

---

## **EXAMINATION OF THE NORTH SOMERSET LOCAL PLAN 2041 MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

**Inspectors:** Helen Hockenhull BA (Hons) B.PI MRTPI, Deborah Board BSc (Hons) MA FRGS MRTPI, Emma Brownless BA (Hons) Solicitor (non-practising)

**Programme Officers:** Helen Wilson and Yvonne Parker

**Tel:** (Helen Wilson) 07879443035 (Yvonne Parker) 07813334305

**Email:** [info@lpexams.co.uk](mailto:info@lpexams.co.uk)

**Examination website :** <https://www.hwa.uk.com/projects/north-somerset-local-plan-2041/>

---

### **Introduction**

These matters, issues and questions relate to the examination of the North Somerset Local Plan (the Plan). All documents can be found on the examination webpage on the above website.

Further information about the examination, the conduct of the hearing sessions and the format of any further written statements is provided in the Inspectors' Guidance Note.

For the avoidance of doubt, under the transitional arrangements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) December 2024 (revised in February 2025) the Plan is being examined under the December 2024 Framework.

---

### **Matter 1 : Compliance with statutory procedures, legal matters and other general matters**

**Issue :** Has the Council maintained effective cooperation during plan preparation and have other relevant procedural and legal requirements in the preparation of the Plan been met?

#### **Maintaining effective cooperation during plan preparation**

1. Has the Council maintained effective cooperation during the preparation of the Plan up until the date on which it was submitted for examination?

#### **Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**

2. Paragraph 33 of the Framework (Dec 2024) indicates that local plans should be informed throughout their preparation by SA that meets the relevant legal requirements. Is the SA methodology robust?

3. Does the SA demonstrate that the SA has assessed all reasonable alternative spatial strategy options, levels of housing and employment need and options relating to other policies in the Plan? Are reasons for rejecting alternatives and discounting unreasonable options clearly given?
4. Is the SA decision making and scoring robust, justified and transparent?
5. Is it clear how the SA has influenced the policies and allocations in the Plan and how mitigation measures have been considered?

### **Habitat Regulation**

6. Has the Habitat Regulations Assessment been undertaken in accordance with the Regulations and is it robust?

### **Consultation**

7. Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and statutory consultation requirements? Has all relevant and available evidence been made available for consultation at the various stages of plan preparation?
8. What evidence is there that representations submitted in response to the submission Plan have been considered as required by Regulation 18(3) of the 2004 Act?
9. Were adequate opportunities made available for participants to access and make comments on the Plan, and other relevant documents, in different locations and using different means both digital and non-digital?

### **Equality**

10. Have the requirements of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 been met?

### **Climate Change**

11. Does the Plan, taken as a whole, include policies designed to ensure that the development and use of land in North Somerset contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change in accordance with Section 19(A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)?

### **Superseded Policies**

12. In response to our Preliminary Questions, the Council proposes a modification to introduce Appendix 3, a table of superseded policies, ensuring compliance with regulation 8 parts (4) and (5) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Should the table set out not only which policies are superseded, but also, by which policies in the submitted Plan?

### **Policies referring to Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's)**

13. Various policies in the Plan refer to SPDs. Under the recent changes to plan making, new SPD's can no longer be prepared and adopted. The Council proposes several modifications to address this, by instead referring to Technical Guidance to be prepared. Will these modifications be effective? Do the Council have an anticipated timeline for the preparation of this guidance?

### **Viability**

14. Are the assumptions for build costs, developers' profits, abnormal costs, phasing and build rates for residential developments realistic and based on evidence?
15. Except for the strategic locations, the maximum scheme size appraised in the Viability Assessment is 500 units which also includes a Primary School. Is this appropriate and justified?
16. Overall, does the viability evidence demonstrate that the policies in the Plan are realistic, and that the cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine the viability of development that the Plan assumes will take place during the plan period, including on each of the site allocations?

### **Policies Map**

17. Does the Policies Map (SD2) correctly illustrate geographically the application of policies of the Plan?

### **Plan period**

18. Strategic Policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption. With adoption of the Plan likely to be between 31 March 2027 and 31 March 2028, strategic policies should look ahead to at least 31 March 2042 to be consistent with national policy. Should the Plan period be adjusted accordingly?

