

accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.

Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.

The objection raises no new issues warranting a

Modification: M/B9/38 - Modifications to GDS.1/NR2 - Radstock Railway Land

<p>Ref: 3780/J1</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Bath</p>	<p>Having lived next to this site for over 40 years, I agree with the inspector's report that more weight should be given to nature conservation value of the site and concludes that the site should deliver NOT more than 50 dwellings during the plan period. Given these reasons for ecology she states that this site should now be considered as a greenfield site ref section 7.123 and section 5.92. I strongly object to the proposed modification.</p>	<p>The Inspector accepts that the site should be developed and should remain as an allocated site under policy GDS.1 but that this should be limited due to ecological interests. She recommended that areas of significant nature conservation interest are retained, with a scheme for their management and the mitigation of any effects of development; together with a programme for compensation where the loss of areas of ecological importance cannot be avoided.</p> <p>The Council has accepted the Inspector's recommendation but allows for a greater level of development provided the site requirements are met, including the ecological requirements.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 2686/J30</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>My client's comments relate specifically to the proposed modifications to Policy NR2 of the Local Plan, which relates to a 4.8ha site known as Radstock Railway Land, Norton Radstock. The Local Plan Inspector concluded within her report on the basis of the sites apparent ecological importance that it can no longer be considered as a brownfield opportunity and therefore development on this site should be limited to 50 dwellings. My client does not support the Inspector's ruling as the site was originally allocated to accommodate development in excess of 100 units and could not be considered to be Greenfield on the evidence before her. A joint position statement was drafted and agreed between the Council and my client on this point and was presented as a Joint Position Statement to the Inquiry, a copy of which is attached to this letter for your information.</p> <p>We support the Council in their recommendations that the site is a brownfield opportunity, which has been supported by documentary evidence in relation to contamination and the extent of the remaining industrial structures and railway infrastructure on the site, which substantiates the brownfield classification of the site. This evidence is before the Council in the current planning application for this site 061028801E0UT and is further supported by PPS3 Appendix B, the definition of previously developed land. It is therefore considered by my client that the site presents an important opportunity to implement a mixed use scheme, comprising excess of 100 residential units, which would not only contribute to the Council meeting its development targets but also make more efficient use of a derelict and vacant site in accordance with national, regional and local policy.</p> <p>PPS3 Housing advocates the need for local planning authorities to support development, which maximises the use of previously developed sites, particularly when they are located within highly accessible urban locations. It is therefore considered that this site presents an important and sustainable development opportunity for Norton Radstock and the Council should seek to maximise the benefits of this site.</p> <p>Therefore whilst we welcome in part the Council's support and policy wording for the redevelopment of the site, we do not consider that any credible evidence has been presented to result in the quantum of development on the site being reduced from in excess of 100 to 50 units. On that basis my client objects to the proposed modifications and would recommend that the quantum of development proposed for the site should be reinstated to the original allocation of development i.e. in excess of 100 units, which would be reflective of national, regional and local planning guidance in relation to maximising the use of previously developed land</p>	<p>The Council's modification reflects that the fact that the actual capacity of the site is being determined through the work associated with the Planning application & the accompanying Masterplanning work. On the basis of the information available at the LPI, the Inspector reached her conclusion that the site's capacity is at least 50 dwellings but she accepted that it could be higher. The Council has retained this site as a General Development Site but accepts ecological interests need to be addressed. The Local Plan allocates the site for 50 dwellings but makes provision for substantially more if shown to be acceptable.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3126/J213</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>sites within urban locations.</p> <p>Support Inspector's wording at point 2. Reason: More in accordance with the desires of the local community, now confirmed by town vote which should take precedence over the Quango-pushed scheme.</p>	<p>The Council accepted the recommendation with qualification. The Council's reasoning is set out in the SOD reproduced below;</p> <p>The Inspector recognises the importance of the site for regeneration of Norton Radstock (para 5.94) but at the same time she recognises that the site is locally important for nature conservation (para 5.91). Probably because of the information available to her at the Inquiry, the Inspector does not recommend a dwelling capacity for the site. Instead she recommends that in order to avoid pressure for the achievement of high numbers of dwellings at the expense of the ecology of the site, that the site be expected to accommodate no more than 50 dwellings during the plan period. She therefore accepts that the site capacity is greater than 50 dwellings (para 5.95) and that the site should be allocated for mixed use development.</p> <p>The Inspector's recommended policy wording also acknowledges that the development is likely to give rise to an unavoidable impact on some areas of ecological importance but that this should be mitigated and compensated for.</p> <p>The development of this mixed-use site is integral to the regeneration of Radstock and entails significant development costs. The benefits and importance of this development are reflected in the Council's 'Radstock Regeneration Principles' approved in May 2006 and in the 'Brighter Futures Community Plan'. The local ecological importance of the site is also recognised and well documented. The existing ecological interest of the site will change in the long term, with certain species and habitats likely to decline unless supported by a management regime. It is likely however that the site could in future retain significant ecological value even without management, although this interest would be different to that currently present. The Inspector has explicitly adopted a precautionary approach in relation to housing provision on the basis of the need to resolve ecological issues. The Inspector states that 50 dwellings is not intended as an absolute limit on development capacity but explicitly recognises that the capacity of the site is higher.</p> <p>On this basis, it is proposed that the Inspector's recommendations are accepted but with the proviso</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3201/J11</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>As you are aware the redevelopment of this site has been being progressed for a number of years by the Norton Radstock Regeneration Company (NRRC). The South West RDA have previously supported the planning application that was submitted for the redevelopment of this site, and I attach a copy of our comments for your information. The support for this application justifies the South West RDA's objection to the modifications proposed by the Council. These are detailed further in the objection submitted by GVA Grimley on behalf of the NRRC.</p>	<p>in the policy which reflects the inspector's comments that the residential capacity of the site could be greater than 50 dwellings. Policy GDS.1/NR2 and the preamble in para B7.30 will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Support for NRR planning application noted. The response to the objection from Norton Radstock Regeneration is relevant and is reproduced below;</p> <p>"The Council's modification reflects that the fact that the actual capacity of the site is being determined through the work associated with the Planning application & the accompanying Masterplanning work. On the basis of the information available at the LPI, the Inspector reached her conclusion that the site's capacity is at least 50 dwellings but she accepted that it could be higher. The Council has retained this site as a General Development Site but accepts ecologically interests need to be addressed. The Local Plan allocates the site for 50 dwellings but makes provision for substantially more if shown to be acceptable."</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 3257/J315</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We put forward the view at the Public Inquiry that what we would like to see is further public money invested in the Radstock project in order to allow for a financially viable limited development that brings forward benefits for the town whilst ensuring that planning policies on Natural Environment are not breached. That NRR have pursued the proposal for massive development of the site indicates that the SW RDA are not prepared to add funding in order to facilitate this. We therefore feel that the inspector's view, that development that includes about 50 dwellings should be reviewed. We believe that the council has an interest in seeing the NRR/Bellway proposal come forward and be granted permission, and we are concerned that the policy modifications proposed are designed to enable this proposal to be brought forward without being a departure from the Local Plan. We believe that the policy is severely weakened by the proviso suggested by the council and that the wording as it remains is not sufficiently robust to prevent the developers from claiming that their development is in line with Local Plan policies. We believe that if the application is granted it will be in breach of natural environment policies, but that councillors may not have sufficient understanding of ecology to realise that the developers' claims are incorrect. Further we believe that there is new evidence in the NRR/Bellway EIA and elsewhere that supports the view that a development that has any significant housing element will have an unacceptable effect on congestion, air quality, the local economy and the quality of life of Radstock residents and will be contrary to planning policy at various levels. We believe that, in order that there can be no ambiguity about the extent of land required for a Nature Reserve that would preserve the ecological value, that the NR2 site should be expanded to include the whole of the Foxhills field, and the area reserved for a Nature Reserve within it clearly marked on the proposals map. We believe that the information provided within the EIA should be sufficient to determine the extent of this area. We believe that the requirement for a comprehensive mixed-use scheme should be restricted to a very limited area of the</p>	<p>The Council has considered the Inspector's recommendations and has modified the Local Plan policy as recommended, including the site's capacity for the Plan period but with one caveat relating to the capacity. Even this caveat is drafted to ensure that ecological and other interests are taken into account. The SVFoE submitted evidence to the Inquiry but are now seeking substantial amendments to what was recommended by the Inspector. The Council considers that the modified policy provides a robust policy for the determination of planning proposals for the site.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the current planning application have been forwarded to the Council's Development Control Team.</p>	No change.

site. This would allow ecological works to be conducted on the Nature Reserve that would prepare the site for the impact of development of the mixed use scheme. Without this clear demarcation, uncertainty over which parts should be developed could lead to ecological losses and difficulties in putting forward sound mitigation suggestions. This has already happened on this site. A further advantage of this approach is that there would be a built in capacity for the mitigation for the effect of the development of the mixed-use area through a contribution to the costs of maintaining the Nature Reserve, possible enhancement of or extension of it or management of part of the Sustrans route beyond it.

1 The lack of management work in an area that may have been developed led to the almost total loss of one of the most extensive Fine-leaved Sandwort colonies on the site. That area is now being used, ironically, for an artificially created mitigation plot to which fine-leaved Sandwort is being translocated (mitigation for total loss of the remaining main colony). The substrate may well now be unsuitable for the plant, and translocations of plants routinely fail after an initial period where they seem to be doing well. The mitigation measure proposed is unlikely to be sound and no nature conservation organisation has any confidence in it. The remaining natural colony is in an area that is now proposed for development, and the plant is threatened with elimination from the site. Management of an existing stable colony would have been mitigatory in nature.

We propose the following changes to the policy.

NR2. RADSTOCK RAILWAY LAND, NORTON-RADSTOCK

Development Requirements:

1. A Nature Reserve over the bulk of the site, retaining the track bed and associated features, river corridors, cutting and meadow.
2. Retention (with relocation if necessary) within the site of engine shed and nearby turntable for heritage and community use.
3. Safeguarding the former railway corridor as a sustainable transport corridor under Policy T.9, and incorporating the National Cycle Network where this is compatible with the safeguarding of trackbed which is of significant nature conservation value.

Mixed use scheme on the remainder of the site, including:

1. (Leisure, residential, employment and community uses with retail uses within the Town Centre Shopping area.) Retail employment, tourism and community use.
2. (About 100 dwellings) Up to 20 dwellings in the period to 2011.
3. (Provision of amenity and public open space)
4. (Safe access to the site for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles)
5. (Provision for safe movement of public transport service vehicles within the site and provision for a public transport interchange)
6. Safeguarding the former railway corridor as a sustainable transport corridor under Policy T.9, and incorporating the National Cycle Network where this is compatible with the safeguarding of trackbed which is of significant nature conservation value.
7. (Preparation and implementation of programme of ecological compensation and a management plan. Identification of areas of significant nature conservation interest) effects of development; together with a programme for compensation where the loss of areas of ecological importance cannot be avoided.
8. (Remediation of potential land contamination)
9. Relocation or retention of Victoria Square public toilets.
10. (Relocation of the War Memorial).
- 10.a (Retention ((with relocation if necessary)) within the site of engine shed and

nearby turntable for heritage, educational and community use)
 11. Allowance for the management of the area for the benefit of the nature conservation value of the Nature Reserve until such time as the mixed-use area is developed.
 (Those in brackets have been crossed out in the original form)

Ref: 3257/J320

Location Radstock
 Railway Land
Norton Radstock

The Inspector recommends further sites in Norton Radstock for housing allocation. She also recommends allocation of housing to existing sites, including Radstock Railway Land. In the light of the development put forward by NRR since the Public Inquiry, studies undertaken for NRR, the requirements of the RSS, and new information on pollution levels in the town, we believe that the capacity of Norton Radstock and Paulton for housing must now be reviewed downwards and that the capacity for dwellings of Radstock Railway Land reviewed.

The studies that have been undertaken by B&NES and for NRR are insufficient to demonstrate that Norton Radstock is a town capable of becoming self-contained. We note that the RSS requires that this is determined through travel studies. We believe that studies that have been done, in combination with Local Plan policies, indicate that Norton Radstock is not capable of self-containment and that any housing development will only serve to increase its role as a commuter town, increase the total travel distances within the authority, encourage reliance on the private car, increase pollution to an unacceptable level within Radstock town centre, increase the total hours of congestion through spread to an unacceptable degree, have a negative effect on local trade, and decrease the quality of life of the residents of the town.

The area has been haemorrhaging jobs and is recognised as having infrastructure that makes it unattractive to business. Although evidence has come to light that indicates that a Heritage Railway from Radstock to Frome is financially viable, the report also indicates that passenger and freight services would not be. A Heritage Railway would rely for viability on volunteer staff, and although providing a number of jobs, would not be producing the sort of numbers that would provide for self-sufficiency. It would not provide the infrastructure attractive to major employers in the short to medium term at least. The Council acknowledges that Radstock needs to concentrate on tourism and environmentally friendly businesses and that there are insufficient services and amenities to serve the present population. This imbalance between homes and jobs/facilities acts against the town playing an adequate role as a centre serving the surrounds. However, the villages in the surrounds are also served by centres such as Bristol, Bath, Shepton Mallet, Frome, Wells, Trowbridge and so on.

Out-commuting levels are high — 78% from Radstock Ward (Census 2001) and high in Norton Radstock as a whole.

See attached sheet for remainder of objection

The evidence put forward in the Environmental Impact Assessment for the NRR planning application and the roundabout study to which the document refers show that the junctions are already at or over capacity and that the new junction proposed for the bottom of Wells Road in Radstock (A 367) will already be at capacity at the start of the development's life. The analysis of predicted pollution levels with and without development is almost certainly an underestimate, as the figures used to choose the modelling system include anomalous readings that should properly be disregarded in any sound statistical analysis. The anomalous figures lower the nitrogen dioxide levels recorded significantly. The figures put forward to show traffic levels on the various roads have not all been accompanied by any studies that show how these figures have been arrived at, and what turning

The Local Plan is required to confirm to the JRSP & RPG10. The RSS does not yet have statutory weight and when it does, it will provide the basis for the new development documents to be prepared as part of the LDF.

No change.

The Somer Valley Friends of the Earth comments on the current Planning application have been forwarded to the Council's development Control Team.

counts have been done have been done at a time of year when there is least traffic on the roads. The origin of some of the traffic data is unclear, but all of the B&NES traffic counts have been undertaken on the periphery of Radstock and have thereby avoided counting a significant amount of internal traffic and local and commuter traffic to Bristol, a major destination. The studies in the EtA paint a picture of an overloaded system that their new road layout will improve, but that their claimed solution is likely to make worse.

The analysis presented in the EIA shows a significant increase in the nitrogen dioxide levels on Frome road (A362) and Wells Road (A367), indicating that further development would cause additional congestion on the roads leading into the town centre. This increase in traffic would result from any development or combination of developments that generated the 502 extra peak time journeys in the centre of Radstock that forms the basis for the NRR analysis (claimed journey generation from 210 dwellings). We believe that the number of dwellings that the NRR land and suggested alternative sites are expected to accommodate should be closely examined with regard to their effect on pollution and congestion in Norton Radstock, and in Radstock in particular.

New developments in towns such as ours display higher levels of car use and larger travel distances than the existing settlements, according to research. Given the high current level of car use, the traditional and characteristic settlement pattern (settlements on the hills and steep valley sides), the poor public transport links to Bristol and Frome, the heavily congested public transport route with no bus lanes into Bath (journey time to central Bath from Radstock centrally a good I - 1 1/2 hours in the mornings — the bus journey is timetabled for less than 1/2 hour) and the lack of investment in walking and cycling infrastructure, it is almost inconceivable that additional development would not exacerbate the existing problems with regard to carbon dioxide emissions and air quality. The Local Transport Plan aims to put resources into Showcase Bus routes, including between Radstock and Bath. However, unless congestion on the route is tackled, which entails queues all the way from Peasedown or Dunkerton into Bath, take-up from as far out as Radstock will be poor. There appear to be no policies in place that would address this issue. A bus route was put in at one time on this route on the Wellsway, Bath, but this was taken out again for legal reasons.

Although there has been investment in the Greenway, linking Radstock and Midsomer Norton, this route is mainly recreational and does not link in to the majority of the industrial, service areas or local schools. There has also been investment in putting in National Cycle Network Route 24. This route will eventually link to NCN 4, which goes up and around Bath, entering from behind, in effect — a long journey that will not be used as a commuter route. It is essentially peripheral to Radstock and unsuitable as a route off which to 'bud' other routes. A more direct route to Bath is being considered, but this sounds like it will be impossibly expensive, involving re-opening railway tunnels. It is an enormous undertaking and at least a long way off.

