, and the policy should give that information or indicate where it can be found, and it should be kept up to date; eg. Impact on bat transit routes of street lighting. • The Bleadon parish environment, including nature and wildlife sites, should continue to be protected under existing constraints and policies.
DM10: Trees	<p>6 representations were received relating to this policy. The points are mainly varied points of detail, but all are more of a supportive nature than objecting.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first bullet should be expanded to require larger scale woodland creation for more significant developments, as part of developer obligations. (Wording suggested) The adopted Core Strategy policies CS4 and CS9 promote woodland planting and the NPPF para 114 advocates planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. The new England Biodiversity Strategy has a priority action which includes expanding the area of woodland in England • The policy should include protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees, in line with NPPF para 118 and other documents, , with the following further bullet: “protect important habitats, particularly designated sites, ancient woodlands and veteran trees”. • The policy should have a further bullet requiring planting of native species of local origin wherever possible. • There is an imbalance in that some of the Plan’s policies are much longer and more detailed than

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>others, and this unevenness of treatment needs addressing as a lack of adequate detail will give too much scope for officer/committee interpretation and lead to inconsistent decision making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A link could usefully be made to green infrastructure • Shouldn't the table include reference to the North Somerset Landscape Character Assessment SPD in "Other documents"?
DM11: Landscape	<p>8 representations were received relating to this policy. Various points of detail, but no strong overall objections.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 3rd bullet's reference concerning views should be revised and clarified. Views of importance should be classified and assessed, but not all views to and from a development are important or involve sensitive receptors. • Request deletion of "where required" from Background section which requires a statement that regard has been taken of the local landscape and incorporated into a final design solution, or at least clarification of circumstances where this would be required (presumably all rural/semi rural areas and any kind of parkland or green space setting?) • Need a balanced approach to reconciling landscape protection with need for development in sustainable locations. It will be necessary to accommodate urban extensions outside existing urban limits to meet the district's development requirements for which some landscape impact is inevitable. Any requirements for mitigation should not be onerous or disproportionate and have regard to the need to meet the district's development needs. • Shouldn't this policy have a "other Documents" section with the North Somerset Landscape Character Assessment referred to in it? • Suggest introduction on the Proposals Map of a designation for the areas "where dark skies are an important feature of the areas" • Please ensure the Bleadon parish environment is protected under existing policies
DM12: Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	<p>6 representations were received relating to this policy, 5 supporting (some requesting a text change), the 6th making a specific point regarding the Landscape Character Assessment SPD.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy and supporting text should make specific reference to the AoNB Management Plan which has been adopted by the council, (2) • Should the Landscape Character Assessment SPD be one of the "Other Documents" under this policy, as it refers to landscape?

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
DM13: Development within the Green Belt	<p>21 representations were received relating to this policy. Support from Long Ashton, Wraxall and Failand and Kingston Seymour PC's. Others commented on wording and boundaries. Some of the comments relate to issues which are strategic and relate to the Core Strategy rather than the Sites and Policies Plan. This policy concerns development in the Green Belt not boundary review.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be tightened up even from the presumption in favour of sustainable development • Infilling should not be restricted to those villages with Settlement boundaries • Height restrictions on permanent structures should not be applied • NPPF restricts extensions to 100% of original not 50%. The limit should not be raised on well screened plots such as Cadbury Camp Lane. • Preserving openness if applied to extensions would grant development for some not others • Policy not consistent with NPPF should also make reference to those uses set out in para 90 • Development should be on brownfield not green • Impact of lighting on wildlife should be referred to particularly regarding sports and recreation. • object to the following wording within policy DM13, Development within the Green Belt 'Where the character of the area is one of a predominantly residential road characterised by large detached houses, on well screened and spacious plots (for example Cadbury Camp Lane north of Tickenham), it is possible that more substantial house extensions or replacement houses may be accommodated than in other parts of the Green Belt.' Some areas of Green Belt should not be treated differently that others • DM:13 Development within the Green Belt Support. Para 2 of the policy contains an error - delete 50%, insert 150%. • should consider including supportive text for water and wastewater treatment sites that are located in the Green Belt or open countryside • Support sport and recreation in the Green Belt <p>Boundary Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt policies relating to the Airport must be changed, entire airport area should be removed from the Green Belt • Nailsea TC believes that, without the ability to review the detailed Green Belt boundary in order to provide for locally generated development needs, or to extend the boundary to include land which performs Green Belt functions, decisions may be taken which result in unsustainable development and

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>perverse outcomes for the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Bristol's site at Long Ashton should be excluded from the Green Belt • There are no special circumstances for development in the Green Belt surrounding Backwell although it should be extended beyond Station Rd, and a small area at Downside could be removed to permit improved land uses and improvements to dwellings, there can be no very special circumstances in the plan period for the extension of the HWRC, located at Coles Quarry, further into the Green Belt • the Green Belt boundary in Wrington should be redrawn to the south along the line of the river Yeo. • The Policy should set the criteria for the definition of Green Belt boundaries and identify the changed Green Belt boundary in wording and on the Proposal map for the SW Bristol urban extension • Consultation on the policy is inappropriate given the High Court Challenge • Key points are retention of the Green Belt and rural character of the Barrow Gurney Parish and surroundings, to avoid further ribbon development on the A38 and elsewhere. • The Green Belt and settlement boundary's line should be co-terminus with the existing residential / historic buildings in the St Mary's Road/Capenor area of Portishead.
DM14: Duration of planning consent for disposal of waste to land	<p>1 representation was received relating to this policy seeking wording amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should be amended by the addition of “having regard to the size and scale of the site and the benefits of the restoration proposals”. Any adverse impacts from waste disposal operations should be controlled by the conditions within the planning consent, and it should not be assumed that a longer period of time for completion would result in additional impacts. There needs to be a balance between the level of activity/infilling at a site and the length of time operations continue for. Imposing too short a period to complete disposal could lead to increased vehicle movements and associated activities. It should be recognised that some waste proposals will be for short term sites, possibly of a small scale, and others will be for a much longer term, perhaps larger sites. Adequate time needs to be allowed to complete the waste disposal operations and restoration works having regard to the size and scale of the site and the benefits of the restoration proposals. If sites require a long period of time to allow for completion then this should be recognised. The recently submitted planning application for aggregate recycling and disposal of inert waste at Durnford Quarry would make a significant contribution to the management of inert waste material in the area, and the proposed restoration and afteruse of the site would have substantial benefits for the area.
DM15: Minerals exploration, extraction and processing	<p>14 representations were received relating to this policy. No overriding objections to this policy. Representations were more to do with clarity and definitions</p>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about PEDL licences affecting Backwell area and the potential harmful effects of fracking particularly on the landscape and public health, with increased traffic, noise pollution and damage to buildings. Few jobs to local people as work is highly specialised and usually sourced from overseas. Question whether fracking is really needed (3) • Support inclusion of fracking in policy and the criteria, but the policy should indicate that wherever possible, new mineral working, extraction and processing should avoid the AoNB. • Support for policy which meets NPPF; issue of unstable land is adequately met by policy CS3 of Core Strategy and this policy. • Policy contains lots of “shoulds”. There needs to be concrete legal requirements in place to ensure clean up after use and after accidents, the costs of which should not be met by the taxpayer. Developers should meet total environmental costs of fracking if it is ever allowed, • Concerned about fracking and request to know whether the council is working with other local authorities on the environmental criteria they have to develop, when the criteria will be developed and whether it will be the subject of a separate consultation. • Applications for fracking should be assessed on their ecological impacts and need full EIA and consultation with local people; policy reference to impacts on biodiversity supported; • Policy may need to change depending on the form of any forthcoming government guidance on fracking. • Mineral working applications should recognise any water or waste water assets affected by proposals, any impacts on groundwater proposals and any mitigation measures necessary. • There should be recognition of economic viability in minimisation of waste in mineral working; the requirement for any waste generated to be used for a productive purpose is onerous and unrealistic; there will always be some waste that cannot sensibly or economically be used for a productive purpose. (Alternative wording suggested, inserting “where economically viable” after “purpose”.) • Object to expectation that companies with more than one minerals site in an area would ensure activity is integrated between them. The last paragraph of the policy is unsound and should be deleted. It is not clear what “suitably integrated” means. It appears that North Somerset want more sites to be worked rather than fewer sites. Sites may be worked to a greater or lesser extent at any one time for many reasons, including the level of sales locally at a particular time, the type of material available, the plant and equipment at each site, agreements with landowners etc. The reasons are generally related to commercial aspects rather than planning. When the consents were granted at each site no integration or phasing with other sites was required and it cannot be a necessity now just because one

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>company controls more than one site. The text implies that it is acceptable to leave sites unworked if they are operated by separate companies but not if a company operates more than one site. There is no justification in the NPPF for restricting the manner in which an operator may bring forward the supply of minerals referred to in its para 142. The wording potentially restricts Tarmac's ability to make commercial decisions on the programming of work at the sites. It could force Tarmac to work from Durnford, incurring greater production costs and reducing their ability to compete in the marketplace. The requirement is unfair as Tarmac is the only minerals operator in North Somerset with more than one site. We doubt the policy could achieve its intention to control activities as the sites are in separate ownerships, though operated by Tarmac, with different commercial terms controlling their operation. Stancombe and the Spinney will require careful programming of continuous work; a decision to recommence quarrying at Durnford will be taken on the basis of specific market demand. The policy seeks to restrict supply of mineral at one site with the intention of increasing speed of working at the other, which is an oversimplification of economic realities and would not be effective. It fails to consider economic vitality and para 173 of the NPPF. The policy is a serious impediment to successful operation of the sites by Tarmac. It is unclear how the council seeks to lawfully impose new phasing and restoration arrangements. The NPPF (paras 204 and 206) requirements that planning conditions and obligations be relevant and necessary would not be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the Landscape Character Assessment SPD be one of the "Other Documents" under this policy, as it refers to landscape? • Further consideration may be merited on compliance with NPPF para 147, which refers to unconventional hydrocarbons, as more information becomes available, informed by evolving government guidance.
DM16: Control of non-mineral development likely to affect active minerals sites or sites recently granted consent for mineral working	<p>2 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy, the other making specific points</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The word "significantly" should be deleted from the second paragraph of the policy since it is not necessary. No impairment of permitted extraction of minerals should be allowed. • The policy should also be applied to the proposed Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) for carboniferous limestone referred to in policy DM18; (revised text suggested to reflect these points).
DM17: Allocation of land at the Spinney, south of Stancombe Quarry, as a preferred area for minerals working.	<p>6 representations were received relating to policies DM17 and DM18. Various comments, including objection to omission of MSA for coal, and requests that the limestone MSA boundary be amended</p>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2nd bullet requiring demonstration of genuine need to work the Spinney should be deleted, as the need for the Spinney has been established by Tarmac, and some of this information is in background evidence for the Sites and Policies Plan. The Sites and Policies Plan (SAPP) will identify preferred sites and mineral safeguarding areas in line with para 143 of the NPPF. Preparation of the SAPP has identified The Spinney as a preferred area, and following its adoption, it will have been subject to sustainability appraisal, public consultation and independent examination to establish its soundness. This process incorporates an assessment of need for The Spinney as a preferred area. There is no additional statutory requirement to demonstrate need at the development management stage, nor any suggestion in the NPPF para 144 that an applicant should demonstrate need to work a preferred area. Also the Plan has been prepared in a recession and an economic upturn is expected to increase demand for minerals. It would be unreasonable to impose a requirement to demonstrate need against assumptions on need set within the plan in 2013. The wording should be deleted as an Inspector is likely to find the Plan unsound on this basis, and the wording would impose an unnecessary and unreasonable burden on a mineral operator and has no proper planning basis. • Should the NS Landscape Character Assessment DPD be listed under “Other Documents” for policy DM17? • The proposed extension to Stancombe Quarry should only be permitted with appropriate safeguards. There should be extensive community involvement in the scale and timing of development • Should fracking exploration licences occur in or adjoining Backwell Parish, there should be extensive community involvement prior to consent, and no fewer safeguards than in DM17.
<p>DM18: Identification of minerals safeguarding areas for carboniferous limestone</p>	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface coal should also be protected via a mineral safeguarding area (MSA). The Plan omits to do this so conflicts with the NPPF para 143. This is also inconsistent with Bristol City’s approach and other parts of the England coalfield, thus showing a failure of the duty to cooperated. No locally distinctive circumstances have been demonstrated as to why a different approach is relevant. The plan is also unsound having not been positively prepared with regard to Core Strategy CS3, being not justified, effective, and contrary to the NPPF. The Surface Coal Resource Plan which has been developed jointly with the BGS and surface mining operators represents the best available geological and mineral resource information for the area, as required by the best practice advice in the 2011 BGS/The Coal Authority Guide to Mineral Safeguarding in England. An MSA for surface coal should be shown on the Proposals Map based on the entire surface coal resource within North Somerset, and referred to in the policy