## **Matter 2 : Vision, Spatial Strategy and Site Selection Process**

**Issue : Are the provisions of the Plan in relation to the Spatial Strategy justified and consistent with national policy?**

### **Vision, strategic priorities and sustainable development priorities**

1. Does the Vision set out clear focussed aims and objectives for North Somerset over the Plan period? How will desired outcomes be achieved?
2. Is the Vision sufficiently locally distinctive?
3. Should the Vision make greater reference to planning positively for employment growth and job creation and reference to providing new homes to meet the needs of the area?
4. Are the Plan's strategic priorities appropriate, clear and achievable?
5. Are the sustainability objectives appropriate?

### **Policy SP3: Spatial Strategy**

6. Is the sequential approach set out in the policy justified?
7. Is the spatial distribution of growth aligned with the sustainable development principles in Policy SP1?
8. Should greater priority be given to growth on the edge of towns outside the Green Belt?
9. Should the policy be clearer on what is meant by urban areas? Should reference be made to the settlement hierarchy? For the avoidance of doubt should the main towns be expressly listed?
10. Is growth too heavily reliant on the four strategic locations?
11. What criteria have been used to define the settlement hierarchy? Has this been reviewed as part of Plan preparation?
12. What is the justification for a two-tier settlement hierarchy of Towns and Villages and Rural Areas? Should larger villages that have a village centre as detailed in Schedule 6 of the Plan be classed as Rural Service Centres?
13. Is the role and function of villages clear in the Plan? Should the spatial strategy be based to a greater degree on the settlement hierarchy and set out the level of growth appropriate in towns and urban areas, the strategic locations, larger more sustainable villages and then smaller settlements?

14. How does the allocation of a new mixed growth location at Woodspring, a new standalone development, align with the spatial strategy focussing growth at towns and urban areas? Should the spatial strategy make provision for a new stand-alone community?
15. Is the amount of development proposed at Yatton appropriate taking account of its sustainability and the proposed new secondary school to the south of the village?
16. Does the scale of growth proposed at Nailsea and Backwell and at Pill and Easton-in-Gordano accord with the spatial strategy? Is the amount of development proposed proportionate to the size of the settlements and the facilities and services that they provide? What impact would this have on local character?
17. The Policy states that residential development in areas at risk of flooding now or in the future will be minimised. What does minimised mean in this context? Is this statement consistent with the Framework and Policy DP9?

#### **Site selection methodology**

18. Have the sites allocated for development in the Plan been appraised and selected in comparison to reasonable alternatives using a robust and objective process? In particular:
  - a) How were different development constraints taken into account? Were they identified using up to date and appropriate evidence and guidance?
  - b) Were constraints given relative weight in the selection process? If so, how was this determined?
  - c) In relation to flood risk, were sites at low risk preferred over those at higher risk? How did the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) inform site selection?

#### **Policy LP10: Strategic Gaps**

19. Is the designation of each proposed Strategic Gap justified by proportionate evidence, and what evidence demonstrates that existing countryside policies would be insufficient to prevent harmful coalescence? Why are the boundaries drawn where they are?
20. Is the policy sufficiently clear regarding the scale and type of development that may be acceptable within Strategic Gaps? What constitutes 'significant adverse effect'? Can development within a strategic gap be acceptable and how much development can occur before harm arises?
21. Does the designation of Strategic Gaps unnecessarily constrain sustainable development opportunities that would otherwise contribute towards housing, employment or infrastructure needs?

22. Should the policy expressly reference green infrastructure, biodiversity and ecosystem services if these are part of the justification for the designation?
23. Are the proposed additions, deletions and boundary revisions to Strategic Gaps justified by robust evidence and consistent application of the assessment methodology?

## **Matter 3: Green Belt**

### **Issue : Whether the approach to the alteration of the Green Belt and development within it is justified and consistent with national policy?**