Development suggested for Norton Radstock appears to be mainly mixed-use development. However, this form of development is usually housing-dominated. We believe that it will cause more problems than it solves in the Norton Radstock area, and cannot be considered to be a 'necessary evil' on the way to self-containment. We feel that this issue needs to be addressed by re-examining the allocations for alternative sites suggested by the Inspector. If other areas generate more sustainable options in terms of, in particular, accessibility to jobs, the area in which the vast majority of annual distance by car lies development should be located

there in preference to the Norton Radstock area.

The Norton Radstock area is attractive to Key workers because house prices are lower and the cost of travel by car is offset by market value savings. In addition, Norton Radstock is seen as a good location for affordable housing, there being less discrepancy between it and market rate housing. Many key workers work shifts, however, and Key Worker dwellings are often, for this reason, multi-car households. We favour the preferential location of Key Workers near to their place of work, and therefore near to Bath and Bristol.

The council wishes to increase the tourist potential of Norton Radstock, a rich resource that presently lies mainly untapped. A proportion of visitors will be from those passing through Radstock on their way from Bath to Wells, Cheddar, Mendips and the Somerset Levels and so on. Radstock has not only a very well preserved industrial heritage, but is also a unique town because of its layout and landscape setting, a setting that is enhanced and made even more distinctive by the grassy and wooded batches in the valleys and on the hills. The very high wildlife and biodiversity value of Radstock Railway Land is of interest to visitors, including for educational visits and although the potential to expand and utilise the biodiversity value of the area has yet to be explored, there is scope for drawing on other wildlife features. Midsomer Norton South Station has been restored and further monies are to be injected to put in a museum. Radstock Railway Land has a significant part to play in promoting the industrial and natural heritage of Radstock, and Radstock already has a much-acclaimed Museum within a stone's throw of it. The 2005 surveys have revealed a number of rare and charismatic species using the Radstock Rail Land site that will aid 'selling' Radstock as a location worth visiting. As the tourism potential of the area is tapped, there is bound to be an increase in visitor traffic that would not have formerly passed through. Given that there is very limited scope for dealing with the congestion problems related to the topography of Radstock and its resulting road layout, and the future importance to the local economy of visitors, we believe that it is important to reduce traffic pressure from other quarters, e.g. housing development. NRR/Bellway have, they claim, proposed an alternative road layout in order to cope with the effect of extra traffic in Radstock town centre. However, this road layout would have an unacceptable effect on local trade, bringing heavy two-way traffic across the front of local shops presently located in a much less busy one-way location, much more attractive to shoppers and visitors. The layout also appears not to have any significant beneficial effect with regard to traffic flow. Any increased flow would in any

Research by Peter Headicar, Reader in Transport, Oxford Brookes University case be likely to encourage through traffic, which local plan transport policy says must be reduced.

The Norton Radstock Regeneration Company has chosen to ignore the advice of the Inspector with regard to its development. This, along with the suggestion that it will not be possible to include 30-35% affordable housing because of the cost of development, suggests that it is not possible to put in a development that is financially viable involving housing on the site. We consider that reports submitted within the EIA for the company's outline application support this view. We feel that the percentage of affordable housing the Authority wishes to achieve would be better served on alternative sites to the NRR site, but that transferring the quota to other brownfield sites in this area should be examined with reference to affordable housing delivery.

<p>Ref: 3298/J99</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>Cam Valley wildlife Group contests the reasoning put forward by Bath & North East Somerset for the proviso to the Inspector's recommendations. We believe that further information has come to light regarding the likely impact of development on the site and the extent of the developable area, which casts doubt on the ability of the site to deliver about 50 dwellings in the plan period. We believe that a re-assessment of the capacity of the site for dwellings is urgently needed and that a precautionary approach should be taken. Our reasons are set out below.</p> <p>1.1. CVWG does not accept the argument put forward by the council that the proviso it has added to the Inspector's recommendations reflects the Inspector's comments.</p> <p>1.2. The council refers, quite wrongly, to the inspector's view that the site is locally important, referring to paragraph 5.91. In that paragraph the Inspector says nothing about local value and states that "the site is clearly of significant importance for nature conservation". She also points out in that paragraph that Wessex Ecological Consultancy considered the site to be of national significance for its invertebrate communities and that her opinion is that no subsequent work has undermined their findings. It would be more correct to say that the Inspector finds no fault with the opinion that the site is of national significance for its invertebrate communities.</p> <p>1.3. The council says that the Inspector accepts in paragraph 5.95, and even "explicitly recognises" that the site's capacity is greater than 50 dwellings. Again, the council is incorrect. She actually says that, "the site be expected to accommodate no more than 50 dwellings in the plan period", and that, "Any higher number of dwellings which may be achieved would count towards the supply of housing land beyond the plan period". What she is accepting is the possibility that a number higher than 50 can be achieved. She further states, in 7.125, "I am satisfied that, with the modifications which I recommend below, clause 1 of the policy sets out an appropriate mix of development that would be desirable on the site. However, the extent to which this could all be achieved must depend on the actual area that can be developed without harm to the areas which are most important to nature conservation, and on the viability of any scheme having regard to the potential costs of decontamination". Contrary to what the council states, the Inspector clearly accepts that the capacity of the site could be below 50, although she obviously expects it not to fall very short of 50, in that she recommends, "About 50..."</p> <p>1.4. With regard to the brownfield issue, the council appears to be suggesting that the Inspector is making a decision regarding the site's status in this regard divorced from the definition in PPG3. However, the Inspector makes it clear that her decision is with regard to the advice in Annex C of PPG3, which is where the definition and its exceptions are laid out! It is clear to Cam Valley Wildlife Group, Buglife and English Nature (see its response to the NRR/Bellway planning application) that the Inspector is correct when she suggests that the site is outside the government's definition of brownfield land.</p> <p>2.1 If the view were to be taken that the site, or parts of the site, qualify as brownfield land, the 'developability' of the site is something that must be reconsidered. The Inspector stresses in her report (5.62) that 'far more work needs to be done to ensure that constrained brownfield allocations are genuinely ready for implementation before any reliance is placed on them to provide for a significant part of the housing land supply... It is only through the allocation of brownfield sites which are genuinely available for development that credibility can be secured in the strategy of giving priority to brownfield first."</p>	<p>The Local Plan modifications regarding this site reflect the Council's consideration of the Inspector's report. He Council has accepted all the Inspector's recommendations for the site but with one caveat on the site's capacity. Even this caveat is drafted to reflect the Inspector's concerns about ecology.</p> <p>The site was considered for designation as a SSI but was not designated, hence the reference to its local importance.</p> <p>The Inspector accepts that the site is 'previously developed land' (in the terms of PPG3). However, she recommends in para 5.92 of her report that the 'major part' of it has become overgrown and the ecological interest 'weigh against' its status as previously developed land. For that reason, her recommended policy wording makes provision for part of the site to be developed and part of the site to be allocated as a nature reserve. Even on this basis she has recommended that the site remains allocated in Policy GDS.1 as a mixed use site to come forward for development before 2011.</p> <p>CVWG's comments on the current planning application have been forwarded to the relevant Development Control Officer.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
---	--	---	-------------------

2.2 We would argue, in the case of Radstock Railway Land, that the actions and opinions of Norton Radstock Regeneration and its development partner and the contents of the EIA accompanying their outline application for a development indicate that there can be no reliance that the site will be developed within the plan period. We consider that there is considerable doubt that any housing can be delivered within the plan period, and that the expected housing allocation for the site should be at least reduced to a much smaller number in order to reduce any overall shortfall. We consider that, therefore, even were the site considered to be a brownfield site, it should not be given priority because its genuine availability for development within the plan period is questionable.

3.1 We assert that it is unlikely that Norton Radstock Regeneration (NRR) will be able to deliver a development in the plan period of a type that would not breach policies on natural environment.

3.2 The developers have put forward, and applied for outline permission for, an unrealistic development proposal that fails abysmally to take into account the constraints to development recognised by the Inspector in her report. It has taken NRR seven years to produce this new proposal (it was NRR who put in the 1999 application), and we have been assured the Planning Director of Bellway Homes, since the outline application was submitted, that Beltway will not consider any development with a smaller development footprint (pers comm. Deborah Porter, meeting with Sue Bridge, Radstock Methodist Church). It is clear that this development footprint is far too large. NRR/Bellway have brought no credible evidence forward in the EIA that accompanies their outline planning application for development that would indicate that it is possible to mitigate or compensate for a development footprint anywhere near this size on this site. This suggests an unwillingness to consider alternatives. NRR appeared to have some difficulty in obtaining a development partner, and we would anticipate that they would encounter even greater difficulty in the future.

3.3 NRR put forward the view at the Public Inquiry into the RDDLP that a development would not be commercially feasible below about a 170-dwelling complement. The material submitted within the EIA on ecology, land remediation, foundations, sewerage requirements, foul water and so on, in combination with the developers' apparent intention to include a lower complement of affordable housing than would be expected from a new development in a market town, suggests strongly that this is the case.

3.4 The company has shown no evidence or made any statements with regard to any attempt to investigate the viability of a scheme based upon the recommendations of the Inspector, who directed NRR to look to concentrate any development on the areas identified by Wessex Ecological Consultancy. This too suggests that they do not feel that it is a commercially viable option. They have not only gone for a development with a large footprint, but have also chosen to retain an access road on the track bed, an area of the site that successive ecological reports have been at pains to point out cannot be developed without significant biodiversity losses. It appears to have been primarily for this reason that the Inspector subjugated any cycle path to the nature conservation value of the route.

3.5 The only option NRR/Bellway consider as an alternative in the EIA is the 'do nothing' scenario, and there is no attempt in the Socio-economic analysis to investigate or quantify any benefit from an alternative involving a nature reserve. Again, this suggests that they do not consider that inclusion of a nature reserve is commercially feasible.

3.6 It is our view that the application will fail to deliver development through either

refusal, Call-in or Judicial Review. In order to present a scheme that is commercially feasible and respects planning policy on natural environment, the company would have to radically depart from the scheme proposed. Given NRR's apparent dogged determination to pursue an unrealistic plan and given the content of the application documents, we consider it unlikely that the company is capable of achieving a radical departure, and therefore delivering an alternative suitable scheme, within the plan period.

4.1 The Inspector states that deliverability of the NR2 requirement is dependant on the area required for nature conservation purposes and the potential costs of decontamination.

4.2 The reports in the EIA suggest strongly that the costs associated with decontamination and foundations will be prohibitive, largely because of the problems of developing a made and contaminated substrate on a site of this nature. The uncertainties and risks associated with this have resulted in the costs remaining unknown and the method to be employed uncertain. However, it is clear to us from the report by Structural Soils Ltd that the option that the developers have elected to use is inappropriate.

5.1 The Inspector gave an indication of which areas were considered the most important to nature conservation in that she stated in 5.9.1, "Although further work has been carried out since that report was prepared, that work does not in my view undermine the findings of the Wessex Ecological Consultancy" and in 7.123, ""The report from Wessex Ecological Consultancy identified three areas which could be developed without significant biodiversity losses given appropriate management of the rest of the site...". The Inspector was furnished with drawings by Wessex from their Mitigation Strategy, that showed clearly the areas that they thought could be developed within a sustainable development framework without significant losses to biodiversity (note that they did not stipulate no loss at all), and without factoring in the full impact of a railway. However, surveys and reports within the EIA for the NRR/Bellway application suggest that the developable area may even be smaller than previously thought, and objectors such as Avon Wildlife Trust further contend that the off-site compensation is unsuitable and inadequate, that the scope for this is limited, and the amount on offer and available is less extensive than the compensation suggested and available in 1999.

5.2 The 2005 surveys and 2006 reports and discussions have revealed the site to be important for further rare species, including an RDB 1 species, plus two new to Britain and a further second British record that are likely to automatically qualify as RDB 1. It therefore qualifies as of International significance (European Important site) using the IEEM guidelines, the criteria recommended by the Government in its Good Practice Guide. RDB 2 and RDB3 species qualify it as of National significance (UK important site) using the guidelines. It is considered by Mike Lush, professional ecologist and entomologist, and by Buglife to be of national importance for its invertebrate value.

5.3 The site is considered by Mike Lush to be of high enough quality to be designated a SSSI and the Invertebrate Report and Impact Assessment (Gibbs 2005) points out that only three sites in the region are known to have higher 'quality' than Radstock Railway Land, all of them large protected nature reserves. We note that English Nature were careful not to rule out the possibility that the site could be designated a SSSI for its overall invertebrate assemblage in its objection to the NRR/Bellway planning application (merely ruling out national importance to one particular invertebrate group, the aculeate hymenoptera, for which it is deemed most valuable). With English Nature on the point of being disbanded, it

would have been inconceivable that the organisation would have considered the site for potential SSSI status. However, it is clear that at least the site has the potential for designation as a SSSI in the future. EN's previous comment, that the site may be of SSSI quality if managed, has not been refuted and still stands.

5.4 NRR/Bellway will claim that the impact of a development such as theirs is acceptable and that in the medium to long term, equal value will be restored. However, they put forward no credible evidence that this is the case. The Invertebrate Survey and Impact Assessment (Gibbs, 2005) lists 10 species that may become locally extinct as a result of their proposed development. The impact of a smaller development is not set out, but the report states, "Should the important areas (Embankment and Trackbed) be destroyed or reduced in area, then some species will be extirpated from the site and potentially the county. Partial development of the site which avoids the most critical area (Trackbed and Embankment would probably do no more than marginal damage". It is important to note, when considering these comments and the comments of others, that the track bed is not the same as the areas narrowly defined as 'track bed habitat' by LDA Design for NRR/Bellway. The track bed extends all the way to the far north tip of the site where it meets the town centre at the A362/A367 junction, and includes land marked inaccurately as hardstanding and paths in the EIA that have become partially or entirely subsumed by grassland or other vegetation. It should be noted that some of the invertebrate B&NES Priority species are dependent on the habitat in the north. The Invertebrate report goes on to say, "The data summarised above clearly highlights the danger that local biodiversity, and potentially even regional and national biodiversity, will be reduced should this site be developed." The invertebrate report highlights the importance of the site in terms of the ecological network, saying, "The populations of some species might range widely over many site in the region but if any one is damaged the population as a whole may become unviable such that

(footnote 1 By which he means the south-west facing cutting)

species can be lost from protected sites, not just the one developed. [example], the tiny colony of *Ceratina cyanea* found at Tucking Mill might be dependent on its viability on the continued existence of the strong colony at Radstock. Thus, if the Radstock colony were reduced to a level that no longer provided occasional dispersing individuals to other colonies, those smaller colonies could disappear". This is only one of the aspects that have not been adequately examined by LDA Design in the EIA for the NRR/Bellway application.

5.5 It could be assumed that a certain level of dwellings can be accommodated on the remaining land and that mitigation and compensation would be possible for a limited proportion of developed trackbed. However, although the invertebrate interest is the primary interest of the site, it is not the only interest. The site qualifies as a Key reptile site and supports a range of other B&NES Priority species, including a number of rare species. The presence of further species of importance, including charismatic species such as otter, native crayfish and Greater horseshoe bat, has increased the value of the site as a biological and community resource.

5.6 The impact of residential development on the site is also now recognised as greater than the impact assumed in 1999 due to the effect on the watercourses, the impossibility of preventing this effect, and the species they are now known to support which are very sensitive to disturbance or stirring up of the river bed.

5.7 Following its appraisal of the application documents, English Nature has endorsed the comments of the Inspector in an objection to the outline planning application. Those comments did not rule out a dwelling capacity below 50, and

took pains to emphasise the necessity to protect areas of nature conservation value and protect the wildlife value of the site. The number of dwellings put forward in 1999 was 88, and the Inspector points out in her report that the ecological issues remained unresolved at that time. It is noticeable that English Nature has not voiced support in its objection for the recommendation of about 50 dwellings.

5.8 The Inspector said that more weight should be given to the nature conservation value of the site in view of the presence of four nationally scarce species of flora and 21 species of nationally rare, scarce or vulnerable invertebrate fauna. The number of scarce, rare and vulnerable species is now considerably higher and there are now at least 100 B&NES Priority Species using the site including 62 invertebrate species of national conservation concern (12 of them Red Data Book species) and a significant number of scarce and rare species that could be entirely dependent on the site at County or even regional level.

