

A topographic map of Bath and North East Somerset, Somerset, England. The map shows various towns and villages, including Bath, Corston, Wootton Bassett, and others. Black outlines on the map indicate the development boundaries for several areas. A white box with a green border is overlaid on the top left of the map, containing the council's name. Another white box is overlaid on the middle left, containing the title and date of the plan. The map features contour lines, roads, and water features.

Bath & North East Somerset Council

Placemaking Plan Housing Development Boundaries Review December 2015

BATH AND
NORTH EAST SOMERSET

Bath and North East Somerset –
The place to live, work and visit

Housing Development Boundaries Partial Review 2015

Contents

Introduction	3
Suggested changes	4
Town and parish council suggestions (excluding commitments)	4
Other stakeholder suggestions	6
Unimplemented planning permissions, site allocations and completed housing.....	9
Minor HDB errors discovered as part of work on Green Belt anomalies.....	11

Introduction

The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (April 2015) shows that on average, 150 housing units per annum have been delivered on sites of less than ten units (small site windfall) between 2010/2011-2014/2015. Housing Development Boundaries (HDBs) exist to allow small site windfall housing development to come forward, within the policy framework of the Local Plan, reflecting the roles and character of each settlement. As part of the Placemaking Plan, HDBs are being reviewed in order to take into account housing development which has occurred since the HDBs were last defined in the 2007 B&NES Local Plan, committed housing developments (allocations and extant permissions) and anomalies. The purpose of this review is not to allocate land at the settlement edge for new housing. It should be noted that in villages meeting the criteria of Policies RA1 and Ra2 where additional housing is required sites have been allocated in the Draft Placemaking Plan. Where these sites lie outside the existing HDB it is proposed the HDB should be amended to incorporate the site. Council data on completions and commitments has been used to inform this review, as well as suggestions from parish and town councils and members of the public, as part of the consultation on the Placemaking Plan Options Document.

For consistency in the review of the HDBs, guiding principles have been developed. Any adjustments must take into consideration the HDB principles, as detailed below. The main principle sets out the fundamental approach, and the sub-principles provide further clarification

The HDB guiding principles

Main principle:

The HDB will be generally defined tightly around the housing (i.e. permanent dwellings) of the settlement, excluding non-housing uses on the edge of the settlement. Sub-principles 1, 2 and 3 provide further clarification.

Sub-principle 1:

HDBs do not need to be continuous. It may be appropriate given the nature and form of the settlement to define two or more separate elements. These elements should normally consist of the core housing of the settlement, but exclude small clusters of housing (i.e. usually less than ten dwellings). HDBs should not be drawn to exclude pockets of land within a larger HDB. If such land requires protection from development, this should be done using another policy tool. HDBs should not give rise to conflict with Green Belt policy.

Sub-principle 2:

HDBs will include:

- a. Existing housing commitments (i.e. unimplemented planning permissions for housing and site allocations for housing, including those proposed in the Draft Placemaking Plan)
- b. Land within residential curtilages, except large gardens or other open areas which are visually detached from the settlement.

Sub-principle 3:

HDBs will exclude (non-exhaustive):

- a. Playing fields or open space at the settlement edge (existing or proposed)
- b. Large gardens or other areas at the settlement edge, where development or intensification would harm the character, form or structure of the settlement or the landscape
- c. Developments which are physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings on the edge of the settlement which relate more to the countryside than the settlement)
- d. Holiday accommodation or other housing permitted through farm diversification schemes at the settlement edge (Saved Local Plan Policy ET.8 and Emerging Placemaking Plan Policy RE3), are not considered as housing for the purposes of the HDB guiding principles. This is because requirements contained within farm diversification policies are less strict than policies on new dwellings in the countryside (Saved Local Plan Policy HG.10 and Emerging Local Plan Policy RE4).
- e. Significant employment sites at the settlement edge.

Modifications to the HDBs

Potential changes to the HDBs are set out in the tables below, divided into sections: town and parish council submissions, other stakeholder submissions, unimplemented planning permissions for housing, housing site allocations and completed housing and other anomalies encountered through work on the Green Belt. All proposed changes have been assessed against the HDB principles. Officer recommendations are also shown in the tables below.

Recommended changes to the HDB have been included in the Draft Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission Version) and are shown on the Policies Map changes in Volume 6 (Appendices).