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The boundary of the MSA for limestone should be amended to include more land including the former Hyattswood Quarry and more land at Hyattswood Farm • Currently the MSA for limestone is insufficiently comprehensive in extent, identifying a relatively small area of known limestone resource between two operational quarries, and only a small part of a wider limestone resource considered to be of at least local importance. It does not reflect the NPPF para 143 which states that MSAs should relate to known locations of specific mineral resources of local and national importance, so is unsound. The MSA should be revised to reflect the distribution of potentially commercial limestone within North Somerset, (our company's understanding of the distribution of deposits with the potential for aggregate production), reflected in a plan supplied. • The policy or accompanying text should be revised to clarify that an MSA passes no comment on the likelihood of any mineral being worked, only of its presence. • It is unclear why the consented existing quarry areas are in the MSA for limestone when they are protected under policy DM16. • A 500m buffer should be drawn around the MSA as referred to in policy DM16. • Prior extraction of limestone is not practical where the deposits are over 100m thick, and the timescales for extraction are prohibitive. We question how any real depth of mineral can be prior extracted. There should be greater emphasis on assessing whether non mineral development would impact on future limestone extraction and if so refuse it.
DM19: Green infrastructure	<p>8 representations were received relating to this policy.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference should be made to trees and woodland creation in the table, since they are important elements of Green Infrastructure provision • A further bullet should be added to cover the protection and enhancement of biodiversity interest within GI, as outlined in Core Strategy policy CS9 and to link with policies DM9 and 10 on nature conservation and trees. • Policy is not sound or consistent with national policy. It is not clear which elements of GI would be funded through individual section 106 agreements and which elements would be truly strategically planned and funded through the Core Strategy. Suggest clarifying text be added that financial contributions will only be sought for those elements of GI which arise as a direct result of the development and which are not already funded through the CIL, to avoid possibility of double counting. • Principles and requirements for GI should feature throughout the Plan to better reflect its multi functional and cross-cutting nature. We would expect GI to feature strongly in the Place Making

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>policies. We advise the council to prepare a GI strategy, providing an opportunity to identify a strategic GI framework for North Somerset, inform plan preparation and provide guidance to individual developments to promote a consistent approach to GI provision and management. The NPPF requires planning for biodiversity at landscape scale across administrative boundaries, including identification and mapping of local ecological networks, etc.</p>
DM20: Major highway schemes	<p>12 representations were received relating to this policy. 5 supporting the policy and 7 additional comments. Opinion was divided on purpose and value of South Bristol Link Road. Additional highway schemes suggested across North Somerset.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation premature as relies on Core Strategy policies now remitted by the High Court • Highway schemes listed should influence development locations and design • New roads increase traffic and harm the environment • Parishes take opposing positions on South Bristol Link Road • Barrow Gurney Bypass should be rerouted to avoid the cost of a new junction • Open up Brockley Combe access to airport • List should include North South Link (A371 to A370) • J19 bypass needed, similar to J21 proposal. J20 also problematic. • Capitalise more on presence of M5, especially for tourism
DM21: Motorway junctions	<p>2 representations were received relating to this policy, both supporting the policy.</p>
DM22: Existing and proposed railway lines	<p>15 representations were received relating to this policy. 5 supporting the policy and 10 additional comments. Portishead station is the main issue, with objections raised against Option 2. Opinions differ on the importance of re-opening.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail link not needed and would not be used • Further delay in re-opening Portishead branch is unacceptable • Scheme compromised if station moved away from current Option 1 location – highway and overbridge issues should not be overstated • Options appraisal for Portishead station should avoid adding to congestion, inconvenience,

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>disturbance, and risks to child safety. Option 2 site too constrained, with inadequate parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobbying needed to allow a level crossing at Quays Avenue • Safeguarding causes blight • Rail/rapid transit access to Airport should be investigated
DM23: Bus interchanges and park and ride facilities at existing railway stations	<p>7 representations were received relating to this policy. 5 supporting the policy and 2 additional comments. Proposals broadly supported but developer interest in associated development, especially for housing</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worle station car park eastward extension unlikely within plan period. Should be re-allocated for housing. • Nailsea & Backwell station should be a focus for mixed use development, in place of NW Nailsea site
DM24: Safety, traffic and provision of infrastructure, etc. associated with development	<p>3 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 2 additional comments. The policy is broadly supported. Problems during construction works are identified as an issue that planning conditions should address.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Building Site Agreement should be considered as a condition of planning permission for major developments, to mitigate highways impact of construction • For compliance with NPPF, test for residual impact should be severity of the congestion, not unacceptability.
DM25: Public rights of way, pedestrian and cycle access	<p>14 representations were received relating to this policy. 7 supporting the policy and 7 additional comments. There were a further 4 comments on Schedule 6, 1 in support and 3 additional comments. Some concerns over wording. Inclusion/exclusion of schemes is challenged in some areas.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording over-prescriptive about provision to be made and by whom • Maintaining amenity/aesthetic attractiveness is subjective – could be interpreted to constrain major changes arising from development • Definition of 'strategic' cycle route queried • Congresbury-Blagdon route, while well-supported, could incur significant costs in the Wrington area

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional routes/sections suggested in Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead areas and towards Bristol • Bridleways need improvement, especially in Hutton Hill area • Make reference to the North Somerset map for cyclists • Engage with Environment Agency where a route affects its assets
DM26: Travel plans	<p>4 representations were received relating to this policy. 2 supporting the policy and 2 additional comments. Concern that initial arrangements may not be sustained over the long term</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More clarity needed on transport objectives to be achieved, together with longer timescales for implementation • Consider impact of budget cuts on bus provision • Concern that initial arrangements may not be sustained, e.g. developer may cease trading after the development is complete
DM27: Bus accessibility criteria	<p>5 representations were received relating to this policy. 0 supporting the policy and 5 additional comments. Generally considered too specific/onerous, with no allowance for locational characteristics</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult town council on new bus stop locations, particularly in new residential developments • Bus frequencies should be considered in the context of a development's wider sustainable travel benefits package and should allow for phased increases as development proceeds • Does not appear to consider the circumstances of rural areas • Acceptable distance to a bus stop should be a target, not a development plan requirement • Acceptable and maximum distances should reflect current CIHT thinking – 1,000 m and 2,000 m respectively • Layout may not always allow for raised kerbs or through routes
DM28: Parking standards	<p>5 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 4 additional comments. Consider implications of parking standards for housing density and delivery as well as for parking problems</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptions should be evidence-based. Important not to penalise short-term users.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over conversion of garages to residential use • No exceptions to standards should be allowed. Non-residential development should not be able to rely on a Travel Plan if standards are not met. • Standards resulting in lower density development have implications for delivery of housing numbers
DM29: Car parks	<p>2 representations were received relating to this policy. 0 supporting the policy and 2 additional comments. A variety of spaces, free of charge where possible, is seen as essential to maintaining the town centre role</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free parking essential to Nailsea's role • More disabled and baby spaces needed, also family parking areas for wider vehicles
DM30: Off-airport car parking	<p>4 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 3 additional comments. Need to consider possible unintended consequences of the policy</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over Airport's effective monopoly on parking • Off-airport parking with shuttle service should be encouraged, to limit casual parking in areas near the airport • Should be an upper limit of 15 spaces at guest houses, with larger hotels regulated through DM28 standards
DM31: High quality design and place making	<p>A total of 11 comments were received relating to the policy. General support for the intentions of the policy.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could a local design manual be created specifically for North Somerset • Support for benefits of access to woodland for health and place-making. • Should create cul-de-sacs as a good model of residential design • Create south facing orientation • Create an additional bullet point related to biodiversity, green infrastructure and trees as these are key elements that contribute to a sense of place. • No specific reference to safety in design. Secured by design principles should be referred to in this policy and explanatory text