5.9 This implies that the conclusions of Wessex must be further revised to take into account the most recent survey data, ecological reports and comments by various organisations including our own on those reports. These casts doubt on the ecological viability of a development of the scale recommended by Wessex Ecological Consultancy, including the viability of residential development in the Foxhills area adjacent to Meadow View.

6.1 Another consideration is the impact of a Railway, which now seems more likely than in 1999 due to the content of a report commissioned by NRR, which indicates the feasibility of a Heritage Railway. A costed proposal, named "Plan B" in the local press, has now been put forward. It does not consider ecology and the costs of mitigation/compensation, but there is a contingency fund included.

Cam Valley Wildlife Group response to proposed modification to Policy GDS
Wessex Ecological Consultancy only factored in the space required for a station and platforms when making their deliberations in 1999 and pointed out that an EIA on the rail proposals themselves should be carried out if an accurate account of effect was to be determined. The consultants warned that the cumulative effects of the development proposed at that time and rail proposals (laying of track and use) could be severe and lead to local extinctions of aculeate hymenoptera. This site is acknowledged by English Nature to be most important for this group.

6.2 We consider it highly likely that if a railway were to be re-opened on the site, there would be little scope for other development other than associated with the railway and nature reserve (which could include retail and employment, community/educational facility and possibly visitor accommodation). The failure to identify suitable off-site mitigation in the last eight years and the opinions of all conservation bodies and reliable ecological consultants strongly suggests that all mitigatory potential within the site must be reserved in order that there is a chance that the negative effects of any heritage rail venture can be mitigated. We are not suggesting that it would be possible to mitigate the effect of the re opening of the railway, neither are we suggesting that it would not be possible — merely that it has not been investigated and that it is necessary to take this constraint into account.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, we assert that it may be the case that Radstock Railway Land can accommodate no housing allocation at all within the plan period, or that such allocation could possibly be restricted to the triangular area adjacent to Frome Road in association with a retail/heritage/educational/visitor facility or with whatever other retail or employment element the site may be able to accommodate in addition. We consider that it may be possible to accommodate further limited

residential development on the Foxhills area adjacent to Meadow View, subject to access via Meadow View and covenants with nature conservation in mind (e.g.. no cats, no honey-bees).

We conclude that a precautionary approach should be taken. We suggest that a housing capacity study is undertaken for the site, using independent advice regarding ecological impacts and taking into account the impact of a re-opened railway and a realistic view of the scope for mitigation and compensation, and that until such time as this has been completed it should not be assumed that Radstock Railway Land can make a contribution to the housing allocation in the Local Plan period. We consider David Gibbs to be as independent a party as you are likely to get – he is unlikely to be biased, as he does have to make a living in consultancy. We consider that his personal experience of this site and extensive knowledge of the area at the county level combined with his extensive experience and expertise as a professional ecologist and entomologist would be most desirable, and possibly invaluable, in this exercise.

Ref: 3300/J13

Location Radstock
Railway Land
Norton Radstock

On behalf of our client, Oval Estates (Bath) Limited, we object to Proposed Modifications M/B 7/26, M/B9/38 and Annex 3 to Chapter 87 (Table 3a) and the associated modification to the Proposals Map which relates to Policy GDS. 1 / NR2 of the Revised Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

The basis of our objection is that the Proposed Modifications do not reflect sufficiently or appropriately the Inspector's findings that the Radstock Railway Land site should be allocated for only 50 dwellings in the period to 2011.

The Inspector's Report into the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Review was published in May 2006. The Inspector considered representations made in support and against the provisions of the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan 2003 which through Policy GDS.1 / NR2 sought to allocate the Radstock Railway Land in Norton Radstock for about 100 dwellings. The Inspector concluded that given the very high ecological importance of this site, and to;

"avoid pressure for the achievement of high numbers of dwellings at the expense of the ecology of the site. . . The site could be expected to accommodate no more than 50 dwellings during the plan period. Any higher number of dwellings which may be achieved would count towards the supply of housing land beyond the plan period" (emphasis added).

As such, the Inspector recommends at R5.16 and R7 that the Council modify the contribution to housing land supply in the period to 2011 from the following allocations: GDS. 1 / NR2 Radstock Railway Land: 50 dwellings

The Council's Proposed Modifications to the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan The Council's Proposed Modifications propose to amend Policy GDS. 1 / NR2 to contribute at least 50 dwellings during the plan period but substantially more provided a robust mixed-use scheme is achieved.,," (emphasis added). We consider that there is a clear and substantial divergence between the recommendation of the Inspector, and the reasoning behind it, and the Proposed Modification to the Plan advocated by the Council. The Proposed Modification is not, therefore, in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation. We consider that the Council's intended actions in regard to the Radstock Railway Land site, and the way that they are presented in the Proposed Modifications, is grossly misleading given the large disparity between the development capacity intended by the Inspector, and which was based on compelling evidence provided by objectors at all stages of the Local Plan Review, and the development capacity which could be facilitated by the altered wording now proposed by Bath and North East Somerset Council.

The Council has accepted the Inspector's recommendation and modified the site's contribution to housing for the Plan period to 50 dwellings. The caveat reflects the fact that the capacity of the site is currently undetermined and it allows for a greater number to come forward in the Plan period IF the concerns raised by the Inspector are addressed. It is clear that the Inspector does not consider 50 dwellings to be the sites' capacity, but a limit for the Plan period.

The objector's concerns that Council's modifications in relation to this site could prejudice housing supply and other allocations are unfounded as the provision made for housing for the Plan period is based on 50 dwellings coming forward on the Railway Land site as recommended by the Inspector.

The modified policy provides a robust basis to consider and conserve the sites ecological interests.

No change.

We do not accept the Council's reasoning for this departure outlined in its Statement of Decisions (November 2006) that the Inspector: Does not identify a dwelling capacity for the site. The inspector most clearly identifies a dwelling capacity at paragraph 5.95 of her report and in her specific recommendations, that no more than 50 dwellings could be accommodated on the site during the Plan period. In arriving at this figure, the Inspector was persuaded by objectors' arguments in respect to the significant nature conservation interests of the site and which, presumably, are not going to diminish once the Plan period has finished,

4.0 Conclusions and Changes Sought

The Council's Proposed Modifications to the Bath and North East Somerset Revised Local Plan in respect to the allocation at Radstock Railway Land does not sufficiently or appropriately reflect the Inspector's Recommendations in respect to the development capacity of this land.

We consider that the revised re-wording of this Policy as now proposed by the Council would have serious adverse implications for the acknowledged ecological values of this site. There can be no justification for departing from the Inspector's recommendation not only because of these ecological considerations, but because there is other and sufficient land elsewhere locally that the Inspector has considered much better suited to meeting the requirements for residential development in Norton Radstock and about which she made clear and positive recommendations.

Put another way, the positive phrasing of this policy has been worded to effectively encourage a development capacity greater than 50 dwellings (subject to other considerations being met), could very well affect other allocations for residential development (and supported by the Local Plan Inspector) in Norton Radstock, and which we agree would be more appropriate sites to meet future housing demand. We consider that if the Council or developers wish to promote development of this site for greater than 50 dwellings, this could more appropriately be dealt with by way of a planning application as a Local Plan departure or through the emerging Local Development Framework process.

We consider that both of these approaches would enable transparent decision making, taking into account the very important issues of ecology and housing supply discussed above.

Our client, therefore, seeks the amendment of this Policy to accurately reflect the findings of the Inspector and which have been based on robust and transparent public consultation throughout the Local Plan Inquiry and her consideration during it. Policy GDS.1 / NR2 should therefore be revised to allocate this site for a residential capacity of no more than 50 dwellings during the plan period (emphasis added).

Ref: 3781/J2	The planning inspector quite clearly says 50 dwellings only in the period to 2011. The attempt to spin this as a minimum rather than a maximum number and over	The Council has allocated the site for about 50 dwellings in the Plan period and based its housing supply calculations on that policy. The modifications allows for more than 50 to be built if certain prerequisites are met as stated in the Policy. This reflects the Inspector's reasoning. The Council's full response is set out in the Statement of Decisions to the Inspector's Report.	No change.
Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock	turn paragraphs 5.91,5.94 and 5.95 of the Inspectors report is unacceptable. The amendment is inconsistent with GDS 1/B2, GDS 1/B13, GDS1/K5,GDS 1/V3. GDS 1/B7, GDS 1/B8, GDS 1/K2 where her decision is accepted.		

<p>Ref: 3781/J8</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We believe that development in ecologically sensitive locations such as Radstock — should only take place on brown field sites which have remained derelict brown field sites.</p> <p>The Council also disagrees with the Inspector's opinion (para 5.92) that the Radstock Railway Land is no longer a brownfield site but that PPG3 applies. In that context, any planning application submitted for this site should be subject to a full capacity study likely to demonstrate that, whilst having regard to its nature conservation interest any development proposals for this site maximise the use of brownfield land.</p> <p>(e) We agree with the Planning Inspector, not the Council, and believe that the former's decision should be upheld. Maximising brownfield sites by piling on small houses may / lead to healthy profits for the developers, but not the mental and physical health of the residents, as so many high density inner city developments have already proved.</p> <p>D The lack of consistency and partiality in regard to development in Bath and Radstock is also shown by the proposed housing development. Chapter B7 Housing. Pp 61-63 of the Statement of Decisions. The Inspector's recommendations for GDS 1/B2 MOD Foxhill GDS 1/B13 Lower Bristol Road G DS 1/K5 Cannocks Garage GDS 1/V3 Paulton Printing Factory GDS 1/B7 Englishcombe Lane, Bath GDS 1/B8 r/o 46-64 Bloomfield Drive GDS 1/K2 Keynsham Have all been accepted and the Local Plan modified accordingly. Not accepting the recommendation for the Railway Land in Radstock is inconsistent and perverse. Under the terms of the Local Government Act which came into force in October 2004 it would also be illegal, but this legislation will only apply to Local Plans begun after October 2004.</p> <p>GDS 1/NR2 states 50 dwellings. BANES do not accept this. Their decision and reasons states, "The Inspector recognized the importance of the site for the regeneration of Norton Radstock (para 5.94) but at the same time recognizes that the site is locally important for nature conservation. (para. 5.91) Probably because of the information available to her at the time of the inquiry, the Inspector does not recommend a dwelling capacity for the site. (a) Instead she recommends that in order to avoid pressure for the achievement of high numbers of dwellings at the expense of the ecology of the site, that the site be expected to accommodate no more than 50 dwellings during the plan period. She therefore accepts that the site capacity is greater than 50 dwellings (para 5.95) and that the site should be allocated for mixed use development. (b) The Inspector's recommended policy wording also acknowledges that the development is likely to give rise to an unavoidable impact on some areas of ecological importance but that this should be mitigated and compensated for. © The development of this mixed use site is integral to the regeneration of Radstock and entails significant development costs. The benefits and importance of this development are reflected in the Council's 'Radstock Regeneration Principles' in May 2006 and in the 'Brighter Futures Community Plan' The local ecological importance of the site is also recognized and well documented. The existing</p>	<p>The Local Plan modification does not propose 210 dwellings. The Council has accepted all of the Inspector's recommended modifications for Policy GDS.1/NR2 but with a caveat concerning the capacity. The reasoning for this is set out in the Councils Statement of Decisions on ther Inspector's Report</p> <p>Any flood risk will need to be assessed via policy NE.14.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	---	-------------------

ecological interest of the site will change in the long term, with certain species and habitats likely to decline unless supported by a management regime. It is likely however that the site could in future retain significant ecological value even without management, although this interest would be different to that currently present. (d) The Inspector has explicitly adopted a precautionary approach in relation to housing provision on the basis of the need to resolve the ecological issues. The Inspector states that 50 dwellings is not intended as an absolute limit on development capacity but explicitly recognizes that the capacity of the site is higher.

On this basis it is proposed that the Inspector’s recommendations are accepted but with the proviso in the policy which reflects the Inspectors comments that the residential capacity of the site could be greater than 50 dwellings....’ We maintain that this is casuistry. When the Inspector said 50 dwellings, she meant 50 dwellings and no more, and the fact that 210 are now proposed instead of the 100 that she thought were proposed in the former John Thompson Plans is irrelevant. We also think that her assessment of the ecological impact is over-optimistic. The wildlife will not be displaced and return, it will simply die with the destruction of habitat. There is ample scientific evidence to prove this available form the RSPB etc.

E Finally, noting the general principles which can be found on pp 206-7 of the Schedule of Proposed Mod Modification no M/C2/49, which is the acceptance of the Policy NE 14’ (vi) the existing drainage systems on the site are adversely affected, or if the land drainage of the site, when developed, is inadequate. This is said to be in accord with the Inspector’s Recommendation R10.21. Also ‘(iv) the run-off from the development would result in, or increase the risk of, flooding of watercourses, ditches, land or property.’ We deplore the proposals to build on an area which we can see with our own eyes is regularly flooded.

We therefore reject the Proposed Modifications to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan. pp 182-183 and the Statement of Decisions in respect of this. Modifications M/B9/38, MIB9/55

Ref: 3834/J1

Location Cautletts Close
Norton Radstock

My Objections are :
 1. Overcrowded traffic access
 2. More traffic on a route used by walkers to gain access to Withies Lane
 3. Proposed 110 houses not the same density as existing estates. Not in keeping with existing
 4. Loss of yet more open space green fields

The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government’s priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector’s reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the

No change.

Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3844/J1</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>1. I strongly object to more than 50 houses being built as this would be detrimental to the surrounding countryside. It would also increase the risk of flooding for local residents for the same reasons 'object to the modification concerning important hillsides'.</p> <p>2. A better solution would be to utilise the old railway line to establish a rail link for both commercial and leisure usage. There would also be benefits to the local community if there were a designated children's play area. It is currently dangerous for the children to play in the cul-de-sac due to the increased traffic flow caused by persons using the cycle track and driving themselves to the location!</p>	<p>watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector accepted that the site may have potential capacity for more than 50 dwellings. The capacity for the allocation has actually been reduced from 100 dwellings to 50 dwellings, although more may be acceptable if the site requirements are met. Any development will need to accord with Policy NE.14 which prevents development that would either cause flooding elsewhere or be subject to flooding itself.</p> <p>The re-instatement of a railway was considered the Inspector who concluded that it should not be given a high priority in the Local Plan para 5.89. The Local Plan requires a sustainable transport route through the site.</p> <p>Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation is relevant ie</p> <p>The Inspector recognises the importance of the site for regeneration of Norton Radstock (para 5.94) but at the same time she recognises that the site is locally important for nature conservation (para 5.91). Probably because of the information available to her at the Inquiry, the Inspector does not recommend a dwelling capacity for the site. Instead she recommends that in order to avoid pressure for the achievement of high numbers of dwellings at the expense of the ecology of the site, that the site be expected to accommodate no more than 50 dwellings during the plan period. She therefore accepts that the site capacity is greater than 50 dwellings (para 5.95) and that the site should be allocated for mixed use development.</p> <p>The Inspector's recommended policy wording also acknowledges that the development is likely to give rise to an unavoidable impact on some areas of ecological importance but that this should be mitigated and compensated for.</p> <p>The development of this mixed-use site is integral to the regeneration of Radstock and entails significant development costs. The benefits and</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3844/J2</p> <p>Location Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock</p>	<p>1. I strongly object to more than 50 houses being built as this would be detrimental to the surrounding countryside. It would also increase the risk of flooding for local residents for the same reasons 'object to the modification concerning important hillsides'.</p> <p>2. A better solution would be to utilise the old railway line to establish a rail link for both commercial and leisure usage. There would also be benefits to the local community if there were a designated children's play area. It is currently dangerous for the children to play in the cul-de-sac due to the increased traffic flow caused by persons using the cycle track and driving themselves to the location!</p>	<p>importance of this development are reflected in the Council's 'Radstock Regeneration Principles' approved in May 2006 and in the 'Brighter Futures Community Plan'. The local ecological importance of the site is also recognised and well documented. The existing ecological interest of the site will change in the long term, with certain species and habitats likely to decline unless supported by a management regime. It is likely however that the site could in future retain significant ecological value even without management, although this interest would be different to that currently present. The Inspector has explicitly adopted a precautionary approach in relation to housing provision on the basis of the need to resolve ecological issues. The Inspector states that 50 dwellings is not intended as an absolute limit on development capacity but explicitly recognises that the capacity of the site is higher.</p> <p>On this basis, it is proposed that the Inspector's recommendations are accepted but with the proviso in the policy which reflects the inspector's comments that the residential capacity of the site could be greater than 50 dwellings. Policy GDS.1/NR2 and the preamble in para B7.30 will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>This Council disagrees with the Inspector's opinion (paragraph 5.92) that the Radstock Railway Land is, in effect, no longer a brownfield site but that PPG3 applies. In that context, any planning application submitted for this site should be subject to a full capacity study to demonstrate that, whilst having regard to its nature conservation interest, any development proposals for this site maximise the use of brownfield land.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Ref:	4046/J1		The Local Plan requires a sustainable transport route through the site.	
Location	Radstock Railway Land Norton Radstock	The increase to the number of houses to be allowed on the NRR site is way out of proportion to need and desire of the people in the local area. It is argued that they are needed to meet the Government targets, however, with the large number of planning applications for building in the Norton-Radstock/Paulton area (these targets can be met easily without even including the current Haydon development which was not in the pipeline when the report was written.	The housing contribution from this site for the Plan period has been reduced not increased.	No change.