1. Are policies SP7 and LP9 justified by appropriate available evidence, effective and consistent with national policy? Is there unnecessary duplication between the two policies? Could they be combined?
2. Has the Council examined fully all reasonable options for meeting its identified needs in line with paragraph 147 of the Framework?
3. Are there rural locations outside of the Green Belt that could meet or contribute towards meeting housing need?
4. Do the exceptional circumstances, as required by paragraphs 145 –147 of the Framework, exist to justify the proposed revisions to the Green Belt boundary for additional land for housing and employment?
5. Are the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Green Belt Assessments (EB47 and EB48) based on a robust methodology? Do their conclusions and the Green Belt Background Paper Update (EB46) adequately consider the fundamental aim and purpose of Green Belts? How does this robustly inform the site selection process?
6. How do the proposed Green Belt revisions align with the spatial strategy? How has it consistently informed the selection of Green Belt sites to be allocated for housing?
7. Do the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundaries take into account the need to promote sustainable patterns of development?
8. Do the proposed alterations to the Green Belt give priority to previously developed land and grey belt sites rather than other Green Belt locations in line with paragraph 148 of the Framework?
9. What are the reasons why some 'weak' sites were not taken forward as allocations when some that make a 'moderate' contribution are? Were there particular thresholds/factors that meant sites were not taken forward?
10. Are the revised Green Belt boundaries capable of enduring in the long term, beyond the plan period?
11. The Green Belt Background Paper Update in Appendix 3 of SD63 sets out proposed changes to the Green Belt boundary. This includes changes to settlement boundaries. Are the exceptional circumstances set out in the document sufficiently robust to justify these changes?
12. Are all proposed changes to the Green Belt shown on the Policies Map?

13. The Plan proposes an area of new Green Belt between Nailsea and Backwell.  
Paragraph 144 of the Framework sets out that proposals for new Green Belt should only be established in exceptional circumstances and outlines that they should be set out in strategic policies which should demonstrate five criteria are met. Are they met in this case? Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated for the establishment of this area of new Green Belt? Have alternatives such as a strategic gap been robustly considered and why has this been rejected as an appropriate option?
14. What factors have been considered in the review of inset and washed over villages in the Green Belt? Is the alteration of Green Belt boundaries to provide thirteen new inset villages justified?

## **Matter 4 : Local Housing Need and Housing Requirement**

**Issue : Is the identified housing requirement justified and consistent with national policy?**

### **Policy SP8 : Housing**

1. Is the housing requirement of 23,700 homes during the Plan period a figure of 1,580 dwellings per annum, justified by the Council's evidence? Does it adequately align with the forecast for economic growth and job creation?
2. The Plan period starts in 2026. This means that there are no completions to take into account in the housing land supply calculation. What is the justification for this?
3. Is the calculation of the Local Housing Need set out in the Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) (SD37) 2025 consistent with the Local Housing Need standard methodology set out in national guidance?
4. Is setting a minimum housing requirement equivalent to local housing need justified and consistent with national policy? Are there any factors which justify a higher requirement, for example: -
  - i. to contribute towards Bristol's unmet housing need.
  - ii. to help deliver the number of affordable homes needed in North Somerset over the Plan period.
  - iii. to provide a balance between housing requirements and the jobs required to support economic growth.

## **Matter 5 : Other Housing Needs**

**Issue : Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies to meet affordable housing needs and the housing needs of other groups, which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

### **Policy DP43: Affordable Housing and rural exception schemes**

1. The LHNA (SD37) considers two scenarios with overall affordable housing need over the Plan period ranging from 6,646 to 10,577 dwellings (28 to 45% of the total requirement). Is scenario 2 a better indicator of overall affordable housing need? How many affordable homes is it anticipated that the Plan would deliver over the Plan period? Should this be set out clearly in the Plan? Will there be a shortfall?
2. What are the past trends in affordable housing delivery in terms of completions and housing type and tenure?
3. Is Policy DP43 effective, justified and consistent with national planning policy? In particular: -
  - i. Is it clear what is meant by market recovery mechanisms in the last paragraph on page 213 of the Plan?
  - ii. Is the tenure mix of 75% social rent and 25% shared ownership justified by the evidence? Is it too prescriptive? What if the requirements change over the Plan period?
4. The Viability Assessment (SD91) tests an affordable housing contribution from 20 - 40%. Is the 50% affordable housing figure for sites in the Green Belt justified and supported by appropriate evidence?
5. The Viability Assessment takes account of the provision of First Homes. FN31 of the Framework explains that this is no longer a requirement of national policy but may continue where local planning authorities judge that they meet local need. Is that the case in North Somerset? If not and First Homes are removed from the appraisal, what implications, if any, would this have for overall scheme viability?
6. In regard to rural exception schemes, the policy states that development should be supported or initiated by the local community. Is this justified and effective? Is it clear how the policy would be applied if an objection were to be raised?