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design policy to consider waste water infrastructure requirements
DM32: Inclusive access to non-residential buildings and spaces	No comments were received.
DM33: Settlement boundaries	<p>55 representations received. Some general support mainly from Parish Council's. The majority of respondents are seeking amendments to the boundaries around individual sites, in the most cases to secure residential development. Objections also received to the proposed changes at Sandford, Weston and the new boundaries at Weston Villages.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <p>General support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long Ashton Parish Council supports the maintenance of corridors between settlements and especially between Long Ashton and Bristol. Kingston Seymour PC – support the Settlement Boundary Clevedon Town Council accept the settlement boundaries for Clevedon as shown on the proposals map. Bleadon Parish Council strongly supports the existing Settlement Boundary in Bleadon and accepts the adjustment at Bleadon Quarry Wraxall & Failand Parish Council supports the maintenance of corridors between settlements and especially between Nailsea and Long Ashton. <p>Other general comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It may be necessary to revise the boundaries should additional housing numbers need to be identified. There are potential extensions available in the most sustainable Service Villages which would be suitable, available and deliverable should there be additional needs to be met. Objections to the consultation on the Sites and Policies Plan until such time as the Council have addressed the matters referred to in Court Judgement. <p>Weston-super-Mare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small site 0.07 hectares adjacent to WSM Settlement Boundary change of SB for residential. Overgrow and derelict site subject to fly tipping, illegal use etc. The settlement boundary at Parklands Village should include all of the land for which positive proposals are made in the draft plan The southern edge of the Locking Parklands site (fronting the A371) does not reflect the scope for sensitive infill development within the parkland setting south of Farnborough Road which includes previously developed land including the former officer's mess building and tennis courts.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Worlebury should be included in the WSM settlement boundary • Object to the exclusion of land at Lynx crescent from the settlement boundary and deletion of an allocated employment site. • Land at Greenway Farm in Lyefield Rd Worle should be excluded from the settlement boundary and allocated for development • The extent of the Weston-super-Mare settlement boundary at Winterstoke village should be revised to be consistent with the current application at Winterstoke village • Objection to policy and its associated depiction on the Proposals Map of the settlement boundary around Weston Parklands. <p>Nailsea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support NW Nailsea allocation and change to the Settlement Boundary • Development at NW Nailsea will require the revision of the SB (This is acknowledged) • The list of settlement boundary changes should include adjustment to the boundary at Nailsea to include land to the south-west of Nailsea between the existing urban boundary and Youngwood Lane <p>Portishead</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed employment site south of Portis Fields, Middle Bridge Business Park Portishead (PDL site) • The Portishead boundary should be amended to include land south of Sheepway, which is considered suitable for residential development. <p>Backwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites Plan is premature in relation to the re-examination of parts of the Core Strategy. The Former BT Radio Research Laboratory at Backwell is suitable for small scale residential development and should therefore be identified in the Site and Policies Plan. • Propose changes to the settlement bound at Rodney Road and Waverley Road, Backwell • No need for any amendment to the Backwell Settlement boundary in the Plan period. In the event of an unforeseen district shortfall then only minor amendments outside of the Green Belt and phased at the end of the plan period. • The Backwell settlement boundary should be amended to include land at Farleigh Road, which is considered suitable for mixed use development (including residential). • The settlement boundary of Backwell be redefined to include Backwell House and outbuildings and designated as a tourist facility • The settlement boundary for Backwell should be amended to include land currently outside of but abutting the settlement boundary, relating to the area safeguarded for the proposed primary school playing field to the south of Dark Lane together with additional land.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>Banwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend settlement boundary at Banwell to include land at Knightcott Road <p>Churchill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Settlement boundary at Pudding Pie Lane Churchill allocate for residential development <p>Congresbury</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Sousta, Weston Road, Congresbury should be allocated for housing Land south of Cobthorn Way and Verlands Congresbury propose change to settlement boundary and allocated for housing The settlement boundary at Congresbury should be amended to facilitate development of a small parcel of land which lies immediately to the south of Cadbury Garden Centre, off the A370 Settlement boundary at Congresbury should be extended to include land off Venus Street and off Brinsea Rd and allocated for residential or mixed use schemes <p>Long Ashton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to building 1000 houses at Long Ashton (This is not a proposal in the Sites and Policies Plan) Land at 169 Long Ashton Rd Long Ashton should be removed from GB and allocated for housing <p>Pill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt review needed to include land south and east of Pill. <p>Winscombe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taylor Wimpey propose a 3.4 ha site off Sandford Road Winscombe for housing as an alternative to Woodborough Farm <p>Yatton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Settlement boundary should be amended to include land north of Arnold's way. SW Settlement boundary at Yatton off Moor RD east of the Rugby ground should be extended and allocated for housing Amend settlement boundary at Yatton to facilitate residential development <p>Bleadon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land south of Bleadon Hill is suitable for residential development and should therefore be identified in the Site and Policies Plan. The amendment to the settlement boundary at Bleadon is only acceptable if the site is protected for employment. If housing is required this is best met at small scale green field sites <p>Cleeve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the SB at 62 Main Rd to include the car lot for residential development.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include 62 Main Rd Cleeve in the SB. Redevelop the PDL site for housing • Extend SB at 8 Rhodyate, Cleeve to a) include all garden b) field adjacent for residential development • Propose the removal of land at Cleeve from the Green Belt and included in the settlement boundary <p>Dundry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the SB at Dundry to include farm buildings off Church Road for conversion to residential <p>Flax Bourton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land north of Clevedon Road and Old Weston Road is located outside the nearest settlement boundary of Flax Bourton should be considered for redevelopment a small low impact housing scheme <p>Locking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a specific policy permitting the extension of park home estates and land to the east of Oaktree Park, Locking should be allocated for further expansion <p>Sandford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the proposed change to the Settlement boundary at Sandford. <p>Tickenham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Settlement Boundary at Tickenham should be extended to include ALL the houses within the speed limit from East to West along the Village.
DM34: Housing allocations	<p>35 representations received. Overall view was that the allocations are premature given the High Court Challenge and pending re-examination. Various comments concern the distribution of housing in particular the emphasis at WSM and on very large sites. Deliverability of some of the allocated sites is called into question.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on the housing allocations is premature until revisions to the Core Strategy are made. • If the Plan is to be pursued then 'at least ' should be included in the capacity in Schedule 1 • This proposal is acceptable but only if it is finally accepted by Government and no greater demands for more housing has to be met. • Sport England supports use of planning obligations/community infrastructure levy (CIL) as a way of securing the provision of new or enhanced places for sport and a contribution towards their future maintenance, to meet the needs arising from new development. All new dwellings (14,000) in North Somerset in the plan period (up to 2026 and beyond) should provide for new or enhance existing sport and recreation facilities

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty over the housing target- too great a reliance on large sites, deliverability issues on some sites identified, the Council should also look to identify suitable sites outside WSM to ensure a balanced supply of sites in the more sustainable towns and service villages in particular Winscombe, Yatton, Banwell, Congresbury and Churchill. • Kingston Seymour PC – Support in principle but would not support any further housing at Yatton because of the very poor Broadband service to Kingston Seymour. • If the Review of housing numbers identifies a need to allocate new sites, a range of the Service Village locations will be more deliverable and better able to contribute to 5 Year Housing Land Supply than some larger strategic sites. • The phasing of development and improvements to the Highway network are imperative to ensure that the capacity for growth comes before demand. All planning applications likely to generate traffic should include a sound transport evidence base to illustrate that there is no detrimental impact on the SRN. • The housing allocations are deficient in terms of quantitative provision and distribution. There is insufficient evidence base to demonstrate the deliverability of sites or to illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period. The suitability, viability and availability of the allocations south of Herluin Way, the Gas Works site, and North-West Nailsea are questioned. As is the deliverability at Weston given the employment led strategy which will act as a break on housing deliverability. The quantum of housing allocated to the second tier settlements should be increased. • Wrington PC – no further sites to suggest <p>Bristol</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context for this policy will change and will need to include the SW Bristol urban extension approximately 6-8000 dwellings <p>Weston-super-Mare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The recent High Court ruling regarding the evidence base and residual housing numbers will potentially result in changes to this policy. Therefore we reserve the opportunity to make further comments at the appropriate juncture. We would add that previously developed sites such as Locking Parklands will provide a potential opportunity to accommodate additional housing capacity through the extension of the settlement boundary. • The Weston Gateway employment allocation should be allocated for housing • Support the allocation at 112-134 Locking Rd for residential but suggest the number in the schedule be increased from 10 to 24 • Environment Agency - new housing allocation by the motorway is in the functional floodplain. With the Banwell scheme in position this site will be removed from the floodplain. We are not aware that the

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>storage calculations have taken this site into account within Royal Haskoning technical note on storage volumes between the Uphill Great Rhyne and River Banwell catchments. This needs to be clarified to ensure sufficient storage is being provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After 2026 there will be little or no land in Weston to build on! The density of development is way too low and therefore land hungry, this is not a sustainable use of land, nor does it create sustainable communities. You need to look at exemplar schemes from Europe and embrace them otherwise the district will soon look like any other car dependant place up and down the motorway <p>Nailsea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town Council supports a policy of limited growth of housing, to balance local housing needs and employment. Limited growth is not defined in terms of numbers, as the Town Council is concerned that the approach to development must be based on the type and mix of housing rather than the quantity in order to address the Town's specific needs. • Proposal for an allocation of approximately 450 residential units at South West Nailsea <p>Clevedon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weston Area Health NHS Trust -the Millcross site (currently a proposed Hospital allocation) should be added to the proposals map and added to schedule 1 as a proposed site for residential redevelopment. • Clevedon TC -include part of the Clevedon Hall Estate south field (behind Old Church Road). <p>Portishead</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Core Strategy housing projections will have to be revised upwards. In which case, additional housing sites will need to be found. Propose a site bounded by Sheepway, the former Portishead/Bristol railway line and existing residential development at Moor Gate be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing. • Additional site for residential development South of Sheepway should be included <p>Backwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing allocations sought at Rodney Road - situated on the western boundary of Backwell, adjacent to West Leigh Infant School; and Waverley Road - situated on the north east boundary of Backwell, adjacent to the railway line. • Support for sites A,B,C in the Draft Backwell Neighbourhood Plan • Additional site at Farleigh Field should be allocated for housing • Land south of Dark Lane as an additional residential site <p>Winscombe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wells Close, Winscombe, should be allocated for housing <p>Yatton</p>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing provisions of the Plan are significantly deficient, exacerbated by a lack of clear evidence to demonstrate their sufficiency and deliverability. The quantum at second tier and smaller settlements should be increased and include land north of Moor Road. <p>Bleadon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the non allocation of SHL72 and 98 for development. <p>Cleeve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site at 62 Main Road Cleeve should be included in the schedule to provide 12 houses <p>Kenn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenn PC - The proposed Kenn site for residential development has been removed as identified in the Replacement Local Plan (H/7 & H/2) Stowell Concrete. Should a development need to be identified in Kenn, at some point in time, this brownfield site would be preferential for development than a new greenfield site.
DM35: Housing type and mix	<p>15 representations received with general support for the policy.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social housing requirements should be set with reference to local need. • There needs to be more specific support for small to medium builders who are local and employ local workers. Sites or parcels of land which are suitable for up to say 5 or 10 houses should be encouraged. Approving large developments for national builders will end in the awful sameness we see at Portishead and WSM. • Yatton Parish Council wish to query why no reference is made to CS16 for Affordable Housing in particular on the affordable element on developments of over 10 houses • Further residential development in Nailsea should maximise the number of 1 and 2-bed dwellings and address the specific need for low cost properties for purchase by young people and families, and suitable properties for downsizing. • The policy that gated developments are not normally supported in the interest of establishing well-integrated communities is welcomed. • Cannot support a rigid requirement for small scale builders, individually designed homes and self build schemes given the implications for site wide viability. • It does not necessarily follow that seeking to achieve some equilibrium within the existing local housing stock in terms of the mix of housing types is synonymous with meeting the needs (market and affordable) of local residents or indeed for which there is a market over the period to 2026. Suggested change: The council will require that the type and mix of housing proposed on a specific site <i>has regard to</i>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>redress any imbalance in the existing local housing stock, <i>and</i> meet the needs (<i>market and affordable</i>) of local residents, and in Weston-super-Mare support employment-led regeneration (Policies WSM19 and 20).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imbalance in the existing housing stock need to be addressed through the operation of the total housing market • The need for aspirational housing should be looked at on a District wide basis to attract those who will be more interested in Town and Village locations, rather than in Weston-super-Mare. • Identification of specifically designed live/work units is counter productive and restricts choice, when any standard house will potentially perform a live/work function anyway. • Policy requires housing mix to be justified at the Planning Application it should be provided through an up to date SHMA which would provide an objective Assessment of housing needs in the housing market area, • Persimmon Homes welcome the emphasis on family homes at the Weston Villages but specifically object to the inclusion of the wording ‘to meet the needs of those working in the town’. It is an unreasonable restriction on the housebuilder to expect new family housing to be solely designed to meet the needs of those already working in the town. • To ensure that a range and choice of new housing types is available, and indeed ‘deliverable’ within the Plan period, it is essential to ensure that a range and choice of sites is available on which to accommodate them choice of location is critical. • Support for ‘aspirational housing’ should apply more widely than Weston-super-Mare. SW Nailsea would be well suited • Whilst it is recognised that residential schemes over 100 units should include a range of building types and tenures, it should be noted that not all schemes will be suitable to support small-scale builders, individually designed homes and self-build schemes. This should be reflected in the policy wording, stating that this will be sought where appropriate to the individual development • Under the background heading this “policy seeks to set out what is meant by the term ‘mixed and balanced community’ within the North Somerset context”. However, the policy does not succeed in this task. i) The policy refers to employment lead regeneration in Weston but fails to mention the self-containment that the core strategy requires elsewhere. ii) No guidance is given on the means of assessing imbalance of various types. • Dearth of 1 bed units despite falling household size and changes to housing benefit now need to redress the shortfall
DM36: Residential Densities	2 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 1 additional comment.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>No overall objection to this policy</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support from St Modwen for recognising density determined by site characteristics • Densities need to rise, not only to accommodate the amount of 1 bed properties required but also to save land for the future and for ecology, the current poor standards of development should no longer be tolerated before it is too late.
DM37: Residential development within settlement boundaries in existing residential areas and on garden land	<p>3 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 2 additional comments. No overriding objections to this policy more to do with clarity and definitions</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obsession with development being ‘in keeping’. Should embrace the 21st century. • Policy should be clear whether it only relates to sites inside settlement boundaries or everywhere.
DM38: Extensions to dwellings	<p>3 representations were received relating to this policy. 2 supporting the policy plus additional comments. General support for this policy from the two Parish Councils who commented. Additional comments also made, see below:</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support • Concern about the governments proposed changes to PD rights concerning extensions, suggest North Somerset should consider using Article 4 Directions over extensions to limit scale and reduce residential conflict. • Applications need to identify any sewerage assets affected by proposals and demonstrate that acceptable arrangements are in place to divert sewers or maintain statutory easements.
DM39: Conversions and subdivisions to residential use outside the Area of Restricted Subdivision	<p>2 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy plus an additional comment.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a blanket ban on the loss of large family houses to flats. Flats should be provided as part of new developments
DM40: Retirement accommodation and	10 representations were received for DM40 – DM43:

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
supported independent living for older and vulnerable people	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support but should offer flexibility i.e. within or <u>adjacent</u> to settlement boundaries where larger plots may be available. • Policy should be amended to allow for development of this nature on sustainable sites that are also outside defined settlement boundaries that provide sustainable and easy access to a range of local facilities and amenities. • Definition of various degrees of independent living required • Concern at the blanket and generic approach requiring provision on sites over 100 • The blanket requirement for provision on sites over 100 is not sound, justified or consistent with NPPF suggest add 'where it is viable to do so' • Policy is unclear and imprecise. Provision should be on a site by site basis not just if 100+ • DM40's relationship with DM35 (Housing Type and Mix) needs to be clarified
DM41: Nursing and care homes for older people and other vulnerable people	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessarily restrictive • The need to demonstrate that there is no alternative site within "the towns and villages" should be clarified as it would be unreasonable to require this to be demonstrated on a district wide basis. • Criteria 1 unreasonable not only does it preclude development of additional, valuable facilities for people in need of this accommodation but assumes that there will be a similar level of demand for this type of accommodation within the Authority area over the plan period. This does not allow for any flexibility or a response to changing patterns of demand. • Definitions should include Elderly Mentally ill (now generally known as dementia care)
DM42: Lifetime homes	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should be more flexible to allow future national guidance. Need to test for viability • It is unreasonable to expect all new developments over 10 dwellings to be constructed to the Lifetime Homes standards. Design innovation should not be stifled by an overly restrictive, inflexible and somewhat arbitrary policy requirement to design all new homes, on schemes over 10 dwellings, as Lifetime Homes, contrary to the NPPF. • This policy requirement could potentially restrict the delivery of housing in North Somerset.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
DM43: Residential annexes	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support in principle but need to tighten abuse and exclude commercial letting. • Personal care is an important source of employment, this argues for more retirement and sheltered housing and the protection of centrally located smaller scale development. Although it is not foreseen that further provision needs to be made in Backwell.
DM44: Gypsies and travellers	<p>8 comments were received primarily relating to the Old Junction Yard WsM proposed site</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contaminated land • Close to two scrapyards • Strain on local schools • Dust from cement works • Too close to houses and businesses • Wider consultation needed • Concern that Gypsy and Traveller sites may still be allocated within Weston Villages
DM45: Replacement dwellings in the countryside	<p>9 representations were received relating to these policies. Some representations were supportive, but there were also comments objecting to some aspects of the policies, such as the requirements for the buildings to be of traditional construction, and for attempts to have been made to secure an appropriate economic use, in policy DM46.</p>
DM46: The conversion of rural buildings to residential use	
DM47: Rural workers dwellings	
	<p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a note following policy DM46 stating that if the proposed replacement dwelling is in the AoNB it will additionally need to comply with policy DM12 on the Mendip Hills AoNB which is seeking conservation and enhancement of the designated area. (There is already a note after the policy stating that if the replacement dwelling is in the Green Belt it will also need to comply with DM13 on development within the Green Belt). • Surprised at the requirement that rural buildings for residential conversions should be of traditional construction. Even within the Green Belt the only proviso for re-use is that they are of permanent and substantial construction. Wouldn't allowing cladding of the buildings in natural stone be more

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>aesthetically pleasing than outright refusal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding policy DM46, traditional construction is not referred to in the NPPF, so the policy is not consistent with the NPPF, and this aspect should be deleted. The policy approach is illogical: the appearance of the building will continue whatever its use. In fact a change to residential may lead to enhancement of the building and the setting; (para 55 of the NPPF refers). • Support conversion and reuse of redundant farm buildings, but suggest a preference for full residential permission, not holiday lets, because the former, but not the latter, would add strength to our small village community. • Policy DM46 is inconsistent with the NPPF in seeking to impose an economic test, requiring marketing with a presumption of a commercial use over residential. There is no requirement for a commercial use to be considered first in the NPPF. This aspect should be deleted. • Support the policy intentions of these three policies (2) • Recommend an additional bullet to policy DM46 outlining that ecological surveys should be carried out as necessary on redundant buildings as they may support protected species such as bats, barn owls etc. • Support for policy DM46. • Support policy DM47, but note that at present there appears to be a complete lack of monitoring of compliance with planning conditions, which allows for abuse of a privilege not enjoyed by other residents.
DM48: Strategic gaps	<p>21 representations were received relating to this policy. A number of representations queried the extent of some proposed strategic gaps or opposed the policy, but some further suggestions for strategic gaps were suggested.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No explanation is given for the precise location of the proposed Nailsea-Backwell strategic gap. A strategic gap between Causeway View and Tickenham Church , and Tickenham village and Stone Edge Batch would be justified, as the area has old buildings and charm of unspoilt rural Somerset. There is a floodplain and important drainage ditches which should not be interfered with. • The strategic gap at Nailsea should be extended to include land behind “The Uplands” that leads down to Youngwood Lane. • Can you confirm that the Green Belt will give adequate protection without the need for additional protection by designation of a strategic gap?

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We request a strategic gap at the north end of Yatton as we oppose further development sprawl that could link to Kingston Seymour and Kenn in future. • The strategic gap designation is inadequate for protecting land to the south of Nailsea from inappropriate designation. Green Belt designation is needed, for which the land meets the criteria. However that aside, the strategic gap should be extended westwards to Nethernton Wood Lane/Chelvey Road. • Policy DM48 is an anti-development policy contrary to the overriding principles of the NPPF, and is an unnecessary and unjustified designation, created without consideration of clearly defined criteria or an evidence based background. The proposed strategic gaps have no coherent function or apparent methodology to their designation. The strategic gap at Nailsea/Backwell follows landownership plans relating to land being promoted for development and is an attempt to frustrate development of a deliverable site rather than about protecting the separate identities of two settlements. Professional landscape architects have produced a report establishing by sound and industry-recognised criteria that there is no need for a strategic gap designation to the south of Nailsea. There has been no examination into landscape character or the rather random way in which the boundaries have been drawn. The council have failed to justify their position regarding the strategic gap. • Land south of Laneys Drove/A371, west of Locking and east of Oaktree Park does not meet the definition of strategic gaps in the Core Strategy as it is not an important open area. Also it is not important to the character or distinctiveness of the area, with parts being untidy or having been used for other purposes in the past, and the strategic gap would divide the community as Oaktree Park residents consider themselves residents of Locking. The designation would prevent future expansion of Oaktree Park, when such expansion would strengthen ties to the village, and should be deleted as it serves no useful purpose. • It is premature to allocate any land at Weston as strategic gap until a final decision is taken on the scale of housing for the district, and the gap at Weston should be deleted pending that. In any case land between Locking Farm industrial estate and Locking Head Drove should be removed from the proposed gap as it forms a logical extension to Parklands Village, should further development be required, and much is at low flood risk. A landscape buffer could provide further physical separation between Locking and Parklands Village. A small triangular area east of the industrial estate serves no useful purpose and should be allocated for industrial use rather than strategic gap; (map supplied showing minimum area to delete from strategic gap. • A case could be made for an additional strategic gap east of the M5 between Clevedon and Kenn • Early delivery of a strategic gap between Nailsea and Backwell would avoid waste of planning resources. Both towns have developed views on the issue. The gap is essential to both communities