Modification: M/B9/40 - GDS.1/NR4 - St Peter's Factory/Jewsons

Ref:	3116/J158	If development requirements were not reviewed then clause 3 should remain, as it was part of the planning permission.	By implication the open areas will be for the benefit of the community. The need for allotments will be considered at the planning application stage.	No change.
Location	St Peter's Factory Norton Radstock	Amend clause 4 to read: "and management of open areas for landscape and ecology purposes and for community benefit". Reason: there may be on-site potential for some allotment provision. Currently there is, we understand, search for off-site land, but the most sustainable option may be on-site and this should not be precluded by the wording.		
Ref:	3300/J14	1.2 The basis of our objections is that the proposed modifications do not reflect sufficiently or appropriately the Inspector's findings that: 1. The St Peter's factory site has capacity for some 150 houses; 2. The 150 houses could be accommodated on the St Peter's site alone (i.e. independently of the Jewson's site) and which should be enlarged to include land west of Lincombe Road; and 3. The Local Planning Authority should carry out an assessment of the precise capacity of the site to substantiate the Inspector's clearly expressed and logically determined view that the site is capable of accommodating at least 150 houses. 1.3 Moreover, we consider that the Local Planning Authority has not given substantive or convincing reasons for not allocating this land in accordance with the Inspector's Recommendations and that as a result both the proper supply of housing land in the locality and our client will be substantially prejudiced. 2.0 Local Plan Representations made by Oval Estates (Bath) Limited 2.1 Oval Estates (Bath) Limited duly made representations on the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan, first and second deposit drafts. In respect to the St Peter's Factory site, these representations sought to have the land re-allocated for mixed use (residential / employment) development through Policy GDS.1 / NR4 (General Development Sites). 2.2 The basis of these representations was that the inclusion of a residential element to the allocation (i.e. providing for mixed-use development) would cross-subsidise much needed improvements to the existing employment premises to facilitate smaller, modern employment units more capable of meeting contemporary requirements, and for which there is acknowledged demand in Norton-Radstock. Such provision would assist in stemming the current substantial flow of out-commuting by employees to areas outside Norton-Radstock through the promotion of suitable employment opportunities locally. 2.3 These representations were not supported by the Council and were subsequently heard by the Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry during April 2006. 3.0 The Inspector's Findings	In response to the Inspector's recommendations, the Council modified the site allocation from one which was solely a business site to a mixed use site with a substantial residential contribution of 150 dwellings during the plan period. The details of the modification were informed by the planning permission granted on this site since the LPI and included the adjoining Jewsons site (ref 05/01926/FUL subject to legal agreement). It is therefore a scheme which satisfies the Council's policies in terms of design, transport, employment needs and affordable housing. The modification also includes the land to the rear of Lincombe Road. In preparing the modifications, the Council could ignore the planning permission recently granted. The council needs to demonstrate a robust defensible approach in meeting the housing requirement at the modifications. It would be challenged by other objector's pursuing alternative sites if it granted a planning permission but then allocated a site for a different scheme. The figure of 100 dwellings is not intended to be a capacity for the site nor a limit on progress and this is explicit in the Policy. It is included as a reasonable expectation from the site for the Plan period and there is nothing in the Plan which prevents development progressing at a faster rate nor does the policy prevent the resubmission of an application on the site of an alternative scheme with	No change.
Location	St Peter's Factory Norton Radstock			

3.1 The Inspector's Report into the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Review was published in May 2006. The Inspector made the following findings in respect to our client's representations regarding the St Peter's Factory site:

1. That the St Peter's Factory site could accommodate at least 150 dwellings on its own, i.e. independent of the Jewson's site adjacent (see further discussion below in respect to the Jewson's site).

3.2 The Inspector's recommendations at P5.18 and R7.25 clearly state that the subject site should be re-allocated to include residential use:

R5.18 "The following sites be considered by the Council for residential allocation in the Local Plan:
Radstock/Midsomer Norton
St Peter's Factory, Westfield together with land to the rear of Lincombe Road: mixed use scheme with 150 dwellings".

R7.25 proposes the modification to Local Plan Policy GDS.1/NR4 to provide for a mix of uses on the St Peter's Factory site including a large number (stated elsewhere in the Inspector's Report as "at least 750") of residential dwellings. Specifically, the Inspector makes the recommendation that the Council:

R7.25 "Modify Policy GDS.1 / NR4 as follows:
insert in clause 1 before "Development" "Mixed use" and after "for" "residential and"
insert new clause 2 "About xx houses can be accommodated, with xx before 2017"
delete clauses 3 and 8".

3.3 In arriving at the above recommendation, the Inspector reasons at paragraph 7.141 that;
"whilst I have no other evidence on which to make an assessment of the level of housing which could be accommodated within the enlarged site, the existing site is some 8 ha and with the additional area of land I consider there is likely scope for about 150 dwellings whilst providing for a significant quantum of employment floorspace".

3.4 The Inspector recommends that the Council carry out its own assessment of the residential capacity of the site and the timing for its provision, as discussed below.

2. That the Council should carry out its own assessment of the residential capacity of the St Peter's Factory site to support or otherwise the Inspector's view that that at least 50 houses could be accommodated.

3.5 At paragraph 5.130 of the Inspector's Report, the Inspector states:
"I have insufficient evidence to given an accurate indication of the level of housing which could be provided at the site, or the timing for its provision. However, this is a substantial area of land and as part of a mixed use development it could be expected to contribute at least some 150 dwellings during the plan period. The Council will need to investigate whether this s a reasonable estimate and whether the site would provide further housing up to or beyond 2011".

3.6 We note the suggestion implied here that the capacity figure could possibly be revised upwards as a result of the capacity assessment and which is also supported by the Inspector's many references to "at least 150 houses" throughout the Report.

3. That the St Peter's Factory site is suitable for mixed use (employment I retail) and that the residential component of any mixed use development would be pivotal to maximising the site's employment use by cross subsidy.

3.7 At paragraph 7.139 the Inspector states that the St Peter's Factory site is, "a substantial but underused industrial site within the urban area which is currently allocated as an employment site. It is clear from the Business Location Requirements Study 2003 that there is a declining demand for industrial type
a higher capacity.

floorspace in Norton-Radstock and as a result there is little justification for the reservation of the whole of this site for such use. However, the Study does identify some need for smaller scale modern employment units in The area. In accordance with the advice in PPG3 paragraph 42(a) I have recommended in Section 5 of my report that the Council consider the potential of this site for a mixed-use development such that the residential units could provide a cross-subsidy for the development of modern business premises”.

4. That the St Peter’s Factory site allocation should include land west of Lincombe Road (Section 5 paragraph 5.129 and Section 7 paragraph 7.140)

3.8 At Paragraph 5.129 the Inspector states,

“This land has no allocation on the Proposals Map and / agree with the objector that it is different in character from the land zoned as Important Hillside to the south east, so There is no landscape constraint to its development, The land is seen by the Council as providing a buffer between the industrial and commercial uses within the site and the existing houses, but with a carefully laid out redevelopment the need for such a buffer would be avoided”.

3.9 As such, the Inspector recommends at R5.18 that land to the rear of Lincombe Road, together with the St Peter’s Factory, Westfield, be considered by the Council for residential allocation in the Local Plan to comprise a mixed use scheme with 150 dwellings.

5. That the Jewson’s site was not intended to form part of an enlarged GDS. 1 / NR4 site to share the mixed use allocation.

3.10 In reference to the Jewson’s site the Inspector clearly states at paragraph 8.58 that;

“I have no evidence That the Jewson’s site is redundant or underused... no significant environmental gains as a result of its redevelopment...” and “I do not There fore recommend that the site be allocated for redevelopment, but clearly any future scheme would fall to be considered under Policy ET.3 as recommended to be modified”.

3.1 It is clear, therefore, that the Inspector did not in any way intend that the GDS.1 site relating to the land at St Peter’s Factory would include the Jewson’s land. Rather, the Inspector unambiguously states that any proposal promoting residential development on the Jewson’s site would fall to be determined under Policy ET.3. The Inspector’s recommendation that the St Peter’s factory site could accommodate 150 dwellings therefore relates to the St Peter’s factory site alone

3.12 This is reiterated at paragraph 5.137 where the Inspector states that;

“the Jewson’s site at Westfield is in active use and whilst It adjoins residential development, it is on a busy main road and There would be no significant environmental gain from its redevelopment for housing. I Therefore make no recommendation in relation to These sites, but any proposals for redevelopment would fall to be assessed under Policy HG.4 and new Policy ET (3)”.

3.13 The Inspector did not, therefore, discount the possibility of the Jewson’s site coming forward in the future for redevelopment by way of a planning application, but rather, that it was not suitable for a specific allocation for residential use at this time. The Inspector ‘makes no recommendation in relation to this site”. As such, the Inspector’s comments in no way oppose the consideration I possibility of this land being promoted by means of a planning application to be determined on its merits by the Local Planning Authority.

3.14 It is significant that the Inspector makes no finding in respect to the ultimate quantum of employment land floorspace at this enlarged GDS.1 I NR4 site. Rather, at paragraph 7.141 she states in respect to the 8 ha site (i.e. excluding the Jewson’

s site) that,

"whilst I have no other evidence on which to make an assessment of the level of housing which could be accommodated within the enlarged site, the existing site is some 8 ha and with the additional area of land / consider there is likely to be scope for about 750 dwellings whilst providing for a significant quantum of employment floorspace".

4 The Council's Proposed Modifications to the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan

4.1 The Council's Proposed Modifications M/B9/40 and M/B9/41 propose to amend Policy GDS. 1 / NR4 and the accompanying proposals map to provide for mixed use development on a site combining the St Peter's Factory land and the Jewson's land. This mix of uses includes residential (about 100 houses to 2011) and business within use classes B1, B2 and B8.

4.2 These Proposed Modifications also incorporate the area of land west of Lincombe Road within this allocation, in line with the Inspector's recommendation.

4.3 The Council's justification for not allocating the quantum of houses recommended by the Inspector (i.e. "at least 150 houses") but rather "about 100 houses", is outlined in its 'Statement of Decisions', (November 2006) at page 65. Here it states,

"St Peter's Factory was granted planning permission along with Jewson's site for 107 dwellings in April 2006 subject to a legal agreement. As the Jewson's site was included in the permission it will be included as part of the allocated site in the Local Plan".

4.4 In its 'List of Proposed Modifications' (page 183) the Council states that it has modified the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan to "accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.18 and R7.25". It further adds that "as planning permission was granted in April 2006 development requirements were not reviewed in accordance with R7.3".

4.5 It is clear, therefore, that the Council has relied upon its resolution in July 2006 to grant planning permission for a mixed use development on this site (which includes both land at St Peter's Factory and the Jewson's land and which provides for 107 dwellings (LPA reference 05/01926/FUL)), rather than carry out its own assessment of capacity, as recommended by the Inspector.

4.6 By implication, the Council is suggesting that the St Peter's Factory site has no additional capacity for additional residential development, with all of the residential development potential being taken up by planning permission 05/01926/FUL

5.0 Oval Estates' Response to Proposed Modifications

5.1 We concur with the Inspector that the land west of Lincombe Road has no landscape constraint to its development and should be included within the GDS.1 / NR4 site allocation for mixed use development. We, therefore, also support the Council's adoption of this finding.

5.2 We also support the inclusion of the Jewson's land within the GDS.1 / NR4 policy allocation for mixed use.

5.3 However, as indicated in other parts of this objection, we consider that the Council has not gone far enough to accurately and properly reflect the Inspector's conclusions on the capacity of this enlarged site (which includes land west of Lincombe Road and the Jewson's land) for residential development ("capable of accommodating at least 150 dwellings"); and her separate recommendation that the Council carry out its own assessment to inform its view about the residential capacity of this enlarged allocation site.

5.4 Rather, the Council's Statement of Decisions (November 2006) confirms that it

has relied on its determination of planning application LPA Reference 05/01926/FUL (still subject to the conclusion of the legal agreement) as the basis of its "capacity assessment".

5.5 This planning application relates to a split site comprising part of the St Peter's Factory site and the Jewson's site, It provides for 39 houses on the latter with 68 houses located on the former (totalling 107 dwellings). It is our client's clear view that, given the Inspector's intention that some] 50 dwellings should be provided on our client's site alone, this would by implication indicate that the site has additional capacity, subject to this being demonstrated satisfactorily, for an additional 82 or so dwellings (150 minus 68).

5.6 Our client now provides evidence that this is easily attainable (see attached indicative layout drawing) whilst meeting other relevant planning and sustainability objectives (i.e. appropriate amenity space, sufficient circulation space, etc)

5.7 We consider that the Local Planning Authority should not rely on this planning application / permission as its capacity assessment because:

1. The development proposed by it represents only one of the many possible development scenarios for this land. That is, there could be other development schemes which may be more appropriate in terms of making the most efficient use of the site in line with national planning policy advice, and which could offer additional benefits, particularly in terms of housing and employment land supply; and
2. The planning application for which the Council resolved to grant planning permission in July 2006 relates to a smaller site, i.e. it excludes the land west of Lincombe Road, and which the Inspector specifically confirmed as being suitable for residential development. Our client considers that this land is capable of accommodating some 66 dwellings in itself (see 5.7 below).
3. A "capacity assessment" needs to consider the total amount of land that might be available for residential development and match this to the anticipated needs for such development within a specified period. The Local Planning Authority has not carried this out in any way which could be properly construed as an appropriate assessment of capacity.

Oval Estates' Assessment of the Development Capacity of the St Peter's Site

5.8 Our client has prepared an indicative scheme drawing (enclosed) to demonstrate an alternative option which better reflects the Inspector's view of the development capacity of the site ("150 dwellings with a significant quantum of employment floorspace"). This indicative scheme ensures that all key planning considerations are appropriately addressed (e.g. adequate parking, circulation and amenity space, and the creation of a satisfactory living environment).

5.9 This option, for instance, demonstrates that additional housing development (in the order of 66 units) could easily be accommodated on land shown as 'housing site 3' ("land west of Lincombe Road") with a further 30 units on a new 'housing site 4'. This represents an additional 96 residential units.

5.10 Based on this option, the indicative scheme drawings demonstrate that a total of some 203 dwellings could be satisfactorily accommodated. We consider that this is reasonable in the context of the Inspector's findings; based on a 50/50 split of residential to employment land uses and assuming a residential density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare, in accordance with government advice contained within PPG3. Based on 50% of the 10 hectare site being taken up for residential development, even a crude calculation suggests that redevelopment should aim to achieve in the order of 150-250 dwellings (at 30-50 dwellings per hectare) to provide for the necessary efficiency in the use of land and which is also satisfactory

in terms of all relevant planning considerations.

5.11 Government advice about target densities in PPG3 has been carried through to the recently published PPS3. This new Planning Statement advises that 30 dwellings per hectare be used as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision making (emphasis added). This advice has been accepted by Bath and North East Somerset Council through its inclusion within Policy HG.7 of the Revised Local Plan.

5.12 Redevelopment of this land in the way proposed by or similar to the indicative scheme prepared by our client, would offer substantive planning benefits for the area. In line with current national planning policy guidance and statements, such development would regenerate this area to provide much needed modern employment floorspace combined with additional housing, including the appropriate number and type of "affordable homes" to meet local housing needs.

Summary

5.13 It is our client's informed view that a greater quantum of residential development could be accommodated satisfactorily on this site than suggested by the Local Planning Authority in its Proposed Modifications and that through careful design and siting, would be compatible with the employment uses on-site.

5.14 We consider that the Council's resolution to grant planning permission for a mixed-use residential / employment development comprising 107 residential units on a site including part of the St Peter's Factory site (68 dwellings) and the Jewson's land (39 dwellings), would have had only a limited bearing on the Inspector's findings in respect to the St Peter's Factory Site and should not be used as a substitute for the full and proper consideration of this site for additional residential development as recommended by her.