### **Policy DP44: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.**

7. Does the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) provide a robust up to date evidence base?
8. Is Policy DP44 justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
9. The GTAA identifies a need of 129 pitches over the Plan period. The Plan makes provision to meet the need for the first five years of the Plan a total of 80 pitches.

The expectation of national policy is that a Plan should identify specific developable sites or broad locations to meet the need in years 6-10 and where possible years 11-15. The Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Background Paper indicates that the remaining need of 49 pitches will be met through windfalls. What compelling evidence is there that this will be achieved?

10. The Plan allocates two sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches, land between Moorland Park and the A370 and land to the west of Heathfield Park both within flood zone 3a. Is this justified? What other sites were considered and why were they rejected?
11. What is the justification for requiring a minimum of 18 pitches within each of the strategic locations at Wolverhill and Woodspring? What evidence is there that these sites will provide appropriately located sites for the Gypsy and Traveller community? Is it clear from the Plan how these would be delivered, funded and managed? Bearing in mind the lead in times to the delivery of strategic sites, what certainty is there that these pitches would be provided in the first five years of the Plan?
12. Are the two site allocations, land between Moorland Park and the A370 and land to the west of Heathfield Park soundly based? Is there evidence that the development of the respective allocations are viable and deliverable when anticipated in the Plan period?

#### **Policy DP45: Residential Space Standards**

13. Is Policy DP45 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
14. National policy states that planning policies for housing may make use of the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS) where the need for an internal space standard is justified taking account of need, viability and timing. What is the evidence relating to need, viability and timing to justify this requirement?

#### **Policy DP46: Housing Type and Mix**

15. Based on the findings of the LHNA, that at least 45% of homes on new developments should comply with Requirement M4(2) Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings, is the requirement for all new dwellings to meet Building Regulations M4(2) justified? Has scheme viability been considered? Should this requirement be determined through planned future updates to Building Regulations?
16. What evidence supports the requirement for 5% of all new dwellings (market and affordable) in developments of 10 dwellings or more to be designed to Building Regulations M4(3) standard? How does this impact on viability?
17. The LHNA suggest that in 2022-23 there were 603 persons on the Self Build and Custom Housing Register. What is the current demand for self-build and custom

build homes in North Somerset? How reliable is the Register as an indication of demand, particularly as there is no local connection or financial viability test?

18. Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) advises that local planning authorities should use the demand data from the registers in their area, supported as necessary by additional data from secondary sources (as outlined in the housing and economic development needs guidance), to understand and consider future need for this type of housing in their area. How has future demand been assessed? In addition to the register, what other data sources have been analysed?
19. Will the policy requirement for developments of 10 or more dwellings to provide an appropriate proportion of self and custom build plots based on local need be effective in meeting future demand? How has the threshold of 10 dwellings been determined? Is it clear how 'an appropriate proportion' would be quantified?
20. The policy includes a section on supported and specialist accommodation. Is this effectively worded? Is it clear how the Council will seek to ensure this type of accommodation?

#### **Policy DP47: Older Persons Accommodation**

21. Given the identified need for older persons accommodation in North Somerset, is it justified to require a proposal to demonstrate it will meet the local need?
22. The Policy seeks an element of affordable housing provision for older persons as part of appropriate market led developments. Is it clear in the Policy at what level this will be sought? What evidence is there that this will be viable? Where viability may be an issue, should the policy be more flexible?
23. What is the justification for marketing accommodation for a minimum period of 6 months before being marketed more widely? How will this be achieved in practice?

#### **Policy DP48: Residential Annexes**

No questions.

## **Matter 6 : Employment Needs and Employment Allocations**

**Issue : Are the provisions of the Plan in relation to the provision of employment land and employment allocations justified and consistent with national policy? Would the allocations be developable, deliverable and otherwise soundly based?**