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strategic gap policy is superfluous and adds little to policy DM33 on settlement boundaries, which will adequately protect land between Weston and nearby villages like Hutton. However if the policy is to stay the strategic gap between Hutton and Winterstoke Village and the settlement boundary, (which appear arbitrary, unreasonable and ill-considered) should be revised to reflect the submitted planning application for Winterstoke Village, which would overcome our objection • Policy DM48 is premature since it relates to Core Strategy policy CS19 which has been remitted for re-examination. • The width of the strategic gap north of Parklands is excessive. The gap may be contrary to the council's own objectives and other policies concerning employment growth. The policy and its expression on the proposals map is prejudicial to continuing negotiations on the planning application. • Could there be a strategic gap between Claverham and Cleeve? • Should the policy's table include reference to the North Somerset Landscape Character Assessment SPD, under "Other documents" ? • Object to the policy and the consultation on grounds that the council cannot move forward with the SAPP in anticipation that there will be no change to the Core Strategy, the strategic policies of which have been remitted.
DM49: Proposals for economic development within towns and defined settlements	<p>18 comments were received for policies DM49 and DM50.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important that local opportunities are available • Support for allocation west of Kenn Road, Clevedon • Aspiration for employment land allocation east of M5 between future J21 bypass • Conflict with NPPF in terms of long term allocation of sites • Support for employment allocations close to residential areas to reduce the need to travel • Concern over Havyatt Business Park allocation in Wrington due to excessive scale and floodplain issues • More flexibility for economic development uses on land last used for employment purposes.
DM50: Allocated and safeguarded B1, B2 and B8 use class sites	<p>General query regarding the relationship of this policy to the NPPF approach to economic development. Specific comments on employment sites.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to have local opportunities for employment/ business.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court House Farm should be identified in the schedule • Support for employment north of Nailsea within the Green Belt • Support for employment allocation west of Kenn Road • Exact form and position of employment areas at Weston Villages should be subject to detailed masterplanning • Land should be allocated east of the M5 between the M5 and the proposed future bypass • Site E24 should be reclassified to mixed use. • Policy does not recognise the importance of non B Class employment. Approach to non B uses on these sites does not accord with the Government's planning policies on economic development. Inconsistent with NPPF view of economic development. • E22 should not be allocated. • Concern over Havyatt Road employment site in Wrington particularly in relation to flooding and scale. • Bleadon Quarry should be added to the sites list.
DM51: Allocated mixed use sites	<p>15 comments were received for policies DM51 and DM52</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for mixed use allocation south of Herluin Way. Regeneration of the site would improve the visual appearance of the area • Proposal to redesign Old Mill Rd in Portishead is supported. • Need to consider how existing employment sites in Nailsea could be better used. Preference for office and industrial starter units rather than warehousing. • Barrow Hospital is supported as a mixed use site • Flexibility should be afforded to mixed use allocations at Winterstoke Village • Policy shows an inappropriate extent of development as it does in DM33. • Site allocation at North West Nailsea has the potential to be impacted by the works to the electricity infrastructure associated with the National Grid proposals near the site. • For mixed use site adjacent to the Cross Rhyne consideration should be given to ensuring access to the watercourse and allowance for potential channel improvements. • Mixed use developments will need to include land at south west Bristol • Recommendation that Bleadon Quarry is removed from the list of mixed use sites.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
DM52: Safeguarded existing employment sites for economic use	<p>Some specific support for certain allocations in addition to views that the policy should allow for more flexibility in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for Old Mill Rd supported. • NSC need to assess how existing employment sites could be better used. • Support for Barrow Hospital as a mixed use development site. • Does not comply with para 22 of the NPPF in terms of avoiding long term allocation. • Restriction to temporary uses is inappropriate. • For clarification, we recommend that the policy's first sentence is amended to read: <i>'Land and buildings used or last used for B uses will be safeguarded for economic uses.'</i> This will ensure that there is no scope for misinterpreting the intended purpose of the policy as clarified by North Somerset's planning policy team by telephone on 19 April 2013.
DM53: Royal Portbury Dock	<p>5 representations were received relating to this policy. 4 supporting the policy and 1 additional comment. Demands placed on the railway line and adjacent land is the key issue – competition for space between rail and port</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case for railway station not proven – reduces scope for land at Court House Farm to meet port needs
DM54: Bristol Airport	<p>9 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 8 additional comments. Bristol Airport continues to seek larger Green Belt inset.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nailsea TC claim that Airport inset raises same issues at land at NE Nailsea • Show operational area on Proposals Map • Extend inset to include all land within 2011 planning permission • Cross-refer to Landscape Character Assessment SPD • No further expansion – protect view from AONB • Further expansion would trigger significant sewerage requirements
DM55: Agricultural and land-based rural	4 comments received, 2 in support and 2 requesting additional reference to other documents

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
business development in the countryside	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should refer to policy DM12, conservation and enhancement of the AONB • Should reference be made to the landscape character assessment in other documents?
DM56: Local food production/community orchards/allotments	4 comments received, 1 general; 1 support and 2 comments received from Backwell Residents Association regarding the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
DM57: Equestrian development	<p>7 comments received: 3 support; 2 object; 2 request for amendments</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't agree with point... 'sufficient routes are available nearby where riding activities can take place without conflicting with the free flow of vehicular or pedestrian traffic and define pre-existing outdoor activities • Should refer to landscape character assessment • Not giving sufficient importance to equestrian activity • Flood risk assessment sequential test not applicable • Further clarification required on the point regarding harm to identified wildlife or archaeological sites, refer DM9, 10 and 19
DM58: New business development in the countryside	15 comments have been received (1 comment being divided into 5 sections relating to different policies). 6 were for unequivocal support and 9 contained objections.
DM59: The redevelopment of redundant previously developed sites in the countryside for business uses (B1, B2, B8 and non-residential institutions (D1) and assembly and leisure (D2)	<p>Main points raised:</p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thatcher's cider welcome discussions about these policies • This policy section should also refer to Landscape Character Assessment SPD
DM60: Extensions, ancillary buildings or the intensification of use for existing businesses located in the countryside	<p>DM 58</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should add criteria that development is acceptable where a site is allocated through Policy DM50 • With whom lies the onus of proof that no sites exist within settlement boundaries?
DM61: Conversion and reuse of redundant rural buildings for business uses (B1, B2 and B8) and non-residential institutions	DM60

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
(D1) and assembly and leisure (D2) DM62: Conversion and reuse of redundant rural buildings for tourist accommodation DM63: Camping and caravan sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should not allow extensions or intensification of existing businesses that are already causing problems to the local community. <p>DM63</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Camping and caravan sites' should also ensure that such development does not have an adverse impact on the setting of the AONB, in particular where views from the AONB to surrounding countryside might be affected by development • Should be some statement in relation DM1 Flooding and Drainage • Should be monitoring to ensure they don't become residential
DM64: Town, district and local centres	<p>15 comments were received for policies DM64- DM69. General support for all designations set out in Schedule 7. Floorspace thresholds are supported as they ensure that new floorspace is commensurate with the size of the centre. Support that the policy allows for the consideration of larger proposals dependant on out come of Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing trends in retail e.g. online shopping are having an impact on how the retail sector operates and out of town retailing has led to the decline of town centres. • A site should be allocated for a county town market near the M5 to sell local produce. • Improvements to Worle High Street should be included in the plan. • Designation of a “service centre” at Backwell, as per their Neighbourhood Development Plan, with mixed office use above retail to ensure viability. • Support for the proposed local centre in Backwell on the Proposals Map and in Schedule 7. • Support for the designation of a local centre at Wrington.
DM65: Retail development outside defined centres	<p>Clarification is needed in the policy that restrictions on floorspace and sequential assessment will not prejudice new retail developments above the threshold coming forward as part of Weston Villages. Concerns over the requirement for a Retail Impact Assessment for all retail proposals over 200sqm as well as support for 200sq.m threshold as an appropriate level that will suit a variety of centres across North Somerset that range in size and function.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence to justify 200msq threshold for retail applications – not realistic or proportionate. • In the absence of evidence to justify the 200m2 threshold the default NPPF threshold of 2,500m2

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>should be set.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement places an unnecessary burden on businesses contrary to paragraph 21 of the NPPF
DM66: Primary shopping frontages	No representations received specifically on this policy.
DM67: Retailing within defined town, district and local centres but outside primary shopping frontages	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary shopping frontages should also be designated in the defined retail centres. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF requires LPA to define primary and secondary frontages in designated centres, and set policies that make it clear which uses will be permitted in such locations. This policy does not sufficiently protect the secondary frontages which perform an important retail function, primarily for independent retailers which cannot afford the rents in the PSF's The wording of the policy should be amended so that the principle of the loss of shops is not acceptable unless there is no harm to the vitality and viability of the service centre or local area. This policy should be stronger and more orientated to ensuring that the loss of retail premises will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that closure is unavoidable. Suggested rewording: "...the loss of shops will only be permitted where it can be shown that this does not harm the vitality and viability..." If this cannot apply across the district then this wording should apply specifically to countryside, Infill villages and Service Villages.
DM68: Upper floor uses	<p>Support for the policy.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A flexible and imaginative approach to all retail areas and upper floors should be taken. Mixed use development including residential should be encouraged in town centres.
DM69: Garden centres and shops in the countryside	<p>4 comments received. Objections to seemingly overly restrictive nature of the policy. Support for the policy but doubts about ability to enforce it.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the requirement that over 50% of the sales floorspace area relates to the sale of produce grown on site. Objection to requirement that remaining sales area relates to products made within a 30 mile radius of the site.
DM70: Air safety	6 representations were received relating to this policy. 1 supporting the policy and 5 additional comments.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>Need to consider consequences of the policy for strategic development at the Weston Villages</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to Government circulars need updating • Extent of safeguarded corridor at Helicopter Museum is excessive and restrictive of strategic development, particularly employment • Individual risk contours should be shown on the Proposals Map
<p>DM71: Protection of sporting, cultural and community provision</p>	<p>6 comments received. Policy should better reflect Paragraph 74 of the NPPF, removal of allocation at Millcross, Clevedon from Schedule 4, safeguard site on Kenn Street for Village Hall and issues of prematurity with regard the Core Strategy re-examination.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theatres Trust – We suggest that item d) in Policy DM71 also includes designated Neighbourhood Forums for consultation. • Policy DM71 on page 108 only refers to Use Classes D1 and D2, likewise the definition of the term ‘community facilities’ in the Glossary on page 172 only refers to D1 and D2. Please amend for accuracy as your theatres are sui generis, not D2. • Sport England – The Policy should better reflect Paragraph 74 of the NPPF. • Request that the site allocation of Millcross for the new Clevedon Hospital should be removed from schedule 4 and the site allocations map. The site has planning permission for this use and as such can rely on that planning permission should the NHS need to bring the site forward for healthcare use in the future. • Previously Replacement Local Plan (Policies CF/2 & CCH7) Kenn Street - want to continue to safeguard this site for a replacement village hall. • The continued consultation in this Sites and Policies Plan on many policies including policy DM72 is inappropriate, following the decision of the High Court to remit strategic policies within the Core Strategy 2012.
<p>DM72: Location of sporting, cultural and community facilities</p>	<p>17 comments received. Objections to some of the proposed allocations, namely Moss Land at Parklands Village, The Batch at Yatton and Royal Oak/Nailsea Glass works site. One comment that taking this policy forward is premature considering the pending re-examination of the Core Strategy. Support for many of the allocations, but requests for allocations for Local Green Space as well.</p>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy does not cover arts facilities and public art. North Somerset lacks a major venue for arts and S&P DPD should include a public art strategy which promotes the area. • Landowner opposed (no site specified) • Land should be allocated for a new school in Portishead • Provide an overlay to the online map to show all playing fields and recreations areas including school playing fields. These are particularly important as a lot have been sold off in recent years. • Support for allocation of Strategic Open Space to the West of Bridge Road, Bleadon, but would also like the site allocated as Local Green Space under Policy DM73. • Sport England will encourage potential providers to consider opportunities for joint provision and dual use of facilities in appropriate locations. • Moss land allocated for playing fields in Weston Villages SPD. Would be better suited for residential and put the playing fields along the A370 as part of the buffer between the Parklands and Locking Village. • The three fields bordered by Bridge Road, Bleadon Road and the A370 should be designated as a Local Green Space (Policy DM73). These three fields, at the heart of the village are important to the beauty and historical character of Bleadon and should be protected. • Policy DM72 and Schedule 4 of the Sites and Policies Plan allocates land at The Batch, Yatton (west of Mendip Road) as proposed strategic open space. This carries forward the allocation under Policy CF/4 of the Replacement Local Plan. It adjoins a proposed primary school site on other land. In isolation, it is considered that there is no reasoned justification for the continuance of the previous policy and it does not possess any inherent characteristics that make it specifically suited for these purposes. It is therefore requested that the proposed allocation is deleted. • Backwell RA support the extension of village schools, to meet local needs, improve facilities and provide additional employment opportunities. • The proposed allocation under policy DM72 and/or DM73 of the Site and which encompasses the Nailsea Glassworks site is opposed. The Royal Oak site and the Glasswork site would be better designated for mixed use development including residential, retail and community development. • Previously Replacement Local Plan (Policies CF/2 & CCH7) Kenn Street - want to continue to safeguard this site for a replacement village hall. • The continued consultation in this Sites and Policies Plan on many policies including policy DM72 is inappropriate, following the decision of the High Court to remit strategic policies within the Core

