The Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) 2018, now submitted for examination, contains proposals for four new communities at Banwell, Churchill, Nailsea and Backwell.

Last year North Somerset carried out some early consultation aimed at ‘generating ideas’ for these new villages and communities. Work has now commenced on the new Local Plan which will provide more detailed policies.

The Local Plan Issues and Options consultation is from 3 September - 10 December 2018. As part of this consultation process workshops are being held with representatives from the local communities where the Strategic Development Locations are proposed. The workshops are focusing on the key principles and place-making elements for these areas which can then be further considered and refined through the Local Plan.

This report sets out the feedback from the discussion at the Banwell workshop.

**Session 1: Hopes and Fears**

**Hopes:**

- Provision of starter homes.
- Provision of facilities and amenities, shops, medical and community benefits.
- Traffic calming measures in place to avoid congestion in existing village.
- Infrastructure will be in place first – not housing first.
- That employment will actually be delivered. Good to have a mix of employment types but concern over impact of distribution type development on AONB.
- Better public transport
- Historic Banwell becomes a diverse vibrant village with more shops and employment
Fears:

- Congestion won’t be alleviated with current Bypass proposals – one potential solution put forward was that the smaller section of scheme south of A368 should not connect to A368 but should bridge over and connect direct onto Bypass in order to prevent vehicles accessing village centre, WSM/ J21 bound.
- Fear of ‘rat-running’ on local road network.
- Concern over no funding for bypass – what happens then?
- Similarly, what if no J21a – will this contribute to ‘rat-running’ J21 bound?
- Concern over impacts on Sandford if Sandford and Churchill bypass not delivered – no current prospect for funding. Will there be greater traffic impacts upon Sandford?
- Proper landscape character assessment not being completed which includes Sandford and impacts on the AONB
- Impact upon AONB including light pollution.
- Impact upon bats.
- Need to assess employment led opportunities
- Getting more development than the JSP allocation
- Disruption during construction
- Gap between Banwell and new garden village will get developed
- Local centre is key to creating community
- What happens if the Bypass doesn’t come – no road, no development?
- What if J21a doesn’t come – continued adverse impacts on local roads and J21.

Session 2: Discussion of scenarios

General points:

- Outdated thinking on Green Belt
- Should avoid development on flood zone.
- 2036 is too short-term in relation to thinking about large-scale growth
- Crucial to have facilities provided with development.
- What is the role of Banwell in the future? How will the village centre function?
- Considered necessary to retain the separate identity of Banwell and the new garden village as two distinct settlements. The green gap considered key to achieving this and the consideration of policy mechanisms to secure it e.g. Strategic Gap.
• The employment area at the motorway junction needs to consider the types of employment.

Scenarios:

• Strategic green gap all the way around Banwell between new development considered critically important. The potential uses of this land was considered e.g. recreation, leisure or maintained as is. **There was general consensus on this principle with all three tables feeding back the same point.**
• Do need good links between the new and existing settlement including walking and cycling.
• Extending northwards as per the Alternative Scenario is considered perhaps more challenging e.g. due to topography and other features however was considered to offer the potential for imparting additional character
• Not extending further north has the potential to put pressure on the need to develop closer to Banwell.
• A counter view to developing further to the north on higher ground is the potential for impact upon the AONB due to greater visibility.
• New development should be distinct in character from the historic village
• There should be no development south of the Grumble Pill rhyne

Session 3: Discussion of key development priorities and principles.

• Community/ social aspects of new development considered of critical importance. Provision of shops, community space, recreation space including outdoor space considered important to achieving this and offering opportunities to meet. Not just about the physical space but the uses also important. Design should encourage social interaction.
• Think about people
• How can new development support existing services?
• A community centre and pub considered priorities to nurture community spirit.
• An ‘organic’ layout/ growth pattern considered beneficial to support walking and cycling and to reduce impact of cars. Principle of ‘walkable neighbourhoods’ and being able to access facilities by means other than the car.
• Need to future proof development for future technological change around electric vehicles, reduced car ownership, more homes working etc. Important link to approach to parking within development. Some views that not so much parking would be required; others that parking is important particularly its design.
Caution over well-intentioned parking ideas that do not work in practice with potential to lead to uncontrolled on-street parking.

- Estate roads need to be wide enough to get large vehicles along them.
- There needs to be a mix of types and sizes of housing. Genuinely mixed together.
- Principle of re-purposing land to adapt to changing requirements over time. This was raised specifically in the context of the parking debate however can be applied more generally. Suggestion of allowing for future expansion, retention of open spaces within village to meet future needs.
- Adequate provision must be made for residential and visitor car parking.
- Future of Wolverhill Road – will the local centre work on this route as shown or does the nature of this route need to change?
- Green space important including gardens and useful green space but maintenance a key issue. A view that large green open spaces are more useful than smaller, piecemeal provision and should allow for informal activities e.g. walking and cycling.
- That higher densities are supported so long as well designed in order to avoid rural sprawl. Higher density could force better quality need interesting streets and buildings which are a pleasure to look at.
- Support for a mixed approach to housing (styles, types, diversity) rather than just standard housebuilder models. Something to meet different needs. How can we influence different and innovative housing models/products? Suggestion of 10% allowance for self-build.
- Bus connections to Bristol as important as to WSM. Consideration of subsidy to support. Need links to Worle station. Worle Station needs to be developed as a genuine Parkway Station with bus and cycling links.
- How can we avoid creating dormitory settlements? Part of the answer in the mix of uses and employment to try and support self-sufficiency.
- Energy efficiency and energy self-sufficiency an important aspect. Development as a whole including housing needs to be energy efficient. A suggestion of considering a solar farm on land between the M5 and Summer Lane to support this principle.
- Separate identity an important principle to retain.
- Historic core of the village of Banwell important.
- Who is responsible for future maintenance of assets within the development?
- NSC opportunity to buy land at the developments to support delivery. Provides ability to dictate quality, and development mix etc. Profits of development can be put back into development. NSC could be a not-for-profit land owner and only sell on to small developers and self-builders who guarantee to built to NSCs extremely high-quality benchmarks.
- Link to Worle station important to support rail use.
• What does a good Garden Village look like? Learn from past experience. Can we explore the good and bad elements of early garden villages to learn lessons?
• Employment should be an eclectic mix. Not only at J21a but throughout the development. Distribution centres would have a harmful impact on the AONB.

Miscellaneous

• Not appropriate to plan without the JSP in place
• Pleased the secondary school is being considered
• Need to understand the lessons learnt from existing garden villages
• These focussed consultations events should not be at the expense of wider consultation.
• Strong policies to ensure minimal development in existing Banwell - tight settlement boundary. Draft plan for village future should revive historical infrastructure.