### **Employment Strategy and Requirement**

1. Does the Plan set out a clear economic vision and strategy which encourages sustainable economic growth?
2. Is the Plan clear what the requirement for employment land is across the Plan period?
3. The assessment of employment growth set out in the evidence, forecasts an employment land need of 50 ha over the Plan period. Is this justified by the evidence? Are the assumptions made robust?
4. The Plan makes provision for 72.8 ha of employment land, which includes a buffer of 22.8 ha. Is this justified? What assumptions have been made and are these justifiable? Has a buffer been included in forecast demand or supply, or both?
5. What evidence is there that the target of 72.8ha of employment land over the Plan period is deliverable, bearing in mind past completion rates?
6. Is the distribution of land allocated for employment justified, and does it represent sustainable development?
7. What assumptions have been made in relation to site capacity? How have employment land figures been converted into the expected number of jobs and floorspace to be created?
8. What factors have influenced the spatial distribution of employment land as set out in Policy SP9? Is it justified?
9. Has the quality of existing employment sites and premises been robustly considered/reviewed? How does the employment land requirement take account of qualitative need?
10. Has the potential for the intensification of existing sites been considered in determining the employment land requirement?
11. How have losses of employment land to other uses been factored into the assessment of employment needs over the Plan period?
12. Does the economic strategy support the future vitality and viability of town, district and local centres?

13. How does the economic strategy support the sustainable growth and expansion of businesses in rural areas?
14. Are proposed changes PC3, PC4 and PC5 necessary to make the Plan sound?

## **Employment Policies**

### **Policy SP9: Employment**

15. Are the requirements of Policy SP9 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
16. Is the Policy sufficiently clear and effectively worded to set out the type of employment uses expected on individual allocations? How does the policy prevent the disproportionate development of one type of employment use? Does there need to be greater clarity about the types and amounts of uses to be supported on the individual allocations?

### **Policy LP5: Employment Sites (Schedule 2)**

17. Are the proposed employment sites, as defined on the policies map, justified? Will the masterplan approach to strategic locations for residential growth deliver the required employment land to support the spatial strategy?
18. Do the site-specific requirements address all the site constraints associated with the development of each of the employment sites?
19. Several of the employment allocations do not have site specific requirements set out. Is this justified?
20. What evidence is there to demonstrate that the proposed employment allocations are deliverable as anticipated within the Plan period?
21. In respect of the employment allocations on the strategic locations and also the site at Parklands, Westwick Roundabout, Weston-Super-Mare where master planning is required, are the expectations clear, who will prepare them, when would they be required and what process would apply?

## **Matter 7: Economic Development Policies**

**Issue : Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies relating to economic development which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

### **Policy LP8: Town Centre Hierarchy**

1. Is Policy LP8 justified, clear and effective and consistent with national policy?
2. Have the town, district and local centre boundaries shown on the policies map been reviewed as part of Plan preparation? Are any changes required?
3. Will the town centre boundaries allow for effective provision of town centre uses that support growth?
4. Will the strategy for town centre uses and the visitor economy support sustainable patterns of development that are accessible for all?

### **Policy DP21: Safeguarding Employment Sites**

5. Is the approach to marketing justified and effective, especially for small businesses/sites?
6. Is the policy clear and consistent with national policy regarding the sites to which it would apply?
7. Is the requirement for an Economic Statement including assessment of job losses, market demand and alignment with local economy strategies too onerous for small scale units and premises? Should the requirement be proportionate to the premises to be redeveloped?
8. Is the requirement for a financial contribution towards local employment initiatives when a business is lost, justified? How would it be quantified and what would it be used for?
9. Is it clear what is meant by 'business development' in the last paragraph of the Policy?

### **Policy DP22: Visitor Attractions**

10. How would the policy be effective in determining how a proposal would support climate change objectives?
11. Is the approach to the location of visitor attractions clear and effective? Would it be clear what is required for a proposal in both a town centre and out of town centre location?

**Policy DP23: Visitor Accommodation**

12. Is the approach to location of visitor accommodation consistent with national policy?
13. The policy refers to 'in accordance with national quality assessment schemes'. What do these require? Should further explanation be provided in the supporting text? Is compliance with these schemes justified?

**Policy DP24: Town Centres**

14. The Town Centre Topic Paper (EB69) refers to making use of underutilised sites and an emphasis on a placemaking approach. Does the policy as drafted support this approach?

**Policy DP25: District Centres**

15. The policy proposes a different approach at Hill Road, Clevedon, is this justified and supported by evidence? Would any of those principles apply to other District Centres?

