

Appendix 5

Scenario: the case against development being pushed through

The site allocations in the SHLAA appear to be influenced in part by avoidance of urban extensions; these extensions may be included later in the plan period through review of the plan as a response to failing policies.

However, B&NES has encountered problem after problem in its efforts to deliver the RAD1 site and delivery could still fall at the mitigation hurdle or not satisfy the three tests for derogation when it comes to need for a licence for conversion of the Brunel Shed or loss of connectivity to a roost (eg the Victoria Hall roost). Delivery of the RAD.1 site and delivery of other Radstock Town Centre sites are linked through the regeneration case, roll-over funding, and provision by the HCA and B&NES of the road infrastructure to enable the RAD 1 development and further town centre developments to take place. The road proposals are based upon incomplete 2009 turning survey data that produced data for flows that was then manipulated in order to present figures that added up, but did not include turning data from a major junction and appears to have produced a traffic flow analysis that is incorrect.

Although B&NES claims to have HCA funding secured for affordable housing, Radstock Action Group has challenged the Authority regarding evidence that this is the case (Day 6 of the Inquiry), and B&NES has claimed to have secured funding in the past without funding ultimately being released or development going ahead. Should the national financial crisis worsen, HCA funding may be slashed again. Radstock was one of the 'losers' last time round, being offered a much reduced amount. Bellway Homes wqalked on the basis that sufficient public funding was unlikely to come forward. HCA funding is not awarded for developments without permission and it has been argued by Somerset Valley Friends of the Earth and Cam Valley Wildlife Group that the rules governing extensions for permission will not allow permission for extension of the outline of the outline on the grounds that it will not be able to jump the hurdles of the stipulation that the same development must be considered, but as if it were a new one. We consider it unlikely that a new proposal could be worked up and work started on site by 1st April, which we think is the only way to actually secure funding for 2012/13.

Similarly, the release of funding for the road depends on surety of build, which must be achieved before the start of the next financial year. Radstock Cabinet members have assured the people of Radstock publicly that the road will not go ahead unless the houses are going ahead, which means, if B&NES sticks to its word, that full permission for all three phases of the RAD 1 development would be required by March in order that work on the roads would be assured and funding released to implement those works. It is clear from the SHLAA that this timing is out of the question.

The B&NES plan for Radstock has a strong political element, but the political make-up of the Authority may change within the plan period, which is another risk to delivery of the *catalyst* RAD1 site.