Town and parish council submissions (excluding planning commitments)

Respondent name	Summary of suggested changes	Officer assessment
Batheaston Parish Council	The existing HDB includes part of Bathford parish – suggested this part is removed.	Reject suggested change The main principle states that the HDB will be drawn tightly around the village. The part which would be excluded as per the suggested amendment does contain housing, however, that housing is within Bathford parish, rather than Batheaston parish. While the land in question does indeed lie within Bathford parish, it is physically more related to Batheaston, as it is contiguous with the housing to the north-west of Morris Lane (in Batheaston parish). Furthermore,

Respondent name	Summary of suggested changes	Officer assessment
		the railway line to the south is a physical boundary between Batheaston and Bathford, and this also severs the land in question from the rest of Bathford. For these reasons, it is considered that the land relates better to Batheaston parish and therefore the existing boundary should be retained.
Clutton Parish Council	Include the Old Methodist Chapel.	Accept suggested change The suggested change would accord with main principle.
Corston Parish Council	Land east and north of Barton House	Reject suggested change This would create a pocket of land within the larger HDB area, which would be in conflict with sub-principle 1.
East Harptree Parish Council	Remove Parker's Mead from the HDB	Reject suggested change This would create a pocket of land within the large HDB area, which would be in conflict with sub-principle 1.
Hinton Charterhouse Parish Council	Alter HDBs to include The Glebe, The Brambles, and land on Wellow Lane.	Reject suggested change The suggested changes consist of three small clusters of housing. These are considered too small to be considered significant housing elements of the settlement, and therefore should not be included within the HDB, as per sub-principle 1.
Keynsham Town Council	Include the gardens of the bungalows at the end of St. Francis Road to the west of Broadlands School (site K14 on the November 2013 SHLAA Map).	Reject suggested change The gardens are in the Green Belt and their inclusion would allow a scale of development that would be greater than 'limited infill'. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to change the Green Belt boundary. The proposed changes should therefore not be made. This follows sub-principle 1.
Keynsham Town Council	Include the Somerdale site.	Accept suggested change This would accord with sub-principle 2 (existing commitments) and should follow the housing elements of the development, but exclude the other elements of the site.
Keynsham Town Council	Include land to the north of the A4 on Bath Road, Keynsham (Broadleaze Nursery).	Reject suggested change The site lies entirely within the Green Belt and its inclusion would allow a scale of development that would be greater than 'limited infill'. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to change the Green Belt boundary. The proposed changes should therefore not be made.
Newton St Loe	Include Newton Farmyard	Reject suggested change

Respondent name	Summary of suggested changes	Officer assessment
Parish Council		The suggested changes would not accord with the HDB main principle.
Paulton Parish Council	Two changes to the HDB, to better follow existing housing.	Accept suggested change This would accord with the HDB main principle.
Priston Parish Council	Removal of parcel of land opposite the entrance to Summerlea, Priston.	Accept suggested change The submission relates to undeveloped land at the edge of the HDB, which is not considered part of the curtilage of any dwelling. Therefore, following the main principle and sub-principle 1, the land should be excluded from the HDB. The land also makes a positive contribution to the character, in its existing undeveloped form. Therefore its removal from the HDB is also supported by sub-principle 3b.
Timsbury Parish Council	Include land at Beechwood, south of proposed site allocation.	Accept suggested change This would accord with the HDB main principle.

Other stakeholder submissions

Location	Respondent name & ID number	Summary of suggested changes	Officer assessment
-	CPRE (3095)	The CPRE supports the concept of HDBs as well as welcoming the opportunity for review of HDBs within the Placemaking Plan. Without HDBs the CPRE feels that there would be greater threats from straggling development on the outskirts of village communities leading to a blurring of the distinction between settlements and open countryside. The review of HDBs should not be seen as a blanket opportunity to increase the size of built-up areas.	Comments noted The HDB guiding principles have been developed to ensure that the HDBs are only modified to allow for housing which is not inappropriate.
-	English Heritage (now Historic England) (279)	EH strongly recommends that the HDB have regard to the implications for effected heritage assets and their settings, applying great weight to conservation of significance. An understanding of the historic	Comments noted The HDBs have been subject to a partial review to reflect housing completions/commitments and in response to requests to amend them from parish councils and other stakeholders. In undertaking this partial review regard