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>Strategy 2012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for allocation of land to the south of Dark Lane in Backwell, which is proposed for primary school playing fields.
DM73: Local green space	<p>83 representations were received relating to this policy. There were very few opposing comments. Some comments expressed general support but the great majority of responses requested consideration of further areas for designation as LGS.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support designation of land at Blackdown Road, Portishead as Local Green Space (LGS) Request inclusion of land at Banwell Recreation Ground, Westfield Road, Banwell, and Riverside Green, Banwell as LGS, to afford them greater protection in future. There is currently no LGS proposed in Banwell parish Request inclusion of the park/play area south of Anson Road in the existing development at the Parklands Village area as LGS. It is much used by the community for recreation. Request inclusion of large field near Farnborough Road and new Parklands development as LGS: it supports wildlife and is used as a recreation area in summer. Belgian Avenue field, Sidcot, should be LGS. It has rich wildlife. The trees in Belgian Avenue commemorate the Belgian refugees who used Sidcot houses in WW1. LGS designation would give recognition and protection that the field, footpath and avenue of Beech trees merit as historic features of the Somerset countryside. Request that The Award land and War Memorial Recreation Ground and associated facilities in Winscombe and Sandford parish be LGS, due to historical significance and recreational value; (2). That should include the Sidcot School playing fields up to the A38. Please protect all the proposed LGS areas, particularly the lovely open space at Spring Terrace, Weston, well used by the community, open, and acting as breathing space between housing. Support protection of land west of Beechmount Drive as LGS. The area is important for wildlife; trees take up rainwater and keep the hillside together, and have beauty. The land is a unique plot which enhances the natural beauty of the area as you leave Weston. The trees should be protected; they enhance the area and act as a natural anti pollutant. Object to designation of the section of land to the east of the TPO near Beechmount Drive as LGS. It does not meet the requirements for redesignation as LGS and does not satisfy the exceptional circumstances required under the NPPF. It is a misuse of the process to redesignate it to prevent development rather than on the basis of NPPF criteria. We will be proposing 3 dwellings on the land

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>sited so as not to encroach on the existing and new TPOs, designed to minimise visual impact and with tree planting and mitigation regarding any flood run off, and a protected wildlife corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nore Road/Lake Grounds, Portishead – support that the redesignation as LGS will not change the purpose of the land, so will not preclude use for a skate park. Other green spaces in Clevedon and Nailsea have these. • Request designation of Birdwell Recreation Ground (Lampton Road) and the green area at the junction of Theynes Croft and Copford Lane, Long Ashton, as LGS. • Request designation of Marshalls Field, Clevedon, a valued space much used by local people, as LGS. • Request designation of fields bordered by Bridge Road and Bleadon Road, Bleadon as LGS. They meet NPPF criteria on beauty, especially regarding Bleadon’s landscape setting, the historical development and character of the village around the fields, and the potential recreation value reflected in the Replacement Local Plan and the proposed designation under DM72 of the Sites and Policies Plan (SAPP). Note: Bleadon Parish Council also requests LGS designation of that land. • Support the policy, but the Backwell Neighbourhood Plan will propose more extensive areas as LGS at Backwell, including the whole Farleigh fields, fields SW of Moor Lane, and existing playing fields and play areas. We request that the council liaise with us on this. • Request that the NSC Merlin Park playing field (part of Portishead downs) be designated as LGS, being of recreational value and a community facility. • Support designation of the LGS at Easton in Gordano/Pill as currently proposed. Also request designation of the following: Brookside playing fields, Lodway cricket club, Easton cricket club, St Georges playing field, Pump Square, The Allotments (Cross Lanes), Jenny’s Meadow (end of Avon Rd), green between Macrae Rd and Horsechestnut Ave, Ham Green. • Request designation of the following as LGS in Blagdon parish: green area between Bath Road and Tim’s Well Path, including The Mead recreation ground, Cawkerd and Eldred’s Orchard and the cricket pitch; field belonging to School Farm, land belonging to Pooracre, Sladacre fields south of Bath Rd, green area called The Clennon, The Rocks common land, land south of Engadine, land south of cemetery and Little Furlong allotments. • Request LGS designation in Nailsea for: Gaulacre fields, and sports fields at Engine Lane to north, Engine Lane allotments and Hannah More Park, Rhyne View open space, Fryth Way football field, Nightingale Gardens, Jacklands Bridge to Moorend Spout, Greenfield Crescent, Stockway North nature reserve, Stockway North garden of rest and extension, glassworks site, Millenium Park, The Hamlet off Lodge Lane, land at junction of Blackthorne Way and Nailsea Park, Hawthorn Way, Middle Engine Pit, Golden Valley, land to rear of 60 Station Rd, Nowhere Lane at east end, Trendlewood Park, croquet lawn, north of Avening Close, Mizzymead Club, Whitesfield Rd allotments, Church Lane

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>cemetery, the Grove playing field, Morgans Hill, The Perrings open space, west of Bucklands End, corner of Bucklands Grove/Station Rd.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support policy, but would be interested in knowing the process of how new sites are to be designated and how local people/organisations will be involved in the process • Support the new designation, particularly in new residential areas • At Backwell all the 6 fields at Farleigh Fields, and parts of 12 fields at Moor Lane except those at Natal and Sumerleaze should be LGS. • Backwell Lake and its surrounds should be redesignated as Green Belt, rather than LGS. • Support the proposed designation of some of the fields at Farleigh Fields as LGS, broadly in line with the SAPP, although there is no evidence to suggest the site as a whole holds a special value as LGS, and the majority is not even accessible to the public. We are promoting a mixed use development including housing at Farleigh Fields capable of being integrated with the proposed LGS. An enabling development would deliver this LGS and public open space, and ensure a significantly higher amount of Farleigh Fields was publicly accessible, not limited to the public footpaths crossing two fields only. If the site is not allocated for development it can be strongly argued it would still be required beyond the plan period, so a LGS for the whole area would not be capable of enduring beyond the plan period, contrary to the NPPF. • Support the proposed areas of LGS at Wrington, but request that land in Redhill (at Church Road/A38 junction) is also so designated, being valuable public green space, maintained by the community on its behalf, though privately owned. • Request that land at 60 Station Road be designated as LGS. Though privately owned it has high landscape value, acts as a buffer between the busy main road and tranquil woodland, forms part of the woodland edge, is valuable wildlife habitat and is an open and attractive introduction to the woodland visible to many. Development would permanently destroy the integrity of the area. • Support the removal of Amenity Area designation for our land at 60 Station Road Nailsea, and disagree with requests from local residents that it becomes LGS, for various reasons. • Request designation of recreational green space north of The Elms, in Wraxhall and Failand parish as LGS, to give greater protection in future. • Object to the policy and the consultation on grounds that the council cannot move forward with the SAPP in anticipation that there will be no change to the Core Strategy, the strategic policies of which have been remitted. • Ensure that the Bleadon parish environment, including nature and wildlife sites continues to be protected under existing constraints and policies, and that fields stay as they are where possible. • If policy NA2 allocating land at North West Nailsea is deleted, the site should be included in Schedule 5

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>as Local Green Space, because it is the largest area of green open space on the north west side of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest the following areas at Clevedon be added to Schedule 5 as Local Green Space: green area north of Walton Park Hotel and Marshalls Field, Millenium Orchard, Hazell Close playing field and play area, Strode Centre playing fields and play area. Also the following important leisure facilities should be highlighted: Strode Centre, Marine Lake, MUGA and tennis courts adjacent to Salthouse Fields, Sailing Club on beach, Promenade Bowling Club. Also Highdale Farm and Highdale Avenue listed above should read “Highdale Hill”.
DM74: Undesignated green space	<p>25 representations were received relating to this policy. Most of the representations advocate protection of specific areas of land under the policy, but there are five representations supporting the policy in general. However there are three comments opposing the policy in principle, and one seeking a change to the wording.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy undermines and belittles the NPPF, by placing the same restrictions, without providing the same justification and criteria. It means that any green space could be refused planning consent. It is disingenuous to claim the NPPF para 7 justifies the policy, as protection of the natural and built environment is already provided by local green space and other policies in the NPPF. The undesignated sites do not comply with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sections 19 and 34, so would be non-statutory and unscheduled, and would mislead applicants and are not necessary or justified. • Land at Nowhere Lane should be protected under this policy. The area assumes a significant environmental, ecological, communal, social, historical, archaeological and well being value. The bridleway is a “walk to school” route and also popular with other users and enjoyed by many community groups, and contributes to residents’ well being. The site enhances the lane, giving a chance to walk through a beautiful green space in the town. There is rich biodiversity, the coal spoil tip has over 60 TPO trees, planted by miners around 1900 ,and contributes to industrial archaeology; The site has previously been labelled as a “green buffer zone”, providing a natural break in the developed area of Trendlewood Way. • Amenity land to the rear of 60 Station Road, Nailsea should be protected under policy DM74, if it is not possible to redesignate it as LGS. It is adjacent to Nowhere Woods and contributes to the character, setting and visual attractiveness of the whole area. The area is used by schools for nature walks in Nowhere Wood, and two appeals on the land were rejected partly due to “some harm to the amenity area” and “significant harm to the character and appearance of the area”. Comments advocate

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>protecting the land either as LGS or under policy DM74, being an integral part of the natural environment on this side of Nowhere Wood, with high landscape value, acting as a buffer between the busy main road and tranquil woodland, a valuable habitat and green corridor for wildlife and a designated Amenity Area for many years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following areas at Portishead should be protected under policy DM74: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - roundabout where Portbury Hundred meets Wyndham Way (having visual attractiveness on entering the town, breaking up the two roads visually); - grassed frontage of Court Farm, gyratory landscape opposite St Joseph’s School/The Albion (public house). • Support policy but would like advice on how to move areas from being undesignated green space to LGS • Welcome protection of various small areas of open amenity land that are important to the character of Nailsea; (map submitted). Nailsea TC request first refusal on any such land owned by NSC that is scheduled for disposal. • The term “worthwhile contribution” is too ambiguous to be used to judge the value of an area, and should be replaced by a more substantive term like “significant” or “demonstrable” contribution. • The policy is not sound nor consistent with national policy, and should be deleted. Any green space of value considered worthy of protection should be justified and designated as LGS under policy DM73. • The policy is not fully justified by a robust and up to date assessment of the need for open space, sports and recreation facilities as required by para 73 of the NPPF.
DM75: Development contributions, Community Infrastructure Levy and viability	<p>3 comments were received on this Draft policy.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions should be made to sports and recreation facilities • Policy should explain the differences between S106 and CIL • Policy should correctly reflect CIL Regulations • Objection to provisions related to collaboration and refusal reasons • More transparency related to provision of CIL to local communities
WSM1: Weston town centre	7 comments were received in total. General support for policies. Concerns over threshold for retail that triggers a requirement for an impact assessment. Concerns over flood risk.
WSM2: Night-time economy	
WSM3: Seafront	