5.15 Whilst our client supports the inclusion of the Jewson's site within the GDS.1 / NR4 policy allocation, sufficient account must be made in respect to the residential capacity of this enlarged site within the policy allocation. That is, the enlarged site is capable of accommodating the 150 dwellings or more identified by the Inspector in respect to the St Peter's Factory site alone, in addition to the 39 dwellings subject to the resolution to grant planning permission in favour of planning application reference 05/01926/FUL) on the Jewson's site. This would, for instance, increase the residential development capacity to around 189 residential units.

5.16 We agree with the Inspector's findings that the St Peter's Factory site alone is capable of accommodating at least 150 dwellings and which is demonstrated by the indicative scheme layout prepared by Oval Estates (Bath) Ltd. Accordingly, we object to the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan which identify a significantly reduced residential development capacity on this site.

5.17 In light of the above comments, we consider that the Council is inaccurate and misleading by suggesting that it has adopted the Inspector's recommendations in respect of the St Peter's Factory site (including "land to the west of Lincombe Road").

5.18 Aggravating this apparent mistruth that the Council claims to fully adopt the Inspector's recommendations, when it so clearly is not doing so in the Proposed Modifications is the fact that there is no mention of the St Peter's Factory land in the Council's 'list of Inspector's recommendations that it does not intend to adopt'.

5.19 Having considered the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan in so far as they relate to the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector's considerations of and recommendations about the St Peter's Factory site, we are of the view that the Council has not provided clear and adequate reasons as to why the Inspector's recommendations have not been adopted.

6.0 Modifications Sought

6.1 Our client seeks the amendment of Policy GDS.1 / NR4 so that it accurately reflects the Inspector's findings in respect to the potential residential capacity of land at the St Peter's Factory site, i.e. to accommodate at least 150 dwellings.

6.2 In the absence of its own capacity assessment, and having now presented the indicative scheme layout to the Council, we believe that the Council can be satisfied that the site is capable of accommodating additional housing in a manner that satisfactorily addresses planning considerations and planning policy objectives, including those in respect of employment provision.

6.3 Should the Council not be minded to support our client's representations we request that;

a. we be provided with clear and adequate reasons for its rejection of the Inspector's relevant recommendations, and that

b. the Council considers holding a further Inquiry to fully consider these outstanding objections.

Modification: M/B9/41 - Modification to site boundary for GDS.1/NR4 - St Peter's Factory/Jewsons

Ref: 3300/J15

Location St Peter's
Factory
Norton Radstock

1.2 The basis of our objections is that the proposed modifications do not reflect sufficiently or appropriately the Inspector's findings that:

1. The St Peter's factory site has capacity for some 150 houses;

2. The 150 houses could be accommodated on the St Peter's site alone (i.e. independently of the Jewson's site) and which should be enlarged to include land west of Lincombe Road; and

3. The Local Planning Authority should carry out an assessment of the precise capacity of the site to substantiate the Inspector's clearly expressed and logically determined view that the site is capable of accommodating at least 150 houses.

1.3 Moreover, we consider that the Local Planning Authority has not given substantive or convincing reasons for not allocating this land in accordance with the Inspector's Recommendations and that as a result both the proper supply of housing land in the locality and our client will be substantially prejudiced.

2.0 Local Plan Representations made by Oval Estates (Bath) Limited

2.1 Oval Estates (Bath) Limited duly made representations on the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan, first and second deposit drafts. In respect to the St Peter's Factory site, these representations sought to have the land re-allocated for mixed use (residential / employment) development through Policy GDS.1 / NR4 (General Development Sites).

2.2 The basis of these representations was that the inclusion of a residential element to the allocation (i.e. providing for mixed-use development) would cross-subsidise much needed improvements to the existing employment premises to facilitate smaller, modern employment units more capable of meeting contemporary requirements, and for which there is acknowledged demand in Norton-Radstock. Such provision would assist in stemming the current substantial flow of out-commuting by employees to areas outside Norton-Radstock through the promotion of suitable employment opportunities locally.

2.3 These representations were not supported by the Council and were subsequently heard by the Inspector at the Local Plan Inquiry during April 2006.

3.0 The Inspector's Findings

3.1 The Inspector's Report into the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Review was published in May 2006. The Inspector made the following findings in respect to our client's representations regarding the St Peter's Factory site:

In response to the Inspector's recommendations, the Council modified the site allocation from one which was solely a business site to a mixed use site with a substantial residential contribution of 150 dwellings during the plan period.

The details of the modification were informed by the planning permission granted on this site since the LPI and included the adjoining Jewsons site (ref 05/01926/FUL subject to legal agreement). It is therefore a scheme which satisfies the Council's policies in terms of design, transport, employment needs and affordable housing. The modification also includes the land to the rear of Lincombe Road. In preparing the modifications, the Council could ignore the planning permission recently granted. The council needs to demonstrate a robust defensible approach in meeting the housing requirement at the modifications. It would be challenged by other objector's pursuing alternative sites if it granted a planning permission but then allocated a site for a different scheme. The figure of 100 dwellings is not intended to be a capacity for the site nor a limit on progress and this is explicit in the Policy. It is included as a reasonable expectation from the site for the Plan period and there is nothing in the Plan which prevents development progressing at a faster rate nor does the policy prevent the resubmission of an application on the site of an alternative scheme with a higher capacity.

1. That the St Peter's Factory site could accommodate at least 150 dwellings on its own, i.e. independent of the Jewson's site adjacent (see further discussion below in respect to the Jewson's site).

3.2 The Inspector's recommendations at P5.18 and R7.25 clearly state that the subject site should be re-allocated to include residential use:

R5.18 "The following sites be considered by the Council for residential allocation in the Local Plan:
Radstock/Midsomer Norton
St Peter's Factory, Westfield together with land to the rear of Lincombe Road: mixed use scheme with 150 dwellings".

R7.25 proposes the modification to Local Plan Policy GDS.1/NR4 to provide for a mix of uses on the St Peter's Factory site including a large number (stated elsewhere in the Inspector's Report as "at least 750") of residential dwellings. Specifically, the Inspector makes the recommendation that the Council:

R7.25 "Modify Policy GDS.1 / NR4 as follows:
insert in clause 1 before "Development" "Mixed use" and after "for" "residential and" insert new clause 2 "About xx houses can be accommodated, with xx before 2017" delete clauses 3 and 8".

3.3 In arriving at the above recommendation, the Inspector reasons at paragraph 7.141 that;
"whilst I have no other evidence on which to make an assessment of the level of housing which could be accommodated within the enlarged site, the existing site is some 8 ha and with the additional area of land I consider there is likely scope for about 150 dwellings whilst providing for a significant quantum of employment floorspace".

3.4 The Inspector recommends that the Council carry out its own assessment of the residential capacity of the site and the timing for its provision, as discussed below.

2. That the Council should carry out its own assessment of the residential capacity of the St Peter's Factory site to support or otherwise the Inspector's view that that at least 50 houses could be accommodated.

3.5 At paragraph 5.130 of the Inspector's Report, the Inspector states:
"I have insufficient evidence to give an accurate indication of the level of housing which could be provided at the site, or the timing for its provision. However, this is a substantial area of land and as part of a mixed use development it could be expected to contribute at least some 150 dwellings during the plan period. The Council will need to investigate whether this is a reasonable estimate and whether the site would provide further housing up to or beyond 2011".

3.6 We note the suggestion implied here that the capacity figure could possibly be revised upwards as a result of the capacity assessment and which is also supported by the Inspector's many references to "at least 150 houses" throughout the Report.

3. That the St Peter's Factory site is suitable for mixed use (employment & retail) and that the residential component of any mixed use development would be pivotal to maximising the site's employment use by cross subsidy.

3.7 At paragraph 7.139 the Inspector states that the St Peter's Factory site is, "a substantial but underused industrial site within the urban area which is currently allocated as an employment site. It is clear from the Business Location Requirements Study 2003 that there is a declining demand for industrial type floorspace in Norton-Radstock and as a result there is little justification for the reservation of the whole of this site for such use. However, the Study does identify some need for smaller scale modern employment units in The area. In accordance

with the advice in PPG3 paragraph 42(a) I have recommended in Section 5 of my report that the Council consider the potential of this site for a mixed-use development such that the residential units could provide a cross-subsidy for the development of modern business premises”.

4. That the St Peter’s Factory site allocation should include land west of Lincombe Road (Section 5 paragraph 5.129 and Section 7 paragraph 7.140)

3.8 At Paragraph 5.129 the Inspector states,

“This land has no allocation on the Proposals Map and / agree with the objector that it is different in character from the land zoned as Important Hillside to the south east, so There is no landscape constraint to its development, The land is seen by the Council as providing a buffer between the industrial and commercial uses within the site and the existing houses, but with a carefully laid out redevelopment the need for such a buffer would be avoided”.

3.9 As such, the Inspector recommends at R5.18 that land to the rear of Lincombe Road, together with the St Peter’s Factory, Westfield, be considered by the Council for residential allocation in the Local Plan to comprise a mixed use scheme with 150 dwellings.

5. That the Jewson’s site was not intended to form part of an enlarged GDS. 1 / NR4 site to share the mixed use allocation.

3.10 In reference to the Jewson’s site the Inspector clearly states at paragraph 8.58 that;

“I have no evidence That the Jewson’s site is redundant or underused... no significant environmental gains as a result of its redevelopment...” and “I do not There fore recommend that the site be allocated for redevelopment, but clearly any future scheme would fall to be considered under Policy ET.3 as recommended to be modified”.

3.11 It is clear, therefore, that the Inspector did not in any way intend that the GDS.1 site relating to the land at St Peter’s Factory would include the Jewson’s land. Rather, the Inspector unambiguously states that any proposal promoting residential development on the Jewson’s site would fall to be determined under Policy ET.3. The Inspector’s recommendation that the St Peter’s factory site could accommodate 150 dwellings therefore relates to the St Peter’s factory site alone

3.12 This is reiterated at paragraph 5.137 where the Inspector states that;

“the Jewson’s `s site at Westfield is in active use and whilst It adjoins residential development, it is on a busy main road and There would be no significant environmental gain from its redevelopment for housing. I Therefore make no recommendation in relation to These sites, but any proposals for redevelopment would fall to be assessed under Policy HG.4 and new Policy ET (3)”.

3.13 The Inspector did not, therefore, discount the possibility of the Jewson’s site coming forward in the future for redevelopment by way of a planning application, but rather, that it was not suitable for a specific allocation for residential use at this time. The Inspector `makes no recommendation in relation to this site”. As such, the Inspector’s comments in no way oppose the consideration I possibility of this land being promoted by means of a planning application to be determined on its merits by the Local Planning Authority.

3.14 It is significant that the Inspector makes no finding in respect to the ultimate quantum of employment land floorspace at this enlarged GDS.1 I NR4 site. Rather, at paragraph 7.141 she states in respect to the 8 ha site (i.e. excluding the Jewson’ s site) that,

“whilst I have no other evidence on which to make as assessment of the level of housing which could be accommodated within the enlarged site, the existing site is

some 8 ha and with the additional area of land / consider there is likely to be scope for about 750 dwellings whilst providing for a significant quantum of employment floorspace".

4 The Council's Proposed Modifications to the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan

4.1 The Council's Proposed Modifications M/B9/40 and M/B9/41 propose to amend Policy GDS. 1 / NR4 and the accompanying proposals map to provide for mixed use development on a site combining the St Peter's Factory land and the Jewson's land. This mix of uses includes residential (about 100 houses to 2011) and business within use classes B1, B2 and B8.

4.2 These Proposed Modifications also incorporate the area of land west of Lincombe Road within this allocation, in line with the Inspector's recommendation.

4.3 The Council's justification for not allocating the quantum of houses recommended by the Inspector (i.e. "at least 150 houses") but rather "about 100 houses", is outlined in its 'Statement of Decisions', (November 2006) at page 65. Here it states,

"St Peter's Factory was granted planning permission along with Jewson's 's site for 107 dwellings in April 2006 subject to a legal agreement. As the Jewson's site was included in the permission it will be included as part of the allocated site in the Local Plan".

4.4 In its 'List of Proposed Modifications' (page 183) the Council states that it has modified the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan to "accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.18 and R7.25". It further adds that "as planning permission was granted in April 2006 development requirements were not reviewed in accordance with R7.3".

4.5 It is clear, therefore, that the Council has relied upon its resolution in July 2006 to grant planning permission for a mixed use development on this site (which includes both land at St Peter's Factory and the Jewson's land and which provides for 107 dwellings (LPA reference 05/01926/FUL)), rather than carry out its own assessment of capacity, as recommended by the Inspector.

4.6 By implication, the Council is suggesting that the St Peter's Factory site has no additional capacity for additional residential development, with all of the residential development potential being taken up by planning permission 05/01926/FUL

5.0 Oval Estates' Response to Proposed Modifications

5.1 We concur with the Inspector that the land west of Lincombe Road has no landscape constraint to its development and should be included within the GDS.1 I NR4 site allocation for mixed use development. We, therefore, also support the Council's adoption of this finding.

5.2 We also support the inclusion of the Jewson's land within the GDS.1 / NR4 policy allocation for mixed use.

5.3 However, as indicated in other parts of this objection, we consider that the Council has not gone far enough to accurately and properly reflect the Inspector's conclusions on the capacity of this enlarged site (which includes land west of Lincombe Road and the Jewson's land) for residential development ("capable of accommodating at least 150 dwellings"); and her separate recommendation that the Council carry out its own assessment to inform its view about the residential capacity of this enlarged allocation site.

5.4 Rather, the Council's Statement of Decisions (November 2006) confirms that it has relied on its determination of planning application LPA Reference 05/01926/FUL (still subject to the conclusion of the legal agreement) as the basis of its "capacity assessment".

5.5 This planning application relates to a split site comprising part of the St Peter's Factory site and the Jewson's site, It provides for 39 houses on the latter with 68 houses located on the former (totalling 107 dwellings). It is our client's clear view that, given the Inspector's intention that some 150 dwellings should be provided on our client's site alone, this would by implication indicate that the site has additional capacity, subject to this being demonstrated satisfactorily, for an additional 82 or so dwellings (150 minus 68).

5.6 Our client now provides evidence that this is easily attainable (see attached indicative layout drawing) whilst meeting other relevant planning and sustainability objectives (i.e. appropriate amenity space, sufficient circulation space, etc)

5.7 We consider that the Local Planning Authority should not rely on this planning application / permission as its capacity assessment because:

1. The development proposed by it represents only one of the many possible development scenarios for this land. That is, there could be other development schemes which may be more appropriate in terms of making the most efficient use of the site in line with national planning policy advice, and which could offer additional benefits, particularly in terms of housing and employment land supply; and

2. The planning application for which the Council resolved to grant planning permission in July 2006 relates to a smaller site, i.e. it excludes the land west of Lincombe Road, and which the Inspector specifically confirmed as being suitable for residential development. Our client considers that this land is capable of accommodating some 66 dwellings in itself (see 5.7 below).

3. A "capacity assessment" needs to consider the total amount of land that might be available for residential development and match this to the anticipated needs for such development within a specified period. The Local Planning Authority has not carried this out in any way which could be properly construed as an appropriate assessment of capacity.

Oval Estates' Assessment of the Development Capacity of the St Peter's Site

5.8 Our client has prepared an indicative scheme drawing (enclosed) to demonstrate an alternative option which better reflects the Inspector's view of the development capacity of the site ("150 dwellings with a significant quantum of employment floorspace"). This indicative scheme ensures that all key planning considerations are appropriately addressed (e.g. adequate parking, circulation and amenity space, and the creation of a satisfactory living environment).

5.9 This option, for instance, demonstrates that additional housing development (in the order of 66 units) could easily be accommodated on land shown as 'housing site 3' ("land west of Lincombe Road") with a further 30 units on a new 'housing site 4'. This represents an additional 96 residential units.

5.10 Based on this option, the indicative scheme drawings demonstrate that a total of some 203 dwellings could be satisfactorily accommodated. We consider that this is reasonable in the context of the Inspector's findings; based on a 50/50 split of residential to employment land uses and assuming a residential density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare, in accordance with government advice contained within PPG3. Based on 50% of the 10 hectare site being taken up for residential development, even a crude calculation suggests that redevelopment should aim to achieve in the order of 150-250 dwellings (at 30-50 dwellings per hectare) to provide for the necessary efficiency in the use of land and which is also satisfactory in terms of all relevant planning considerations.