		<p>character of each place, their distinctiveness including any non-designated asset and or landscape feature should be formally considered.</p> <p>I note in paragraph 1.448 that nature conservation sites are a consideration. Clarification of how the significance of the historic integrity of these settlements will be given equally consideration would be appreciated.</p>	<p>has been had to the implications for heritage assets and proposed changes have sought to ensure harm to these assets and their significance is avoided. In addition it should be noted that planning applications for residential development will be determined against Development management policies including Policy HE1 that requires development has a positive (and not negative) impact on heritage assets and their significance.</p>
-	Strategic Land Partnerships (Peter Brett) (1556)	Suggest use of word 'settlement' instead of 'village'	<p>Accept suggested change</p> <p>The suggested change would reflect the fact that the HDB review includes towns as well as villages.</p>
-	Strategic Land Partnerships (Peter Brett) (1556)	Object to Principle 1 and its wording which says the HDB will be defined tightly around the housing of the village. This currently gives no flexibility and there is no justification for this. It should be reworded to allow some future flexibility.	<p>Reject suggested change</p> <p>HDBs are defined to identify areas within settlements where housing development can come forward that meets evidence based need in a way is appropriate to settlement function, form and character. Generally this means HDBs will be defined tightly around existing housing as they are not a vehicle for promoting large scale housing on the edge of settlements. Where such housing is required in order to meet the housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy this is achieved through site allocations.</p>
-	Strategic Land Partnerships (Peter Brett) (1556)	Principles 3D & 3E are very similar and are subjective. Terms 'form' and 'structure' need to be defined.	<p>Reject suggested change</p> <p>Assessment of potential development impact on the structure, form or character of a village, or landscape or highway impact is dependent on professional assessment. This does not mean it 'fails tests of planning policy'. Once the HDBs are defined, they will provide clarity to decision makers.</p>
Chew Magna	Mr & Mrs GV Jones (CSJ Planning)	Modification of the HDB to include a site to the north of the existing HDB, within the Green Belt, land adjacent to 3 Streamside, Chew Magna.	<p>Reject suggested change</p> <p>This would not accord with the main principle.</p>

	Consultants) (3701)		
Chew Magna	Mrs V Hamilton-Davies (Planning Ventures Ltd) (6510)	Include Old North Chew Farm, Chew Magna.	Partly accept suggested change The domestic curtilage of Old North Chew Farm is significantly smaller than the whole site, which includes other uses. The extent of the domestic curtilage is as identified in drawing number EX001_B 20/09/10 (Existing Site Plan), application reference 10/04371/FUL, for the conversion of derelict outbuildings to business units and holiday lets. The HDB, should include the permanent housing and its curtilage, as per the main principle and clarified by sub-principle 2. The other parts of the site should not be included in the HDB, following sub-principle 3.
Clutton	Phil Carrow (N/A)	Include land which was the subject of a refused planning application (reference 14/00549/out), in Clutton	Reject suggested change This would not accord with the main principle, or sub-principle 2.
Farmborough	Boystown Ltd (Rocke Associates Ltd) (6453)	Include housing commitment at Cold Bath, Bath Road, Farmborough (14/00862/OUT)	Reject suggested change The housing commitment is part of an existing cluster which is excluded from the HDB. The existing cluster of housing is detached from the main part of the village of Farmborough and is poorly related to it. The housing commitment is located further away from the main part of the village housing than the existing cluster and therefore does not make the cluster better related to the main housing of the village.
Farmborough	Boystown Ltd (Rocke Associates Ltd) (6453)	Include land around and adjacent to housing commitment at Cold Bath, Bath Road, Farmborough (14/00862/OUT)	Reject suggested change This would not accord with the main principle.
Midsomer Norton	Strategic Land Partnerships (Peter Brett) (1556)	Include existing housing commitment at Silver Street, Midsomer Norton (13/00127/OUT (12/05546/OUT = same site))	Accept suggested change This would accord with sub-principle 2.
Midsomer	Strategic Land	Include potential housing at Silver Street,	Reject suggested change