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
WSM4: Gateway area	<p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for Allocation on the Avoncrest site • Desire for regeneration of town centre sites to encourage daytime visitors and families • Objections to restriction to bulky goods retail on retail parks • Concerns about the requirement in Policy WSM5 for Retail Impact Assessments (RIA) to accompany all applications for retail development in out-of-centre locations exceeding 200 sq m net. • Concerns over flood risk.
WSM5: Weston out-of-town retail area	
WSM6: A370 corridor into Weston-super-Mare	<p>4 comments were received. No significant objections.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for landscaped Boulevard approach with street trees and high quality design. • Need to be consistent with the referencing of the North Somerset Landscape Character Assessment SPD throughout the document – it should be referred to under other policies. Clarify its status. • Following on from the winter 2012 floods, there should be consideration of channel improvements, where deemed necessary, to improve conveyance of the rhyne network corridor along this stretch.
WSM7: Dolphin Square	<p>5 comments received and it was the same comment for each policy.</p> <p>Main point raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further detailed assessments will be needed in terms of Highways and Flooding at the planning application stage on these sites.
WSM8: Victoria Square	
WSM9: St James Street	
WSM10: Lower High Street East	
WSM11: Walliscote area	
WSM12: Birbeck Pier and environs	<p>1 comment received from the Environment Agency</p> <p>Main point raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed Flood Risk Assessment should be undertaken very early on in the development of this site and appropriate evacuation measures should be put in place in the event of large volumes of water spraying onto the island.
WSM13: Sunnyside Road site	<p>6 comments received in total for these policies.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p>
WSM14: Rugby Club site	
WSM15: Tesco site	

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
WSM16: Locking Road car park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further detailed assessments will be needed in terms of Highways and Flooding at the planning application stage on these sites.
WSM17: South of Herluin Way (Avoncrest)	<p>5 comments received for this policy.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the mixed use allocation on this site. • Flood mitigation measures maybe needed on this site. • Ecological constraints need to be taken into account. • Transport Assessment needed.
WSM18: Gas works	<p>There were 3 comments received</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological constraints need to be taken into account. • FRA is required • Potential traffic impacts on Drove Road roundabout need to be taken into account.
WSM19: Employment-led regeneration at Weston Villages	<p>There were 7 comments recorded to this draft policy. Mixed support and objection to the principle policy approach and some specific comments regarding detailed aspects. A general caution advised in respect of the policies potential adverse impact on housing delivery and a more strategic view regarding the employment-led strategy approach generally.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wish to see clarification that this policy does not contradict other documents e.g. Core Strategy, Weston Villages SPD etc. • Whilst accept need for 1.5 ratio, need to allow for market conditions and evolving circumstances. Need to be adaptable to allow alternative occupiers to be accommodated. • With ref to a(3), need to allow for outline schemes that were approved prior to this policy coming into force where an Outline Economic Statement will not have been present. • Policy currently refers to the use of S106 Agreements and Conditions, should be or, and that preference should be given to S106. • Exceptions where certain employment uses will not qualify for balancing with residential are too vague.

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 year supply issues should form part of the review process outlined in part (d). • Policy is dated and severely restricts the delivery of new housing at WSM, and is contrary to the NPPF. • Whilst employment delivery should be kept under review, housing delivery should also be monitored in relation to the degree of unmet need in WSM and pursue a policy that better achieves a balance. • Support for all employment generating land uses with some exceptions to be counted towards the release of housing. • Consider policy is premature and inappropriate, and unnecessarily repeats provisions of CS28 and CS30. • Impacts and implications of the High Court Challenge on this policy area. • Policy seeks to apply excessive control to the point where it may inhibit development. • Meets none of the requirements of NPPF, para 182. • Policy does not provide an effective means of addressing the issue. • More effective to allow jobs growth at WSM and housing closer to Bristol, because allowing jobs to 'catch-up' with housing in WSM has merit. • The policy is difficult to implement, and if successful will prevent the Council meeting its housing requirement requiring other sites to come forward.
WSM20: Employment-led regeneration within the Weston urban area excluding the proposed Weston Villages	No comments received.
WSM21: Junction 21Enterprise Area	<p>There were 5 comments received to this draft policy.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further motorway junction at Knightcott should be considered in light of population increase. • Welcome simplified planning procedures however seek clarification as to whether these will be applied to other areas in the Enterprise Area. • Request that any LDO developed should be in dialogue with the Environment Agency to ensure necessary Conditions and requirements are incorporated.
WSM22: Areas of restricted subdivision	<p>2 representations were received both very supportive of the policy. Support especially as some of the areas are in high flood risk areas and the policy will help avoid an increase in ground floor flats in the flood plains.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support and feel that an additional area should be included, comprising Upper Church Road between it's junctions with Knightstone Road and it's junction with Lower Church Road, and the roads off of it, and the area above it known as the Shrubbery. Support in flood risk areas
WSM23: Bournville community area	<p>1 representation was received</p> <p>Main point raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Uphill Great Rhyne and Cross Rhyne fall within the northern and southern boundaries of this area. The floodplain is quite minimal in this area but new development should be screened carefully using the latest baseline flood maps. Surface water drainage improvements should be considered as part of the design criteria.
WSM24: Allocation of land for residual waste treatment, Warne Road	No comments were received.
WSM25: Allocation of land for waste treatment facilities, Aisecombe Way, Weston	<p>2 representations were received</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the sites proximity to the A370 and potential impact on J21 of the M5 the agency will need to be satisfied that the proposal does not impact on the SRN. Additional wording required to recognise potential ecological constraints
WSM26: Park and ride provision at Weston-super-Mare	<p>2 representations were received. 1 supportive comment the other requesting a recognition of ecological issues.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional wording required to recognise potential ecological constraints Highways agency supports the provision of Park and Ride Sites
<p>CD1: The Triangle, Clevedon town centre</p> <p>CD2: Hill Road/Alexander Road district centre, Clevedon</p>	<p>3 representations were received, all on different aspects of these policies.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional parking for Hill Road should be created on the poor quality area at the top of Alexandra Gardens

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point out spelling mistake on Alexendra Road, not Alexander Road • Further fast food takeaway establishments should be discouraged as these units do not encourage people to stay and use the town centre. • Clevedon site specific FRA's are required for development located within the flood zone, as determined by NSC
NA1: Nailsea town centre	<p>3 responses have been received. Support for strengthening town centre but concern about Lidl development proposals (pre-app) if approved.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that the Royal Oak site and the Glassworks be designated for mixed use development including residential, retail and community development. • Concern that Town Centre will not be strengthened by proposals such as Lidl
NA2: North-West Nailsea	<p>45 Representations were received. The overwhelming majority were objecting to the proposals (38) compared three supporting and three which were neutral. Major concerns were flooding and drainage as well as the inadequacy of highways infrastructure. Effect on wildlife and pylons were also commonly cited issues.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National grid-wording doesn't reflect situation need to reword. • Power Lines prohibit development • National trust –setting of Cadbury Camp, need softening of edges • Town needs housing for younger families and couples and better locations are on underutilised employment land closer to Town Centre. • Transport infrastructure is inadequate and development would worsen this. Improve road infrastructure before development. Pound Lane is congested at peak times due to school traffic. • Avon Wildlife Trust ask for additional wording to reflect that development should be subject to an ecological survey making provision for mitigation and compensation measures as appropriate as outlined in DM9` • Does not qualify for development under CS32 as does not have community support. • Site selection process not been undertaken. Trendlewood Way is a better site (40 dwellings) • No justification for housing number-should be greater • Availability fro development not certain

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Represents policy about face by NSC • Will adversely affect otters, bats, wild birds. Tree lines and hedgerows are used as foraging routes. • Question need for employment when vacancies are high on the Blackfriars and Southfield Road
NA3: Trendlewood Way, Nailsea	<p>5 responses have been received objecting to various aspects of the policy. Landowners Brunel Care and St Peters Hospice claim no justification for community uses and contrary to DM40 to allocate retirement homes. Market housing is a more appropriate use. Some reference to protecting wildlife should be added and the addition of a convenience store on the site would be useful.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A convenience store would be a useful addition to the site • 14 new retirement homes are not needed-will exacerbate the population imbalance in Nailsea • Reference to a church in the policy is unnecessarily prescriptive, should just say “community uses” • Wording should be added to policy to recognise ecological constraints 'development should be permitted subject to an ecological survey of the site as necessary, making provision for mitigation and compensation measures as appropriate as outlined in DM9.' • No justification for community uses (and type of uses inappropriate in this location) and 14 retirement units not viable (also contrary to DM40 as not accessible to shops and services). • Better suited to family housing as within walking distance of schools • It has not been demonstrated the land at North West Nailsea is the most sustainable alternative to other options including this site. • No justification for allotments in this location • Should be allocated for open market housing
PH1: Portishead town centre	<p>5 comments have been received. Two objecting to some aspects of the policy and three in support. Divided over Town Centre expansion</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2x Support extension to Portishead Town centre • 1x object, will weaken the High Street, not encourage quality, do nothing for vacant units, not support independent retailers • Support inclusion of train station • Need more jobs in Portishead

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more car parking • Fix High Street pavements
PH2: Old Mill Road, Portishead	<p>There have been 6 responses, four objecting to the principle of change of use from employment, one unrelated to the change of use and another supporting the principal but wanting more flexibility in the alternative uses. There is a general concern among respondents over the re-allocation from employment to other town centre uses.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4x Object to loss of Old Mill Road for employment • Support improved linkages which will be created between high Street and dockside/Ashlands • Drainage and operational access to the watercourse need clarification through site specific FRA • Support designation however the wording “to compliment not compete with the High Street” should be removed • The wording “a mix of <i>bars/restaurants/cafes, leisure, tourist uses with potential for residential and offices users on upper floors</i>” should be removed to allow as much flexibility as possible
PH3: Proposed railway stations and transport infrastructure for the Portishead to Bristol railway line.	<p>144 representations have been received. Opinions are strongly divided between support and objection to the line in principle. Of the options, option 1 is the most popular with Option 3 being the most strongly opposed. Whilst there is some objection in principle to the railway the majority of the opposition is levelled at Option 3 (north of Moor Farm). There was no support for this option and 25 specific objections. The main reasons for objection were impact on adjoining residents due to noise and extra traffic, also green belt site and intrusion into countryside, more of a park and ride which would generate more traffic movements instead of reducing them. This is in contrast to the 75 respondents who support Option 1 (Harbour Road). Main reasons for supporting Option 1 are closer proximity to centre of population, town centre and marina facilities, fewer residential properties to impact on. Option 2 was raised 20 times as being the most pragmatic solution given the cost of providing an over bridge for Option 1. There was considerable support amongst the Option 1 supporters for pressurising Network Rail into accepting a level crossing solution.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Railway line is not needed since improvements to Jn19 • Should investigate a bus based service which takes people where they want to go! • Temple Meads is not the main commuting destination for residents of Portishead • Removal of the current footpath across the railway will encourage more people to drive rather than