5.11 Government advice about target densities in PPG3 has been carried through to the recently published PPS3. This new Planning Statement advises that 30 dwellings

per hectare be used as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision making (emphasis added). This advice has been accepted by Bath and North East Somerset Council through its inclusion within Policy HG.7 of the Revised Local Plan.

5.12 Redevelopment of this land in the way proposed by or similar to the indicative scheme prepared by our client, would offer substantive planning benefits for the area. In line with current national planning policy guidance and statements, such development would regenerate this area to provide much needed modern employment floorspace combined with additional housing, including the appropriate number and type of "affordable homes" to meet local housing needs.

Summary

5.13 It is our client's informed view that a greater quantum of residential development could be accommodated satisfactorily on this site than suggested by the Local Planning Authority in its Proposed Modifications and that through careful design and siting, would be compatible with the employment uses on-site.

5.14 We consider that the Council's resolution to grant planning permission for a mixed-use residential / employment development comprising 107 residential units on a site including part of the St Peter's Factory site (68 dwellings) and the Jewson's land (39 dwellings), would have had only a limited bearing on the Inspector's findings in respect to the St Peter's Factory Site and should not be used as a substitute for the full and proper consideration of this site for additional residential development as recommended by her.

5.15 Whilst our client supports the inclusion of the Jewson's site within the GDS.1 / NR4 policy allocation, sufficient account must be made in respect to the residential capacity of this enlarged site within the policy allocation. That is, the enlarged site is capable of accommodating the 150 dwellings or more identified by the Inspector in respect to the St Peter's Factory site alone, in addition to the 39 dwellings subject to the resolution to grant planning permission in favour of planning application reference 05/01926/FUL) on the Jewson's site, This would, for instance, increase the residential development capacity to around 189 residential units.

5.16 We agree with the Inspector's findings that the St Peter's Factory site alone is capable of accommodating at least 150 dwellings and which is demonstrated by the indicative scheme layout prepared by Oval Estates (Bath) Ltd. Accordingly, we object to the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan which identify a significantly reduced residential development capacity on this site.

5.17 In light of the above comments, we consider that the Council is inaccurate and misleading by suggesting that it has adopted the Inspector's recommendations in respect of the St Peter's Factory site (including "land to the west of Lincombe Road").

5.18 Aggravating this apparent mistruth that the Council claims to fully adopt the Inspector's recommendations, when it so clearly is not doing so in the Proposed Modifications is the fact that there is no mention of the St Peter's Factory land in the Council's 'list of Inspector's recommendations that it does not intend to adopt'.

5.19 Having considered the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan in so far as they relate to the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector's considerations of and recommendations about the St Peter's Factory site, we are of the view that the Council has not provided clear and adequate reasons as to why the Inspector's recommendations have not been adopted.

6.0 Modifications Sought

6.1 Our client seeks the amendment of Policy GDS.1 / NR4 so that it accurately reflects the Inspector's findings in respect to the potential residential capacity of

land at the St Peter's Factory site, i.e. to accommodate at least 150 dwellings.
 6.2 In the absence of its own capacity assessment, and having now presented the indicative scheme layout to the Council, we believe that the Council can be satisfied that the site is capable of accommodating additional housing in a manner that satisfactorily addresses planning considerations and planning policy objectives, including those in respect of employment provision.
 6.3 Should the Council not be minded to support our client's representations we request that;
 a. we be provided with clear and adequate reasons for its rejection of the Inspector's relevant recommendations, and that
 b. the Council considers holding a further Inquiry to fully consider these outstanding objections.

Modification: M/B9/49 - Addition of GDS.1/NR13 - Land at Coomb End

Ref:	4275/J1	Please explain what we are supposed to comment on!! Take note of appalling access. Please use correct address: COOMBEND not as written here.	The site requirements include the need for the development to address some of the particular highway problems. In addition, Policy T.24 requires that new development should take issues like this into account.	No change.
Location	Coombend Bath			
Ref:	3044/J4 /s	Development at Coombe End, Radstock and Radstock Scrap Yard It is noted that the previously proposed Coombe End regeneration area has now been deleted from the Proposals Maps. Notwithstanding this it is submitted that the area is in need of improvement and furthermore represents an opportunity to provide redevelopment which will enhance the area as a whole. In this regard general support is given to the text contained within Recommendation R5.18 and modification number M1B9149-M1B9150 which states in part that: 'preparation of DPD for the area to address the highway and environmental problems in the area will be considered in a review of the LDS.' I also note that the Council further suggests that: 'a DPD will help to address some of the long term problems of the area and difficult sites but in the meantime, existing policy framework, particularly new policies ET3 and ET4 and Modified Policy HG4 will guide proposals for development.' Clearly this approach will allow the consideration of sites not specifically allocated for housing at this time such as the Scrap Yard site in Coombe End. The Scrap Yard is accessed off Coombe End at what is the gateway to the Coombe End area from Radstock Town Centre. As such it is considered it has an important part to play in future regeneration of the area. The site is of a reasonable size in relation to Radstock and has the potential to provide a scheme which could help to secure environmental enhancement to the area by removing a bad-neighbour use. Land surrounding the Scrap Yard is also subject to a number of residential consents located on the hillside which have resulted in the piecemeal development of this area of Coombe End. It is considered that a more comprehensive scheme providing an overall enhancement of the area as well as the opportunity to regularise the development boundary will be appropriate in order to provide environmental benefit to Radstock as well as the adjoining Conservation Area. Furthermore a site of this size could act as a catalyst for future regeneration and improvement in the area with the aim of providing an overarching approach to the existing environmental and highway problems in the area. As such any DPD should consider the Scrap Yard site in detail as part of a co-	Support and comments noted.	No change.
Location	Coombend Norton Radstock			

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
	ordinated approach to development in the area.		
Ref: 4267/J1 Location Coombend Norton Radstock	We are objecting to the proposed allocation of land at Coombe End, Radstock because with no improvement on access to Coombe End this will be a risk hazard for motorists and pedestrians. Also a mixed usage on a bigger scale is not appropriate.	The site requirements include the need for the development to address some of the particular highway problems. In addition, Policy T.24 requires that new development should take issues like this into account.	No change.
Ref: 4274/J1 Location Coombend Norton Radstock	Thirty houses being built we feel that we will be overlooked as we only have a bungalow. Our view at the front will be obstructed by the houses. There will be no more green fields to look at, only buildings. Thirty houses will mean more congestion. The road at the moment is full of cars parked on pavements, this little road will never cope with the amount of traffic thirty extra houses would bring. Would a road be made onto both roads so that traffic would have to use this exit and not block up Coombe End.	This is a brownfield site with existing development. Government policy requires that densities are maximised for sustainability reasons but at the same time, this site lies within the Radstock Conservation Area and therefore Policy BH.6 requires that any proposed scheme would need to preserve or enhance the character of the area. In addition Policy D.2 has been modified to clarify considerations to be given to the amenities of existing residents. The site requirements include the need for the development to address some of the particular highway problems. In addition, Policy T.24 requires that new development should take issues like this into account.	No change.

Modification: M/B9/51 - Welton Packaging Factory

Ref: 3629/J8 Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock	<p>Inclusion of this previously-developed land allocation reflects acknowledged re-development opportunities for residential and employment uses. The site is also deliverable (i.e. likely to contribute at the point envisaged in the plan) in the context of definitions within relevant PPS & PPG.</p> <p>A responsive approach to plan making is however required in Council's consideration of the Inspector's recommendations based upon the desirability of using the land efficiently. In this regard the future delivery of mixed use development should be based upon accurate and up to date information relating to the rationalisation of the existing use of the site (Inspector's Reasoning 8.56 Pg. 356).</p> <p>Based upon previous confirmation from B&NES Council staff that this existing factory site would be dealt with as an opportunity site in future decision making, a detailed planning application was formulated for mixed use development. This incorporated a robust review of site-specific factors, relevant guidance and standards, market demand and preparation of a detailed masterplan for the site. Statutory consultees commented upon the site specific proposals. Community participation also took place over the options for accommodating mixed use development on land and buildings that are vacant and derelict as well as land that is currently in use but has potential for re-development.</p> <p>Based upon this assessment additional employment related development (3,250 sq.m.), removal of all existing factory buildings south of Welton Brook, opening up of sections of the existing culverted brook, provision of a range of community facilities and a mix of 135 high quality dwellings (including affordable housing). These proposals have recently been reviewed in the context of the key principles underpinning PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS3 Housing including the effective use of land and existing infrastructure.</p> <p>In view of the above an allowance should be included in the wording of the</p>	<p>Support for the allocation noted. 100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	No change.
---	--	---	------------

allocation to reflect the defined potential of this existing factory site for employment regeneration, the provision of community infrastructure and housing within the plan period. We would be happy to liaise with Council over the full details of this representation.

Ref: 3869/J1

Location Welton Bag
Factory site
Norton Radstock

My main concern is the traffic problems, Station Road is very busy as it is and it can take up to 4-5 minutes to join traffic flow at busy times. If this development goes ahead I think Council should consider the introduction of Traffic lights, otherwise existing residents are going to find it extremely difficult to join traffic on Station road.
. . At the moment our road is subjected to the 'Welton Pong ' from the existing development, If mixed development is permitted can a tighter controls of emissions etc be implemented relating to the industrial users.

The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.

No change.

100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.

The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.

The objection raises no new issues warranting a

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3870/J1</p> <p>Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I do not think that putting houses on this site is a very good idea. It would be better to put small units for people to set up business in Midsomer Norton. It would help people looking for work in the area rather than to go to Bath or Bristol. There is no point in having housing if you cannot afford to pay the rent.</p>	<p>further modification.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.</p> <p>100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Ref: 3991/J2</p> <p>Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We have lived at Wilola which is directly behind the factory with access directly behind the rear factory entrance. For the past 22 years the traffic which passes our road has gradually increased over the years to the point that it has become increasingly difficult to pull out onto the main station road at all times, but especially during peak times. The traffic coming from both ways is very fast moving, especially traffic from the Midsomer Norton direction. This road is now very much a main through fare for traffic from Bristol (very large lorries are the norm) and Paulton, and from the other direction we have traffic from Radstock, Frome etc. The coach park in Welton now has approximately 20-30 coaches daily doing school runs etc and causes a lot of traffic jams at peak times, creating queues right past our entrance. With more people now also using the cycle track, we also get a lot of people parking up in this area so that they can walk their dogs or take the children to the park at Radstock. Further development of this very large site would create a huge amount of traffic and the only access would be straight onto an already very busy, congested road. What about the link road we thought was going to be put in to take traffic straight across to the Radstock Road Enterprise Park, thereby avoiding the queues up to the Stones Cross and along Radstock Road? We would like to be kept informed of any future developments regarding this proposal. Our further concern apart from increase in traffic would obviously be the increased noise levels. Over the last 5 years we have been continually in contact with Mr Alan Bratt the Environment Officer who has dealt with all our enquiries to a very satisfactory level by liaising with the factory. This has been because of the excessive noise levels coming from the factory which is below us, and the factory has made several improvements to decrease noise levels to bring them within the legal requirements.</p> <p>Also attached is a map and email.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.</p> <p>100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

<p>Ref: 3993/J1</p> <p>Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We object to any development on the land at Welton Bag Factory. It will completely spoil the peace and quiet of our garden, and also the nature of our house. Our house is adjacent to the Car Park and Factory.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.</p> <p>100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

<p>Ref: 3994/J1</p> <p>Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock</p>	<p>Part of the factory is not being used and is not being maintained. It is an eyesore. The boundary hedge has grown into trees and is encroaching upon the neighbours garden.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.</p> <p>100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

<p>Ref: 4271/J1</p> <p>Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I agree that the old eyesore buildings should be pulled down but not to be replaced by further industrial units or low cost housing.</p> <p>The noise, smell and unsafe building have been a nuisance for as many years as I can remember. The current green area should be made into a park with the river running through it.</p> <p>The homes must not be low cost housing or rental as this brings with it crime, drugs, theft and single teenage mothers on social.</p> <p>It is hard to object or approve a blank canvas.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.</p> <p>100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

<p>Ref: 4285/J1</p> <p>Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock</p>	<p>1. Reasons for objecting - We are concerned that access for the site will lead to increased traffic on A362 adding to more congestion on the Stones Cross roundabout, also the Radstock Road/ North Road/ Station Road/ West Roads.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.</p> <p>100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

<p>Ref: 4286/J1</p> <p>Location Welton Bag Factory site Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I consider it would be preferable to leave the site undeveloped or else make this semi-rural area around the Wellow Brook into a nature conservation area. I would be very concerned for wildlife already existing in this area, when we have a marvellous opportunity to use this greenfield site as a natural habitat for otters, bats and Kingfishers etc.</p> <p>If houses or further industrial units were to be built on this land I would be extremely concerned about access to either project.</p> <p>Any vehicular access via the Station Road existing access to the factory site would be a death-trap, as anyone who travels this route on a regular basis will no doubt already be aware, particularly the dangerous bend at the junction with Millards Hill. School children regularly use the surrounding local footpaths on their way to school via the local Greenway and if they had to resort to being driven on a 'school-run' by their parents, because of the road safety issue, this would greatly increase carbon emissions locally and it would be such a shame not to see children and mothers walking to school in all weathers, as we do now, thus helping to reduce childhood obesity.</p> <p>Further housing would add to the already dense developments between the Greenway/ West Road/North Road area. We have already had to have the Greenway dug up by Bristol Water because the local sewers could not cope with increased use by the existing houses so any further development in this area would surely mean further problems in this respect once again. If any more mature trees had to be cut down as well this would be further devastation to the natural environment of the Greenway and surrounding area.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that the Welton Bag Factory should be allocated for development. It is currently an underused factory site within a residential area and offers the opportunity for partial redevelopment for mixed-uses providing modern workspace and local improvements.</p> <p>100 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation. The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in principle in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. It is in a sustainable location close to the town centre and to local employment opportunities.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requires a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) and would also require that any developer contact them at an early stage for advice on flooding issues relating to the Wellow Brook.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

Modification: M/B9/52 - Addition of land at Welton Packaging Factory to Proposals Maps

Ref: 3953/J1 /s	Support proposed modification but only if upgrading to street lighting, footpath extends from Radstock up to proposed modification and road surface is upgraded to carry additional traffic, access to the entrance to Coombend is suitably reviewed and parking "off street" is included with any proposed housing etc.	Support noted. Any proposals for the site will need to meet the site requirements set out in the Local Plan in terms of highway safety as well as other policies in the Plan such as T.24 on the highway requirements of new development as well as policies D2 & 4 on design and Policy T.26 on parking standards. Opportunities for improvements to street lighting will need to be investigated.	No change.
Location Coombend Norton Radstock			

Modification: M/B9/53 - Addition of GDS.1/NR15 - Land at Cautletts Close

Ref: 2310/J21	As a greenfield site outside the main urban area of Bath, allocation of this site should only be considered after land at Beechen Cliff School, Bath.	The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.	No change.
Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock		The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.	
		The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of	

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3826/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I am objecting for a number of reasons. The first being an increase in traffic in the neighbourhood generated by any new development. Redfield Road, for example, would have to deal with yet more congestion adding to a much greater threat of accidents and fatalities to children travelling to St Johns C of E Primary School or Somervale School. My own home, at present situated on a quiet cul-de-sac, could very likely be changed to a busy through road for access to new homes. Secondly, the destruction of wildlife and habitats that any development will create is unacceptable. The land is a hunting ground for buzzards, provides grazing for deer, and along the river king-fishers are regularly spotted searching for food. In addition to this the flora may well be of significance as I have spotted orchids growing. The local railway is already destroying wildlife corridors by cutting down woodland in the area to lay track. Soon there will be no green spaces left in this area and Midsomer Norton will be a landscape of concrete and brick.</p>	<p>the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Finally, the possibility of adding yet further concrete or tarmac surfaces will impact on the River Somer. Flash flooding would be a real possibility and would lead to an overall change in the biodiversity in the river and have an effect on the course that the river takes down stream. Building on this flood plain would lead to a rise in insurance for residents and potential flooding of homes. Planners do not seem to have taken into account events from recent history such as the floodings of towns and villages (e.g. Gloucester and Tewksbury) from building in places such as this. Developing Brownfield sites must be more appropriate. I would like to see the plan remain as it is and NOT be changed to an area of development.

housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3827/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>It would be a shame to lose one of the few remaining natural fields within Midsomer Norton. Not only for dog walkers of our community, but also for our local wildlife. We personally have seen slow worms and deer in this field on numerous occasions, which all adds to the character of our town. This development would also add to an already over congested road (withies park/steam mills) on a major route for children walking to school. We are proposing that this land remain as a field.</p>	<p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

			<p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	
Ref:	3828/J1	<p>We object to the proposed modifications as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land is on a flood plane and is often water logged. 2. There will be at least 200 extra cars needing access. 3. This is a greenfield site in a rural area next to a school playing field and the local cricket club, both of which would be effected adversely by 100 extra persons. 4. The value of the houses in this quiet cul-de-sac will be badly affected by an adjoining development. 5. The GP surgeries and local Schools would not cope with the extra families that would move in. 6. Withies Park and Steam Mills are already congested areas and access for 	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the</p>	No change.
Location	Cautletts Close Norton Radstock			

emergency vehicles and buses is already difficult.

Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3828/J2</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase in traffic by at least 50% 2. Access through Withies Park is already severely congested at times - buses, emergency vehicles in particular are affected. 3. The site is a flood plain and is waterlogged much of the year. 4. Drainage (sewers) is already a problem in the Withies Park area - this would add to the problem. 5. Diminishing wildlife in the area would be even more badly affected. 6. Additional houses in this area will put even more strain on local doctors/dentists/schools. 	<p>application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate</p>	No change.

Ref: 3830/J1	A) If this proposed development went ahead it would radically change this quiet residential area, where many existing residents have chosen to live next a green belt, potentially causing existing residents to move away and breaking up the neighbourhood ethos, and lower house prices.	additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.	
Location Cautletts Close	B) A development of this size would allow potentially up to 200-250 children close access to the newly set up 'nature reserve' associated with the new steam railway line, and drive away or kill existing wildlife who have very little green field options	The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.	
Norton Radstock		The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.	
		The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.	
		Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.	
		The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham,	No change.

and space left.

C) Withies Park road being the exit from the development would become even more congested and dangerous that it already is. This is a twisting road with many parked cars on it, and is already over busy at certain times, and already dangerous; cars having to stop at a moments notice, due to the bends in the road.

D) The field already becomes water logged at times, plus at times rain water travels like a river behind my home in Withies Lane (so that people cannot walk along it at all) and drains into a ditch running on one side of he proposed field.

E) What schooling would be provided for the children and where? - over populated

F) The area of Withies Lane, and the fields leading up to the old railway line are the main places people from the surrounding area at present walk their dogs, plus families walk this way, especially in the Summer. The whole area would be spoilt. Please keep this whole area green.

then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3831/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>The site was excluded from future housing developments. Over population of the area. Another 200 plus cars. Access problems. Area is prone to flooding. Green belt area, loss of wildlife. Loss of park land, green trees and fields. Decrease of house prices. Not enough schools to accommodate children</p>	<p>part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy</p>	

walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.

<p>Ref: 3832/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Previous plans discussed in depth and a decision was made to remove the site from any further developments. 2. It is designated a flood plain 3. The area is currently over populated 4. Access is poor 5. There will be a loss to wildlife 6. Facilities in Midsomer Norton are already stretched 7. Recent weather has shown that facilities currently cannot cope with water 	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

Ref:				
3833/J1		Development of the field will destroy wildlife (badgers have been heard during night time).	associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.	
Location	Cautletts Close	Area of proposed development land and beyond was designated a flood plain.	The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.	
	Norton Radstock	Withies Lane is awash after rain, the proposed development site is a swamp, the river Somer rises near to overflowing after heavy rain, the existing flood prevention scheme now does not allow the river to be at a constant level.	Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.	
		Withies Lane too small to accommodate estate traffic, Steam Mills/Withies Park already used as a 'Redfield Road' derestricted bypass to Chilcompton Road, Chilcompton and beyond.	The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no	No change.
		Facilities in the town, in comparison to nearby towns of Frome and Wells, are inadequate to keep custom (not enough large chains to draw/keep shoppers).		
		Existing schools, doctors and dentists will already be over subscribed after the Duchy of Cornwall development is complete, without the population expansion this proposal will bring.		
		Local employment is dying in the area.		

additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3835/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>This area will become overpopulated if there are 110 houses built here, This will also mean at least another 150 cars, There will be problems with access to this site and will make the" Close" a very busy road.</p> <p>This will also increase traffic problems in the Redfield Road area, where there is already a great problem with the traffic flow, due in part to parents dropping off and picking-up their children at the local schools and this will be increasingly aggravate the situation.</p> <p>There will be a loss of green fields and trees, which we greatly need. .The reason we moved here 3 years ago was for the peace and quiet the area gave us, but with the increase in this area of over 300 people and at least 150 cars that will be lost. It will also mean that our houses will be devalued.</p> <p>Will the schools, doctors and the other infrastructure be sufficient to cope with this additional growth in population?</p> <p>According to the Environment Agency flood map the Cautletts Close area is in a flood plain, what plans have been made to alleviate the risk of flooding? We were greatly surprised not to have been notified of this proposal personally, but only to find out about it in the local press. We understand that in the past at least two planning applications have been made but refused, we feel this proposal should again be refused.</p>	<p>Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3836/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bad access 2. Traffic congestion in an over populated housing estate 3. Bad drainage in field 4. Flood relief exit for river 5. 110 units, 150 cars 6. Would you want it in your back garden? 7. My biggest concern will lose value to my property 	<p>stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for</p>	

residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3837/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>There are for sure big issues about flooding to be considered. I would have grave concerns about an increased risk of flooding to any property. The development of this land considered by Wessex Water (letter to support) to be located in the natural flood plain of the River Somer would be a huge mistake. We do not have the services infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors, dentists, roads etc to support continued over development in Midsomer Norton. Access to any development would be from I assume, Withies Park. This road is already used as a Chilcompton road by-pass by residents of Chilcompton. The 'Barley Mow' housing estate has also had an impact on traffic volume.</p> <p>Included are letters from Wessex Waters, Wessex Rivers and 'photographic evidence'.</p>	<p>harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3838/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I am firmly of the opinion that the land at Cautletts Close is designated in the 10 year plan - it most certainly was when I was a councillor. Given the dire warnings given by eminent scientists about global warming and the possibility of increased flooding, it seems to me that to even consider development on this site is wrong. Withies Park has become the 'Redfield Road By-Pass' and is frequently used as a short cut between Midsomer Norton and the Mendip villages. All in all this is an ill conceived modification and is not worthy of consideration. This area is flood plain, designating it otherwise is risky.</p>	<p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3839/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning permission previously refused. 2. Area floods, loss of green belt, park land 3. Increase in cars 4. Lack of schools able to cope with extra children locally 5. Loss of privacy 6. In 1990, councillors decided not for any building in future as the site was unsuitable 7. Access problems 	<p>features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design,</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3841/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>Objecting because when we purchased our home three years ago we opted for a quiet cul-de-sac with country side views and it is lovely. If the field in question is built upon, our location will be spoiled and probably decrease the value of our house. The other thing to concern us is where the point of access will be to the houses, it better not cut through our cul-de-sac. We strongly oppose the building on this land.</p>	<p>layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3842/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>The area was currently the right balance between housing and recreation. Further housing cannot be substantiated. Access to the proposed area will be limited and other points cannot be seriously considered. Further housing, unless of a select nature will likely decrease housing prices, increase the risk of vandalism and potentially attract undesirable clientele. The proposed area is often flooded, therefore considerable council tax money would need to be spent, hence increasing rates/ Finally, no notice has been advised to local residents other than a small newspaper article. This development is not viable and should not be considered.</p>	<p>nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110</p>	<p>No change.</p>

			<p> dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	
Ref:	3882/J1	We object to the land becoming a site for development. The reasons are;		
Location	Cautletts Close Norton Radstock	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is part of a flood plain 2. Development could lead to flash flooding down stream 3. Increased road traffic will increase congestion significantly 	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be</p>	No change.

both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3883/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We are objecting on the following grounds;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extra traffic flow and attendant hazard feeding into the established Withies Park/ Steam Mills area 2. The proposed field would be over developed and is often a swampy location with much water flow off the adjacent hillside 3. The tranquillity of the valley with its sports and recreational ambience spoiled 	<p>2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries</p>	No change.

			<p>have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	
Ref:	3884/J1	<p>Thank you for your letter notifying us of a proposed development (yet again) in the field directly behind our house. What a shame that we read about this two weeks ago in the Somerset Guardian. We were even more surprised to learn from our local councillors that they had also received no prior notification, and also learnt about it first via the local press.</p> <p>Many of our neighbours, local councillors and ourselves objected to applications to build on this field in 1988 and 1990. We had hoped that would be an end to matters regarding this piece of land.</p> <p>I have enclosed copies of press cuttings from 1990—please read them!</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield</p>	No change.
Location	Cautletts Close Norton Radstock			

As we have explained before, we purchased our house for its superior outlook at the rear over open countryside, and for this we paid a premium. The field in question is not heavily farmed but is used regularly for exercising dogs in the dryer months. At this time of year the field is passed over much less often as it is very wet and boggy. We were led to believe that drainage was an issue in the earlier applications and this would explain why the owners representatives have made recent enquiries to Wessex Water regarding their latest plans. You will be interested to know that over the last few years there have been problems regarding land and sewer drainage with the houses already on the estate. Earlier applications were for 34 houses, the latest is for up to 110. One might assume that someone has the bright idea that if they ask to build 110 houses, this might be scaled down somewhat and then any objectors might consider that not so bad after all? Let there be no misunderstanding, we do not want II0—34—or any houses on this field.

Finally we would ask that in future, can you please notify us at the earliest opportunity with any information regarding this land adjoining our property.

Also attached, two newspaper clippings

site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3885/J2</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>1. It would be irresponsible to build on this land as it acts as a sponge to soak up the winter flood waters. (See photographs provided and note the reeds and rushes growing in the middle of the field which indicates how boggy this land is.) Some of the surrounding fields drain into this field. It has always been considered to be a flood plain. The last time planning on this land was refused (1988) Wessex Water objected because it was a flood plain and Wansdyke technical services could only recommend planning if the level of the site was artificially raised and flood banks constructed.</p> <p>2. Draining the land into the river Somer will cause flooding further down stream. Gardens from Redfield Farm onwards already suffer occasional flooding in winter. The river narrows to approximately four to five foot at one point before it enters the flood relief system and any extra surge of water will make their problems far worse.</p> <p>3. The local infrastructure is at bursting point. The number of cars using Withies Park is intolerable. This is a well known problem to the council which has not been resolved. Part of the problem is due to the fact that it is easier to cut through the estate than use the main road (Redfield Road). New housing has already been built in the area putting extra pressure on the already congested Redfield Road/Steam Mills area, which is still to be resolved.</p> <p>4. We have had several issues with the sewers blocking and raw sewerage getting into the stream. This is mostly due to low level of the land and angle of incline of the sewers. These issues will only get worse if this land is developed.</p> <p>5. A route to the site is not as obvious as it seems from looking at a plan. The junction of three roads at the Crossway's pub is a planner's nightmare. Steam Mills is so narrow that parked cars cause huge congestion. The Withies Park estate roads are generally narrow as they were never designed to be thru roads and carry the amount of traffic that they presently do</p> <p>Also included are 6 colour photographs (3 pages)</p>	<p>risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has</p>	No change.

confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.

Ref:	3886/J1	Several years ago, a council decision was taken that the site referred to should be excluded for the purpose of future housing development. To my knowledge this decision still stands. The decision was based on local knowledge of the area and sound common sense. I recommend BANES investigates its records inherited from Wansdyke council!!! See also covering letter	The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the	No change.
Location	Cautletts Close Norton Radstock			

Without wishing to appear caustic, how can you write to remind me about a subject of which I was previously unaware? As a local resident and council tax payer likely to be directly affected by this proposal, I would have expected to have been informed immediately this proposal was considered, as a matter of common courtesy!

Having lived at my present address for 18 years I have seen both good and bad developments within the Midsomer Norton and Radstock areas. However, for every new housing development that has been completed the basic road structure has remained the same creating overcrowded and overused roads. Yes, we have new traffic lights, crossings and roundabouts supposedly designed to help traffic flow. But developers are missing one vital point — the basic roads are still the same and when designed for limited market town use, not an offshoot for Bath's housing problems.

My information source suggests that if the green light is given for the above proposal we could be looking at up to 110 houses being built in this one small field. The following is therefore highly relevant:

- A small field prone to flooding because of its low-lying position with the potential to pose major problems to any new residents.
- This number of houses will add a possible 200 more vehicles to our local roads, creating more unnecessary carbon emissions.
- The extra refuse created will add to the already overworked collection services resulting from B&NES ill conceived and poorly received changes inflicted on residents in June of this year.

I firmly believe that B&NES will be making a rod for its own back by pushing on with this proposal especially as councillors previously working for Wansdyke Council had agreed that this site should not in future be used for housing.

Earlier this year Writhlington School received a massive boost with funding for major improvements there are also welcome plans for road improvements in Radstock so it would make sound sense to look at Radstock and Writhlington for any housing developments if they really are needed?

I enclose my completed 'Representation Form' for your consideration and retention and hope that common sense prevails over this proposal i.e. in an age when green is supposedly the watch word for the future, B&NES as a Liberal run authority should be looking to keep this part of Midsomer Norton as intended — a green field to be enjoyed. Failure to do so will be remembered by the voting public!

Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3902/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We wish to take this opportunity to lay out why we are strongly opposed to any development on this site and to underline the impact on the residents of this area and the environmental concerns we have.</p> <p>Firstly this area is still a flood plane and change of ownership doesn't change this fact. When the area was owned by Wessex Water, they objected to any building plans on this site, so what has changed... apart from ownership? Surely with what we are told about Global Warming and Climate Change we are going to need this area more than ever to avoid flooding in years to come. I have personally seen this river only feet from the top of its banks and living only several metres away, does give us reasons for concern! You only have to take a walk into the proposed field to see that this area is doing its job, the ground is absolutely sodden this time of year, all the locals know that! If you cover this area in concrete and tarmac there is only one place this water could go ... in the river!</p> <p>This brings me to the environmental issues concerning the impact on the river. Being a keen conservationist and angler, I am aware of the direct impact residential areas can have on the natural habitats of fauna and flora.</p> <p>For example surface wash from residential areas in the form of oils, detergents and fertilizers can cause untold damage to any river, lake or stream. This isn't just bad news for the fish, but for the whole eco system. This why as I am sure you are aware that the Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora also Annex I habitats and Annex II species occurring in the UK, sets out a very specific E.U. directive to safe guard habitat deterioration (just a quick look down the list tells me the Bullhead... and possibly the Brook Lamprey are present in this river.</p> <p>With regards to the wildlife, we regularly see: Kingfishers, Deer, Badgers and Foxes which are a rare sight in most areas, not to mention nesting birds, we don't want this to change. These small things bring a certain quality to living in this area, this is why we chose to be here.</p> <p>Moving on to other issues, the access to this site, I would imagine would be on the left after the bridge leading to Cautletts Close. We live next to the bridge and</p>	<p>development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle</p>	No change.

additional noise from vehicles accelerating and slowing down to use the junction would be a real issue, not to mention the additional vehicular traffic passing our door. We also have pets including 4 cats, which when finding a new home is a big consideration. Questions of their safety were paramount when we decided to move here and we feel our duty of care would be compromised.

Additional traffic through Withies Park and Steam Mills, which is already a rabbit warren would cause an issue for many, and the proposed traffic calming scheme would be like 'closing the stable r after the horse has bolted' ... hardly a solution! Also our thoughts on the improved public access along the River Somer... is this really going to a step in right direction? If you spend time living here you would know that we are already disturbed most weekends especially in the warmer months (windows open) by revellers returning from a night out. Improvements to access and increased pedestrian traffic would be horrific, not progress.

Additional lighting along the way would almost certainly attract a youth following.., as somewhere to hang out and 'have a bit of a laugh' at the expense of families in the area.

Summing up, for us this development would be a total disaster, It would spoil an idyllic and unique part of Midsomer Norton reflecting its rural location, but accessibility to amenities. For us any change to this area will have a detrimental affect on the quality of our lives and an impact on the environment surrounding us. This is why we say a big NO to this proposal.

Also included; copies of the EC Habitats Directive, a location map and an extract from Mersey Basin Campaign

links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.