Norton	Partnerships (Peter Brett) (1556)	Midsomer Norton.	This would not accord with the main principle.
Midsomer Norton	Waddeton Park Ltd (Peter Brett) (4803)	Include existing commitment west of Fosseyway, Midsomer Norton. (12/04590/OUT)	Accept suggested change This would accord with sub-principle 2.
Newton St Loe	Mr N Mould, Duchy of Cornwall (N/A)	Include 3 parcels of land in Newton St Loe.	Reject suggested change Amendments would not accord with the main principle.
Radstock	Mr J Hooke (6380)	Modification of the HDB to include land south of 3 Kilmersdon Road, Radstock	Reject suggested change This would not accord with the main principle.
Stanton Drew	Mr & Mrs J & F Hudson (2683)	Modification of the HDB to include site at Elm Farm, Stanton Drew	Reject suggested change This would not accord with the main principle.
Stanton Drew	Mr El Shanawany (N/A)	Land adjacent to 2 The Orchard, Stanton Drew	Reject suggested change This would not accord with the main principle.
Wellow	Mr RGH Williams (N/A)	Include land west of Manor Farm Barn, Wellow within the HDB.	Reject suggested change This would not accord with the main principle.

Unimplemented planning permissions for housing, completed housing and housing site allocations (HDB revisions)

Parish	Planning consent reference
Batheaston (village centre)	None
Bathford	None
Bishop Sutton	12/05279/FUL
Bishop Sutton	12/04238/OUT
Camerton	None
Chew Magna	None
Chew Stoke	06/03515/FUL
Chew Stoke	98/03027/FUL
Claverton	09/04132/FUL

Clutton	06/00768/OUT
Clutton	12/00293/FUL
Clutton	12/01882/OUT
Combe Hay	None
Compton Martin	None
Corston	None
East Harptree	None
Englishcombe	None
Farmborough	11/02432/OUT
Farrington Gurney	None
Freshford	None
Hallatrow	None
High Littleton	None
Hinton Blewett	15/01591/OUT
Hinton Charterhouse	None
Kelston	None
Keynsham	13/01780/EOUT
Marksbury	None
Midsomer Norton	12/04590/OUT
Midsomer Norton	14/00649/OUT (pending 106)
Midsomer Norton	13/00127/OUT (12/05546/OUT = same site)
Monkton Combe	None
Newton St Loe	None
Paulton	13/04081/OUT
Paulton	07/02424/EOUT
Peasedown St John	12/05477/OUT
Pensford	None
Priston	None
Radstock	13/024636/EOUT
Shoscombe	None
South Stoke	None
Stanton Drew	None
Temple Cloud	13/03562/OUT
Temple Cloud	12/03142/FUL

Timsbury	None
Tunley	None
Ubley	None
Upper Swainswick	None
Wellow	None
West Harptree	14/05899/OUT
West Harptree	06/02081/FUL
Whitchurch	None

Minor HDB errors discovered as part of work on Green Belt anomalies

Location	Analysis
West Harptree Land to the rear of The Linney to Conifers, Bristol Road.	Make changes to HDB The HDB does not follow the curtilages of The Linney, through to Conifers. Following sub-principle 1 and 2, the HDB should be redrawn to reflect the curtilages. The exceptions in sub-principle 3 do not apply here. This would make the HDB co-terminus with the Green Belt.
Bishop Sutton Land west of Meadow View, Ham Lane.	Do not make changes to HDB The boundaries of the site appear to have been changed without permission. The council's planning enforcement team has been notified. Changes should not be made to the HDB.
Saltford Land rear of 43 High Street.	Make changes to HDB The HDB does not follow the curtilage of 43 High Street. Following Principle 2, the HDB should be redrawn to reflect the curtilage. The exceptions in Principle 3 do not apply here. This would make the HDB co-terminus with the Green Belt.
Saltford Land north-west of Manor Barn, Saltford Manor.	Make changes to HDB The HDB does not appear to follow any particular physical boundary. Mapping indicates a boundary lies to the south of the existing HDB, which also aligns with the Green Belt and the conservation area boundaries. If the HDB were to follow this line, it would better accord with the main principle and sub-principle 1. Therefore the HDB should be realigned to follow the Green Belt and conservation area boundary.