**Policy DP26: Local Centres**

16. No questions.

**Policy DP27: Primary Shopping Areas**

17. Is Policy DP27 justified, clear and effective and consistent with national planning policy?

**Policy DP28: Retail Parks**

18. Is the Policy justified, clear and effective and consistent with national planning policy?
19. Is the floorspace threshold of 2,500 sq. metres for an impact assessment appropriate and justified?
20. Is the Policy too restrictive in relation to other main town centre uses?
21. Is it clear what the Plan considers 'Retail Parks'. Weston out of town retail area is shown on the policies map, are there other locations that should be shown for clarity?

**Policy DP29: Sequential approach for town centre uses**

22. Is the Policy justified, clear and effective and consistent with national planning policy?

23. Is the requirement for a sequential approach to applications for small scale rural retail development under 200 square metres justified?
24. Is the floorspace threshold of 2,500 sq. metres for an impact assessment appropriate and justified?

## **Matter 8 : Other Locational Policies**

**Issue : Are the Other Locational Policies justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?**

### **Policy LP7: Settlement boundaries**

1. Are the settlement boundaries justified by proportionate evidence and sufficiently flexible to support the delivery requirements of the Plan?
2. Is the policy's approach to residential curtilage extensions justified and sufficiently robust to avoid incremental encroachment into the countryside, having regard to the purposes of Green Belt policy and the potential cumulative impact of such extensions?
3. Is the relationship between Policy LP7 and the policies governing development outside settlement boundaries sufficiently clear and effective?
4. Is it clear from the last paragraph of the policy that it relates to settlements "Inset in the Green Belt"?

### **Policy LP19: University of Bristol site in Langford**

5. Are the transport requirements realistic, deliverable and within the control of the applicants?
6. Is the policy sufficiently clear regarding how community integration requirements will be measured and secured?
7. Should the policy wording be amended to better recognise the sustainability credentials of the site?

### **Policy LP20: Wyndham Way**

8. Should the site be referred to as the Wyndham Way Broad Location rather than the Wyndham Way Development Framework Area in the policy?
9. What evidence is there that the redevelopment proposed will be deliverable over the Plan period? What are the implications for housing supply and employment land supply over the Plan period if it is delayed?
10. Is there sufficient evidence that the infrastructure required to support the proposed scale of the development can be delivered?
11. Are there any constraints that would need to be overcome which could affect the anticipated delivery?

12. What measures are in place, or are proposed, to coordinate the multiple ownerships on the site and ensure timely delivery of the site? Is there a realistic prospect that existing uses and occupiers will be able to relocate so that delays in implementation do not occur?
13. Are the projected new homes and employment outputs realistic, justified and supported by evidence?
14. Policy wording requires development to adhere to principles of Wyndham Way Development Framework (2022). As this is not a development plan document should proposals 'have regard' to their principles rather than 'adhere to'?

#### **Policy LP22: Epic Employment campus**

15. Is the policy sufficiently clear regarding the scale and nature of future development that can be accommodated whilst preserving Green Belt openness?
16. Is there sufficient certainty regarding the limits of future development within the campus? How much flexibility exists within the policy and could further expansion occur?
17. How has the boundary of the allocation been defined? Is it appropriate and justified?

#### **Policy LP23: Monaghan Mushrooms, Stock Lane Langford Broad Location**

18. Is the proposed redevelopment justified in light of the loss of an existing employment site, and is there sufficient certainty that replacement operations will be secured elsewhere in North Somerset?
19. Is there a realistic prospect that the business can be relocated and, if not, what implications would this have for housing delivery assumptions?
20. Is there sufficient evidence that redevelopment of the site is realistic, achievable and capable of delivering the anticipated housing numbers within the Plan period?
21. Are there any constraints that need to be overcome which could affect delivery? Do additions need to be made to the site-specific requirements set out in the policy for example local infrastructure improvements?
22. Are improvements to pedestrian access and highway safety measures on Stock Lane achievable?
23. Is it clear what is expected of development in providing benefits to the residents of Churchill and Langford?
24. Would a requirement for a masterplan or development brief be appropriate to secure a comprehensive coordinated development?

## **Matter 9 : Minerals and Waste**

**Issue : Are the minerals and waste policies justified, effective, and consistent with national planning policy?**

### **Policy SP12: Minerals**

1. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
2. The PPG states that Mineral Planning Authorities should designate specific sites as a first priority, followed by Preferred Areas, and lastly Areas of Search. The supporting text to Policies LP16 and LP17 states that the Council has reviewed the issue of minerals allocations. Where is this set out? What was the outcome? Why is defining a Preferred Area and an Area of Search an appropriate strategy as opposed to an allocation?