<p>Ref: 3909/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposal. The main reason is the volume of traffic along Steam Mills/Withies Park has increased tremendously since Staddlestones was developed. This traffic will inevitably increase further should more houses be built on the land in question. Cars travelling to the ongoing estate in Chilcompton Road which has not yet been completed also use this route. At times the traffic is horrendous with severe accidents occurring.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3914/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I feel that another 150 cars at least would cause more traffic congestion as the roads around the area i.e. Chilcompton Road, Redfield Road and Church Lane. As this field has been set aside for a number of years, it is a haven for wildlife. Deer can often be seen in the field, while many species of small birds visit our garden. Flooding to a number of bungalows by the river could be a real threat.</p>	<p>associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no</p>	

additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3931/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>1. Overcrowding of area. Withies Road congestion. Waterlogged ground. Flooding Area. Close to wildlife site - disturbance. Town expanding into green belt. No one welcomes this.</p> <p>2. Amendments - leave for animal grazing.</p>	<p>Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3932/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>Too much traffic in the area especially at the school. The area is over populated.</p> <p>Attached a letter sent to neighbours.</p>	<p>stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3933/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We object because;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Over population of the area 2. An extra 200+ cars 3. Loss of green fields and trees 4. Flooding 5. Access problems <p>We are seeking a refusal for planning permission to build up to 110 houses at Cautletts close , Midsomer Norton</p>	<p>harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3934/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I object to the proposed plans to build on land behind the Midsomer Norton Cricket Club for the following reason;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Previous decisions to exclude site from future development 2. Access problems for additional vehicles 3. Flooding 4. Loss of green fields 5. Over population with insufficient amenities 	<p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3961/J1 /s</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>The land at Cautletts Close, Midsomer Norton, is surrounded on two sides by residential development, lies within 400m of three schools, two comprehensives and a junior mixed infants, is only 600m from the Town Centre, and has excellent cycle/footpath links. The Cautletts Close site is, therefore in a sustainable location. The site also lies within, rather than on the edge of the settlement and consequently does not result in the outward extension of the town. For the reasons provided above, we support the addition of Planning Policy GDS.1/NR15.</p>	<p>features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 4026/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I must object most strongly to the proposal to build some 110 houses on the land at Cautletts Close. The road access and pedestrian access required for such a development would put a tremendous strain on the currently available resources together with the impact on the environment brought about by that increase in both road and pedestrian traffic. The impact to the area with some 200 extra vehicles requiring access, together with an over-population issue of the area would potentially seriously impact the immediate area. Add to this the potential for increasing the risk of flooding in this area and the impact this would have on existing houses must be deemed as unacceptable not only by the existing residents but also by the services that will be required to respond to such situations. The environment would be further impacted by the loss of the green field site and the loss of trees. In 1990, the council moved to exclude this particular site from future housing development in this area, if this is the case, then why is this land being considered?</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has</p>	No change.

confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.

Ref:	4027/J1	We are objecting to the development of more houses/bungalows to be built at Cautletts Close, Midsomer Norton. Due to over development of the area, pollution, traffic problems have already arisen. Over population, lack of public resources - schools, doctors and all resources not mentioned. Development totally unacceptable.	The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the	No change.
Location	Cautletts Close Norton Radstock			

Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4028/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>1. Traffic: there have been a number of accidents on Steam Mills/Withies Park as a result of traffic congestion and parking. The council has acknowledged the problem by proposing restrictions in Redfield Road/Steam Mill. These road serve two large local schools. With no continuous pavements, children are a risk every day. Any further development will jeopardise what the council is trying to achieve.</p> <p>2. Reject modification.</p> <p>1. Water table: Foundations in the water meadow will elevate the local water table. Water levels will de-stabilise the bottom third of our garden making it prone to erosion. The cricket pitch already prone to flooding, will be under water. You will recall this happened to the play park when Cautletts Close/Furlong Close were built. This necessitated remedial work.</p> <p>2. Reject modification. If plan is modified, major expenditure needed on total rebuild of drainage system to protect you from liability.</p> <p>1. Sewerage: there is a (known) existing problem with drains from Withies Park/Cautletts Close. There has been overflow of sewerage into the river. This development will exacerbate this problem, causing higher risk of contamination of the river Somer with a risk to health and wildlife.</p> <p>2. Keep it as a water meadow OR total rebuild of sewerage system in this park of Midsomer Norton. Reject Modification.</p> <p>1.Surface Water: The land is a water meadow and stores water, reducing surges down the River Somer. With each new development up stream the run-off has increased and during surges our bridge and banks are under threat. One third of our garden is already compromised by flooding from this field. Further development will potentially flood our garden and house.</p> <p>2. Leave as a water meadow to safeguard property and protect you from liability. Reject modification.</p>	<p>development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle</p>	No change.

links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.

<p>Ref: 4029/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>We have previously objected to this land being developed many years ago and we understand from the councillor at the time that this land would be excluded from any future housing development. This land floods badly, is rarely dry - more houses would be overpopulation of the area resulting in access problems causing heavy traffic problems in Withies Park and added problems for local amenities. It would be the loss of another open space and of course our view across to the horizon from the rear of our property. This field is obviously on set aside which encourages all sorts of wildlife - deer, pheasants, wild birds for example, and of course for people to exercise dogs.</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	---	--	-------------------

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4030/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>This land has always been flooded and has been left as green field for this reason. Also the flood scheme in place starts further down stream towards the 'high street'. We watch the birds build their nest and feed their young in the trees between Withies Park and the said field. Withies Park is now like a race track for cars and motorbikes, even the short stretch between the main run through Withies and Cautletts Close. The footpath called Riverside Walk crosses this stretch of road and even now should have a raised path across the road to protect the children, Mothers and people that use this path from the racing cars. I used to walk this path up the side of the river over fifty years ago when I was a child playing in the fields and helping the farmer. I also believe there is a need for speed ramps through the main run of Withies Park as it is getting harder all the time to pull out of the side roads as cars are racing through so fast and I would say some had to be doing between 50 and 60 miles per hour. I am a car driver myself.</p>	<p>associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p>	No change.

additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.

The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.

The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.

The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4284/J1</p> <p>Location Cautletts Close Norton Radstock</p>	<p>As a family we feel that there is enough traffic in this area already without the addition of another 150+ vehicles. Also we feel very lucky to have fields around us, which is a main reason for moving here 18 months ago. Cautletts and Withies are sought after properties and if this site goes ahead, this will have an adverse effect on us all.</p>	<p>Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc. As a result of the Council's investigations it was concluded that land at Cautletts Close/Withies Lane should be allocated for residential development. Although planning permission was refused on this site in 1988 for a residential scheme circumstances were such that no additional land was required for housing in the Norton-Radstock area at the time.</p> <p>The site is well related to the urban form and well located to local shops and community facilities and services with good existing pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre. It also lies within easy walking distance of local primary and secondary schools which, Council's education department has confirmed, have the capacity to accommodate additional pupils generated from the proposed development. Similarly the existing local surgeries have capacity to receive new clients.</p> <p>The anticipated dwelling capacity is about 110 dwellings although the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application as will other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed allocation is considered acceptable in highway terms and any traffic management issues would need to be resolved at planning application</p>	<p>No change.</p>

stage. The development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan will require an improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures and a secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians.

The Environment Agency has no objection to development of this site in principle but advises that part of site nearest river in Flood Zone 3 should not be developed. The Agency would require a Flood risk Assessment to accompany any planning application (which is now a requirement of Policy NE.14) in respect of any development in Flood Zone 2.

Although the site is not designated as a site of nature conservation interest Policy NE.11 would safeguard any species of local importance or its habitat whilst Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to biodiversity and other natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application. Policy NE.15 seeks to conserve or enhance the character, amenity or wildlife value of watercourses and their corridors.

Modification: M/B9/55 - GDS.1/V3 - Paulton Printing Factory

Ref:	3237/J28 /s	Mixed use development of Paulton Printing Factory.	Support noted.	No change.
Location	Paulton Printing Factory Paulton			
Ref:	3237/J40	REASON FOR OBJECTING: Mixed use development of Paulton printing factory.	The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate a number of sites in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. In respect of the two sites at Peasedown St John the concluded that land between Church Road and New Buildings performs an important function in maintaining the separation of New Buildings as an independent group of houses rather than an extension of the larger built up area into the countryside. Land east of Carlingcott Lane forms part of the open	No change.
Location	Paulton Printing Factory Paulton			
	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Representations for the proposed sites for inclusion in the B&NES Local Plan have previously been submitted by Healey and Baker, GVA Grimley, Hephher Dixon and ourselves.</p> <p>At the Public Local Inquiry held on the 5 April 2005, consideration was given to-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Whether the two sites should be allocated for housing within Policy GDS.1. > Whether the Housing Development Boundary should be amended to include both sites. > Wider housing issues concerning the adequacy of Brownfield Sites in the plan area. 			

From the Public Inquiry it was understood —

a. SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

The drawn boundaries on plan did not take into account aspects such as recreation and leisure fields (cricket etc), which should be within the urban boundary, not on the outside of it; with the actual boundaries still being under consideration at that time. It was stated that the representation sites at Church Road and Carlingcott Lane should be part of the Village Envelope and not part of the Rural Hinterland.

B. TRANSPORT

The council agreed that the Public Transport and village shops were adequate to sustain the village life and that a bus stop exists on the edge of the sites, which would assist in parties travelling to work outside the village without the use of cars thereby assisting in reducing carbon dioxide emissions. The council admitted that the sites are 500m from the village centre, but most of the village is 500m from the village centre.

C. HIGHWAYS

The council stated that Church Road and the surrounding roads were too narrow; however, the site frontage could be widened; and the Inspector stated that could be dealt with at the planning stage. The Inspector also stated that at Carlingcott Lane, the complete lane did not require to be widened, just at the access point at one corner near the recreation ground where the lane had already been widened; and again it could be dealt with at the planning stage.

D. ECOLOGY

The Ecologists stated that the Sites should be of National Conservation Interest (SNCI). They had found Limestone Grass on both sites, and a Badger Set on the Church Road site, however; that would not stop development.

The Church Road site was overgrown and had killed much of the Limestone Grass but Limestone Grass was growing well on the Carlingcott Site. The Ecologists requested that the site be grazed to encourage its growth and recommended that the Council should be content with some development on the Carlingcott site providing that an area of land was set aside for the grass to thrive; which was agreed.

E. DEVELOPMENT

The Council stated that Peasedown Belle Vue Farm was fully built out to 21 units and that there would be no more development in Peasedown until after the UDP period ending 2011. However, two other large sites had been forwarded as a consideration for development.

The Council stated that Peasedown is an important R1 Settlement — a main area for habitation with infrastructure, public transport and shops to substantiate residential expansion; and that it was Peasedown Policy to develop Brownfield sites first, but admitted there were none at that time. The Bus garage was mentioned as a possibility but if it were developed it would lead to loss jobs; and the Inspector agreed that the new proposed employment zone would warrant in-migration and new housing.

F. THE INSPECTOR

The Inspector summed up by enquiring of the Council a suitable development density. It was agreed 8 dwellings to the acre, 20 dwellings to the hectare could be constructed on the sites.

countryside and that any development would be a harmful intrusion of the built up area into the countryside. In rejecting these sites the Inspector has identified sufficient sequentially preferable options for the Council to investigate to meet the strategic housing land requirement without the need for the allocation of Greenfield sites in such locations.

The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Ref: 3967/J1	<p>This representation relates to the former Paulton Printing Factory, Paulton. The site is approximately 9 km (6 miles) south of Bristol, via the A37/A39 trunk roads, Paulton is defined in the Local Plan as an R1 settlement with good facilities and public transport services.</p> <p>Following the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector's recommendation, the Paulton Printing Factory is proposed to be allocated for residential and business use under Policy GDS1 .V3.</p> <p>Historically, planning permission was granted in October 2002 for development of B1/B2/B8 units on the vacant land to the north west of the factory. In July 2003 outline planning consent was granted for residential redevelopment of the former book factory. The site was subsequently sold to Barratt Homes, which has submitted several reserved matters applications but is yet to gain an implementable consent. It was agreed at the Local Plan Inquiry (and appeal against refusal of a reserved matters application) that about 150 houses could be accommodated on the site.</p> <p>Polestar properties sought, through representations to the Local Plan as it emerged, the allocation of the north eastern part of the site (approx 4 ha) for 200 dwellings. This was in addition to the assumed 150 dwellings to be provided on the former book factory (now owned by Barratts) which has outline permission for residential development.</p> <p>At the time the representations were made and considered by the Inspector, the print works were to remain open. The print works closed in December 2005 and the buildings are currently vacant.</p> <p>Local Plan Representations and Process to Date</p> <p>In May 2006 the Local Plan Inspector's report was published. The Inspector found that Paulton is one of the larger R1 villages with a number of local services and facilities and public transport connections. The printing factory site is well located for future residents to make use of these services, and it comprises previously developed land. To that extent, development here would be a sustainable location" (para 5.144). The Inspector concluded that the Council "should assess the potential for a further 200 dwellings to be provided at the site together with new employment development during the plan period."</p> <p>The Inspector recommended that Policy GDS.1N3 Clause I be amended to read; "development for residential and business use beyond the south eastern part of the site to take place only as part of a mixed use scheme which includes employment development".</p> <p>The Inspector recommended that Policy GDS. 1N3 Clause ii be amended to read, "Some 350 dwellings to be accommodated within the factory site, with no more than 150 to be constructed unless linked to a scheme for the development of employment floorspace."</p> <p>Proposed modification no.M/B9/55 clause 11 states 'About 350 dwellings to be accommodated within the factory site, with no more that 150 to be constructed unless linked to a scheme for the development of employment floorspace.'</p> <p>Paulton Print Works Site</p> <p>The allocated site (owned by Purnell Property Partnership and Barratts) is approximately 19 ha.</p> <p>The Inspector's recommendation was made on the basis that the factory would remain open and the residential allocation would only cover a then disused part of the site. Since the Local Plan Inquiry took place the factory has closed completely. 200 dwellings is a very low estimate for the number of dwellings that could be provided on the non Barratts part of the site. This part of the site measures</p>	<p>Noted. 350 dwellings is the anticipated dwelling capacity but it is accepted that the actual dwelling capacity of the site will be determined through a planning application.</p>	No change.
---------------------	--	--	------------

approximately 15 ha overall. PPS3 (Housing, 2006) highlights the need for development to be in sustainable locations with good access to jobs, services and infrastructure, including public transport. PPS3 highlights the contribution that previously developed land can make to housing land supply and refers to a national annual target for at least 60 per cent of new housing to be provided on previously developed land. It also states that 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net should be used as a national indicative minimum. PPS3 also refers to the need to provide rural areas with housing in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability. There was significant discussion about housing numbers at the Local Plan Inquiry, which resulted in the Inspector identifying the need for additional greenfield housing allocations to be made. Even given the new allocations, B&NES has been set a very challenging housing completions target, which is inevitably difficult to deliver in an area where the main city is a World Heritage Site and much of the surrounding countryside is Green Belt. The Local Plan Inquiry also heard that there had been significant difficulties in bringing some brownfield allocations forward. The need for the Paulton Printing Works site to provide a mix of uses, including employment uses, is not contested. However, the 15 ha site (excluding the Barratts permission) has potential to deliver more than 200 dwellings. The precise mix of employment and housing (and other) uses should be determined through the development control process. However, the Local Plan should not place an overly conservative estimate of housing provision on the site which could be taken as an upper limit and may serve to restrict the delivery of housing on the site.

Proposed Changes

The Local Plan should state 200 dwellings as the minimum number to be provided on the site. We therefore suggest that proposed modification no. M/B9/55 clause 11 is amended to read:

At least 350 dwellings to be accommodated within the factory site, with no more than 150 to be constructed unless linked to a scheme for the development of employment floorspace.

Modification: M/B9/60 - Addition of GDS.1/V10 - Land between Wellow Land & Peasedown Bypass

Ref:	90/J1	We wish to register our opposition to the proposed modification of the above plan which will allow the release of agricultural land for further house building in Wellow Lane.	The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives,	No change.
Location	Wellow Lane and By-pass, Land between Peasedown St. John	At least 1400 houses have been built in this village in the past decade with no significant increase in core utilities. The village dentist, doctor's surgery and school are already over subscribed. There is only a small post office and a few little shops for a population of 6500+. There are frequent mini power cuts and low gas and water pressure where the systems cannot cope with the demand. There has been no significant job opportunities created leading to a massive increase in commuting to 1 and surrounding towns. The traffic on the A367 by-pass has increased four-fold in recent years, well in excess of original forecasts and will become much worse with the development of the Bath Business Park. It is proposed that children moving into any new development can go to schools outside the village thus increasing traffic pollution even more. Although the development proposal is in Wellow Lane, all the local traffic has to come along Wellow Mead. We will be sandwiched between two busy roads increasing pollution from exhaust		