<p>Saltford Land west of 42-64 Grange Road.</p>	<p>Make changes to HDB The HDB does not follow the curtilage of the property. That part of the garden which is currently outside the HDB is not visually detached from the settlement, nor does it relate more closely to the countryside than the settlement. The inclusion of this land within the HDB would not harm the structure, form or character of the village. The HDB should be redefined to align with the curtilages of the properties in question.</p>
<p>Saltford 1 Willow Cottages, The Shallows</p>	<p>Make changes to HDB The HDB cuts through the dwelling at 1 Willow Cottages as does the Green Belt boundary. Therefore, to include the curtilage of the dwellings within the HDB would mean that HDB and the Green Belt boundary would not be co-terminus. Sub-principle 1 states that the review of the HDB should not give rise to conflict with Green Belt policies. Green Belt policies include provisions for extensions to existing dwellings and therefore to realign the HDB with the curtilage of the dwelling should not give rise to conflict with Green Belt policy. The HDB should therefore be amended to include the curtilage of the dwelling, to accord with sub-principle 2.</p>
<p>Bathampton Land west of The Woodlands, St Georges Hill, Warminster Road.</p>	<p>Make changes to HDB The land can be divided into three parts, east, west and central.</p> <p><u>East</u> In the eastern part, the HDB extends in to the Green Belt. In accordance with sub-principle 2, the HDB includes the curtilage of 8 St Georges Hill. The HDB as defined in the 2007 B&NES Local Plan is not tightly drawn around the housing, and there is sufficient land to allow for at least one dwelling, but this would not meet the definition of infill for the purposes of Green Belt policy, as it is not frontage development, and not developed on three sides. Therefore, this area could not be developed due to Green Belt infill policy. This means that the HDB and Green Belt boundaries are currently in conflict. In order to provide clarity, the HDB should be redrawn to match the Green Belt boundary in this area, in accordance with sub-principle 1.</p> <p><u>West</u> The existing HDB excludes part of the curtilage of several dwellings</p>

	<p>(12-20 Trossachs Drive). Curtilage would normally be included within the HDB, unless one of the exclusions in sub-principle 3 applies. In this case, part of the curtilage lies within the Green Belt, so in order to avoid conflict between the HDB and the Green Belt boundary, (as in the 'east' area, above), the HDB and Green Belt boundary should be co-terminus, following sub-principle 1.</p> <p><u>Central</u> To the rear of 11-16 St Georges Hill, the HDB and Green Belt boundaries are co-terminus. In accordance with sub-principle 1, the HDB should remain unchanged.</p>
<p>Batheaston Land east of Kyrle Gardens.</p>	<p>Make changes to HDB The HDB currently lies to the south of the Green Belt boundary (i.e. within the Green Belt) and this could give rise to conflict between the Green Belt boundary and the HDB. The HDB is not currently drawn tightly around the housing of the settlement. To redefine the HDB so that it aligns with the Green Belt would more appropriately accord with the main principle, as well as sub-principle 1.</p>
<p>Whitchurch Land north-east of Saltwell Avenue.</p>	<p>Make changes to HDB The HDB currently does not follow the curtilage of 14 and 15 Saltwell Avenue. Sub-principle 2 states that the HDB should follow the curtilage of the dwelling. The exceptions do not apply in this case.</p>
<p>Whitchurch Land at Blackacre.</p>	<p>Make changes to HDB The HDB currently does not follow the curtilage of several dwellings at Blackacre. On the south side of Blackacre, from 4 Blackacre to 125 Bristol Road, the HDB cuts through dwellings, and on the north side, the HDB does not align with the boundary of the curtilages of several properties. To the north of Blackacre, following the main principle and sub-principles 1 & 2, it is clear that the HDB should be redrawn to align with the curtilages of the relevant properties, making the HDB co-terminus with the Green Belt boundary. To the south of Blackacre, to include the curtilages 1-4 Blackacre would mean the HDB and Green Belt are not co-terminus. Sub-principle 1 states that the review of the HDB should not give rise to conflict with Green Belt policies. Green Belt policies include provisions for extensions to existing dwellings and therefore to realign the HDB with the curtilage of the</p>

	dwelling should not give rise to conflict with Green Belt policy. The HDB should therefore be amended to include the curtilage of the dwelling, to accord with sub-principle 2.
Whitchurch Land at 1 Church Meadows.	Make changes to HDB The HDB currently does not follow the curtilage of 1 Church Meadows. Following sub-principle 2, the HDB should be redrawn to align with the curtilages of the property. The exceptions do not apply here.
Whitchurch Land west of 49 Bristol Road.	Make changes to HDB The HDB currently does not follow the curtilage of 49 Bristol Road. Following sub-principle 2, the HDB should be redrawn to align with the curtilages of the property. The exceptions do not apply here.