### **Policy SP13: Waste**

3. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

### **Policy LP16: Preferred Area for mineral working – land at Hyatts Wood Farm, south of Stancombe Quarry**

4. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
5. In the first bullet point of the policy, is it clear what criteria the Council would use to assess phasing. Should the policy simply require a phasing plan?
6. How has the Preferred Area been defined? What is the justification for not permitting extraction above the 198m contour?

### **Policy LP17: Area of Search for minerals working – land at Downside Farm, south of Freemans Quarry.**

7. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
8. In the first bullet point of the policy, is it clear what criteria the Council would use to assess phasing? Should the policy simply require a phasing plan?
9. How has the Area of Search been defined?

### **Policy LP18: Minerals Safeguarding Area for carboniferous limestone**

10. Is policy LP18 sufficiently clear, justified and effective to ensure consistent decision-making? Is the term 'overriding need' sufficiently precise and effective to ensure that the policy can be applied consistently and objectively, including across different types and scales of development?

11. Under what circumstances would prior extraction be expected and how has the viability of this approach been assessed?
12. Should the policy provide greater clarity regarding the circumstances in which a Minerals Assessment will be required? Should this be elevated into the policy wording itself, rather than being contained only within the wording of the supporting text?

**Policy DP30: Control of non-mineral development**

13. The PPG refers to separation distances/buffer zones. What is the justification for the controlling of non-mineral development within a 500m boundary? What factors have been considered in defining this area?

**Policy DP31: Mineral working exploration, extraction and processing**

14. No questions.

**Policy DP32: Waste management facilities**

15. No questions.

**Policy DP33: Disposal of waste by landfill or land raise**

16. No questions.

## **Matter 10 : Transport**

**Issue : Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies relating to Transport which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

### **Transport Evidence (Policies SP10, LP11-14, DP14-20)**

The Transport Assessment (TA) sets out that the transport modelling has demonstrated that the allocations within the Plan have been aligned to strategic priorities to reduce the need to travel (North Somerset Active Travel Masterplan). It also addresses mitigation at J19, J20 and J21 of the M5.

1. Is the modal hierarchy compatible with the spatial strategy?
2. How would this work in practice on a site by site basis? Is it reasonable to rely on more localised analysis on a site by site basis?
3. Is it clear how impacts would be assessed and any mitigation secured? How would this be coordinated if sites come forward in a piecemeal fashion?
4. Is the 'predict and provide' approach justified? How does this translate to SP10? Should a 'vision and validate' approach to highway safety and traffic management be adopted?
5. The approach relies on effective mitigation; will the Plan secure this effectively with the policies as drafted?
6. Will cost effective and deliverable mitigation to an acceptable degree through a vision led approach be achievable to support the planned growth over the Plan period?
7. The TA modelling makes reference to a 10% trip reduction (para 2.37 bullet 2) to be delivered through master planning (paras 3.7 and 3.8). Is it clear what is required, when it would be required and the process that would apply? Should this requirement be embedded in policy?

### **Strategic Highway Matters (M5 J19, 20, & 21)**

#### **(Document SD21)**

8. Does the approach to transport modelling and the outputs of the strategic model provide a valid representative picture of the impact of the planned growth in the Plan? Does the transport evidence appropriately identify all the necessary strategic mitigation at plan making level?
9. Junction 19, M5:
  - a. The TA found that there will be increases in congestion on the circulatory of the junction roundabout, which has the potential for knock-on impacts. What progress has been made in modelling and identifying appropriate mitigation at this junction? Is there confidence that an acceptable solution can be found?

- b. Has there been adequate consideration of the cumulative impacts from the strategic elements of the Plan that would rely on this junction?
- c. A residual traffic impact of the Plan on Martcombe Road, High Street, Royal Portbury Docks, and Portbury Hundred has been identified in the TA. The Council has chosen to accept this traffic impact and focus mitigation from developments on improving bus services. Is this approach appropriate and justified?
- d. When will the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Order of Cost estimate being undertaken by the Council be completed?
- e. Are the costs of highway improvements at this J19 clear. How will they be funded?
- f. Is there an update regarding the relationship between this work and the active travel scheme for Marsh Lane?