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>walk to school/shops etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should perhaps consider siting the station at Portbury where a platform already exists (makes as much sense as Option 3) <p>Option 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the most logical as closer to the town centre, therefore more central for commuters and closer to attractions for day trippers etc • Over bridge too intrusive and expensive –underpass? • Bridge is an unfortunate but necessary expense for safety reasons • Strong opinion that Network Rail should be pressured into providing a level crossing instead of bridge as train speeds will be very slow here anyway, close to the end of the line • In general option 2 is cited as the next preferred option if 1 is discounted on costs grounds. • Would cause unacceptable increase in traffic in what is already becoming a congested area <p>Option 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicts with schools and dwellings and will have most impact on adjacent residents • Parking congestion in nearby streets • Too unsafe having car park on opposite side of main road to station <p>Option 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposed as encroach into surrounding countryside and impact on adjacent residents through noise, vibration and increased traffic. • Wyndham Way is already a bottleneck for peak hour traffic, which would be exacerbated with traffic coming from Clevedon to use the station • Green belt-other non-green belt sites exist • Unsustainable location • Doesn't meet requirements of the brief • Parking congestion in nearby streets • Too far from centre of Portishead for visitors and will result in more car based access to station • Potential for extension to Clevedon? • Increase in crime will result (thieves using “end of line” station to ride in commit crime and ride out) + graffiti and vandalism. • Object to station site off Portbury Dock Road because of access, unacceptable amount of land take

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	and lack of justification
Y1: Yatton Station, Yatton	<p>3 representations were received. General support</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that 200 car parking spaces is a net increase in provision, existing provision is approx 150 spaces. Should be reworded and the 200 omitted. Supportive of the other criteria • Subject to no adverse impact on the SRN the Highways Agency has no objection and in principle supports the development which allows easy access to other forms of transport to the car. • Could this be an opportunity to co-ordinate the train and bus timetable? • Is it too small a station to operate a park and ride facility?
W1: Woodborough Farm, Winscombe	<p>33 representations were received. The majority of local respondents who commented on the Plan object to the development of the site emphasising traffic, access and flooding/drainage issues. Some object in principle whilst others suggest mitigation measures for the various constraints or issues. There is some recognition for the need for affordable housing but some question the demand for employment uses. The Parish Council support limited growth within the settlement boundary. The owners of the site also question the employment allocation and suggest the allocation should be more than 100 units.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council - Limited growth within the settlement boundary is supported (as published in the Parish Plan Report 2010, recommendations 17, 18, 19 & 21) due to evidence of an ageing population and to contribute to a better balance of low density housing stock for the parish. Should the Woodborough Farm site be developed as a mixed use site for up to 100 homes, traffic calming measures flood risk assessment and sewage improvements would be necessary as part of any proposal. • Some support due to being the most sustainable site in Winscombe - needs flexibility over uses and further investigation. The site is within a Service village and Settlement boundary. Owner confident that constraints to development can be mitigated. Seek removal of the employment allocation, 100 housing units is not effective use of land, too low a density - suggest 100-160. • <u>Traffic</u> Concern about the increase in traffic and impact on safety. Access to Bristol and Weston an issue with hold ups at Banwell and on to the A38. Particular issues on Church Road which is used as a rat-run and has a lack of pavements. Suggested that traffic calming needed or that Church Road should only be used as vehicular access for a limited number of houses. Needs wide pavements. Main access would be to Banwell Road which is narrow and busy and would require highway improvements. Construction and commercial traffic an issue as weight limits are in force locally and the bridge restricts

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>traffic. Highway Agency – no measurable detrimental impact on the SRN due to relatively small scale nature of development and distance from M5 junctions. Sound transport evidence will be required as part of the planning application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Access</u> Question whether access is wide enough for two way traffic • <u>Flooding and drainage</u>. Considerable concern about flooding and drainage, existing drainage is not working and there are sewage issues -A comprehensive drainage scheme is essential to prevent any future flooding of the site or surrounding area needed before development takes place. Environment Agency- located within flood zone 1 if the sites are greater than 1hectare then a specific FRA considering surface water drainage is required. • <u>Employment uses</u> Some objection to the employment use –small industrial units would be unacceptable. Is there evidence of demand for these units? Not suitable for business due to weight restrictions on commercial traffic in the area. Others recognise employment is needed so long as restricted to B1. • <u>Impact on local services</u> The effect of an additional 100+ houses on the village primary school and the health centre (already at capacity) would need to be taken into consideration. Lack of services in the village especially school and pre school places to support a development of this size and already lack of parking in the village. Additional facilities would need to be provided as necessary. Inadequate public transport • <u>Loss of open space</u> Unfortunate to lose a large open space. It is a valued green area and can be viewed from the Mendips, will impact on the AONB. Loss of amenity, wildlife, heritage and agricultural value. Additional wording in the policy required to recognise the ecological constraints • <u>Housing</u> Question the need for the number of houses suggested. Density is not in keeping with the village, need for plenty of open green space. Should be a phased release so as to not swap the community. Affordable housing is desperately needed - not executive homes. Need to guarantee a high percentage of housing would be truly affordable. Houses should be sustainable and some big enough to work from home. Some should be reserved for people with local connections. Design should be a maximum two storey, with materials complementary to surrounding area. • <u>Community uses</u> Not sure about community uses other than amenity space. Need for allotments. • <u>Landscaping and footpaths</u> Existing hedges and trees retained and the public footpaths across the site retained. A substantial landscaping belt needs to be provided around the site. Need path to join with the Strawberry line plus link from Strawberry line to the village school, and cycle link with Churchill school • <u>Other</u> • Where will all the extra people work? Will increase dormitory nature of village

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devalue properties in the Lynch and Church Road • The two sites shown on the proposals map (mixed use and housing) should be treated as one thus permitting employment and community uses to be clustered on the main road. The relationship between the two sites should be recognised so that one does not prejudice development of the other. • The proposed allocation of the builders' yard should include two small additional areas • An alternative or complimentary site to Woodborough Farm is proposed at Wells Close.
BL1: Bleadon Quarry, Bleadon	<p>10 representations were received relating to this policy. No overall objection to this policy, but some points of detail objected to. Some wholly supportive comments.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection (from landowner) to specifying number of dwellings in policy, and request that policy reads: “To secure mixed use allocation including residential, employment and community uses on this existing site, with the appropriate balance of uses to be addressed via the development control process”. It is premature to specify housing number at this stage: a higher number seems likely. A full marketing exercise has shown zero interest for employment use with only interest being for residential use. We intend to hold public consultation events to take account of views of Bleadon’s residents which will inform the site layout. It is anticipated a planning application will be lodged before the end of 2013. • Proposals brought forward should have to include protection of landscape character • Suggest the retention of stone-built quarry building at entrance to site, which contributes to historic character and interest • Request protection of the property “The Poplars” (old village Police House) on Bridge Road, for its historic character • Suggest development is brought forward in accordance with a masterplan prepared in conjunction with the local community • Localised issues with foul and surface water drainage would need to be addressed, and policy should require measures to ensure surface and foul water drainage arrangements are adequate for existing and proposed uses on Bridge Road • Policy wording should be amended to require employment and community uses which are “appropriate and in character to a residential neighbourhood”. • Policy wording should require measures to protect and enhance the biodiversity value of the adjacent wildlife site • Support for proposed settlement boundary

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dedicated community space should be included in any development • Local infrastructure will be key issue and should include: provision of pavement and possible widening of Bridge Road, and major road works to improve safety of vehicles and pedestrians at A370 Bridge Road/Bleadon Mill junction. • Will the 2005 Bleadon Village/Parish Plan be also used as consultation material for the Sites and Policies plan process? • Is a referendum needing 50% of the electorate needed for a specific development plan like Bleadon Quarry under the Localism Act? Are potential developer presentations to the public considered referendums? • There are no reasons why a mixed use development should not include commercial properties with housing. Suggest incorporating a nature reserve theme with small art and craft studios, community café and leisure areas with seating and perhaps small pond. • Concerned at loss of employment land, contrary to policy CS20: the site should remain principally as an employment opportunity and be protected as such, although the use may need to change from the current B2 class for tile manufacture. • If the site is over a hectare a specific flood risk assessment will be required • Support the proposal for a maximum of 25 dwellings
Schedule 1: Proposed sites for residential development	<p>There were a total of 7 responses, some of which were duplicated in other sections. The identification of additional sites for housing and that the need to review the Core Strategy housing numbers makes work on the Schedule largely abortive</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clevedon Town Council requested that part of the Clevedon Hall estate be included as a residential site • Request for the Car Import Site in Cleeve be identified as a housing site and also South West Nailsea • Some questioned the wisdom of proceeding with the plan whilst the Core Strategy housing figures are still to be determined through examination • One respondent suggested that if plan was to proceed the housing capacity figures in Schedule 1 should be seen as a minimum
Schedule 2: Sites for employment development	<p>There were 5 responses in total. Some additional sites were put forward and the need to revisit the schedule when the Core Strategy housing numbers are confirmed.</p>

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If housing numbers increase in Churchill/Langford – then the area will need further employment opportunities • Need for exiting employment sites to be better utilised through offices rather than warehousing • Clevedon Town Council suggested inclusion of the following existing employment sites; Sawmill Old Street, Teignmouth Road; TAD Industrial Site ParnellRoad/Kenn Road; Tesco Kenn Road; Asda Strode Road. • Schedule will need to be fully re-examined after the Core Strategy housing target is modified
Schedule 3: Mixed use development	<p>A total of 8 responses received. There were some specific site issues raised, one suggested new site in Clevedon and the need to revisit the schedule when the Core Strategy housing numbers have been finalised.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge Farm, Bristol Road WsM could be extended to include the adjacent proposed station car park site • Trendlewood Way Nailsea – specifying a church use is too specific • Requested deletion of the NW Nailsea site • Moor lane, Backwell – extent of employment element will only become once further detailed work undertaken, Suggest a maximum of 1 hectare • Suggest inclusion of the following existing mixed use site – Gas Works Moor Lane Clevedon • National Grid request that the detailed wording for N W Naisea is revised to reflect the proposed infrastructure works on the WPD and N Grid lines • Concern regarding North West Nailsea traffic issues • Schedule will need to be revisited when revised Core Strategy housing target is known
Schedule 4: Proposed sites for community facilities	<p>A total of 5 responses were received. A number of specific site issues were raised.</p> <p>Main points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nailsea TC suggested a number of additional areas which have been considered under Local Green Space • Strategic Open Space not required at NW Nailsea if site not required for development • Need for the safeguarding of land adjacent to, or in close proximity to, schools for recreational use. In

Policy/Site	Summary of responses
	<p>particular within Backwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain Millcross Clevedon as a Health Care site • Strategic Open Space in Tickenham is no longer required due to provision of new facilities at the school
Schedule 5: Proposed local green space	No comments received
Schedule 6: Proposed strategic cycle routes	4 comments were received on Schedule 6, 1 in support and 3 additional comments. See DM25 for main points raised.
Schedule 7: town, district and local centres	<p>2 responses received. One letter of support and another seeking clarification.</p> <p>Main points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas listed in Schedule 7 need to be checked against the proposals map to ensure they are coterminous. • Support for the identification of a local centre in Backwell on the Proposals Map and in Schedule 7.
Glossary	<p>1 representation was received.</p> <p>Main point:</p> <p>For clarification please note the suggestion in the Glossary that all National Nature Reserves (NNR) are also Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is not strictly correct, although there is often a strong correlation the boundaries do not always coincide, for example a small part of Gordano Valley NNR is not within a SSSI.</p>

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

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

Please contact 01934 426 816



For further information please contact

Planning Policy

North Somerset Council, Somerset House, Oxford Street, Weston-super-Mare, BS23 1TG

E-mail: planning.policy@n-somerset.gov.uk

Tel: 01934 426 816