#### 10. Junction 20, M5

- a. A concept design drawing for junction improvements has been produced by the Council. What do these works entail and is there confidence that an acceptable cost-effective solution has been found?
- b. Has further work been undertaken on the suitability of the mitigation proposals for the Ettlingen Way Roundabout?
- c. How would the necessary improvements be secured?
- d. Have the highway improvement works been costed and is it clear how they would be funded?

#### 11. Junction 21, M5

- a. What is the current position regarding the latest micro simulation modelling and potential mitigation for this junction? Is there confidence that an acceptable cost-effective solution can be found?
- b. How would necessary highway improvements be secured?
- c. Have they been costed and is it clear how these would be funded?

### **Policy SP10: Transport**

- 12. SP10 seeks to embed the importance of active travel, how would this be delivered?

### **Policy LP11: Transport infrastructure, allocations and safeguarding**

The policy and schedule set out land that is allocated or safeguarded for the delivery of transport schemes, improvement or creation of sustainable transport links.

- 13. Are all the schemes necessary to support the transport demand arising directly from the allocation and growth aspirations of the Plan?
- 14. If so, how will they be delivered? What are the anticipated timescales? Will it be within the Plan period? Are any allocations dependent on their timely delivery? Are there any constraints to their delivery that would need to be overcome? How will the schemes be funded and by who?

15. Has a site been identified for the proposed Weston-Super-Mare Transport Hub? Are there any land assembly issues?
16. Are suggested modifications PC64, PC65, PC66 and PC67 necessary to make the Plan sound?
17. Should Schedule 7 be clearer on which schemes require land to be safeguarded? Should the policy specifically refer to such areas and secure their protection in a similar way that policy DP16 treats Active Travel routes?
18. Is suggested modification PC59 necessary to make the Plan sound?

**Policy LP12: Bristol airport**

19. Is the policy consistent with the Aviation Policy Framework?
20. The policy refers to the release of the airport from the Green Belt and also it being a Green Belt inset – is this clear and effective?
21. What exceptional circumstances are there to justify the release of land in the Green Belt?
22. Is the approach to change to the Green Belt boundaries for the airport (based on a current planning permission) justified and will it be effective? Does the policy positively consider the future needs and requirements of Bristol Airport?
23. Will the policy be effective for decision taking and considering all the site constraints associated with future development proposals?
24. Would the policy approach for the airport support sustainable patterns of development?
25. Does the Plan TA take into account the Airport's aspirations for growth and requirements for mass transit?
26. What is the expectation in regard to a sustained modal shift to public transport? How would this be measured?
27. Should the second bullet point of the policy make reference to the impact of lighting particularly at night?
28. Are suggested modifications PC28 and PC29 necessary to make the Plan sound?

**Policy LP13: Air safety**

- 29. In relation to the helicopter safeguarded corridor, is the policy clear on what 'in the vicinity of' means in practice?
- 30. Is suggested modification PC30 necessary to make the Plan sound?

**Policy LP14: Royal Portbury Dock**

- 31. Is the policy consistent with the Ports National Policy Statement?
- 32. Is the policy positively prepared in a manner that recognises the strategic contribution the port related uses and development make to employment?
- 33. Should the policy set down guidance for the potential growth and expansion of the Dock meeting its needs over the Plan period?
- 34. The policy restricts development to port related uses. Is this justified? Could there be other complementary uses which would be appropriate supporting dock related uses?
- 35. Does the Plan TA take into account of the Royal Portbury Dock's aspirations for growth?

**Policy DP14: Highway safety, traffic and provision of infrastructure associated with development**

- 36. Is policy DP14 consistent with national policy and would it be effective?
- 37. What is the justification for a contribution to funding improvements to rail freight facilities when a proposal would secure benefits to the highway network?

**Policy DP15: Active and sustainable transport**

- 38. Would the policy be effective in delivering active and sustainable travel through planning applications?
- 39. How would contributions and mitigation for delivery of local active and sustainable travel be determined and delivered?
- 40. Is the requirement for electric vehicle charging points necessary when this is a requirement of Building Regulations?
- 41. Is it clear what is meant by statutory walking distances to schools? Should this be clarified in the supporting text?

### **Policy DP16: Active travel routes**

- 42. Is the policy clear how new development schemes would contribute to active travel? How would this be secured?
- 43. How would someone developing a site know whether they are required to address schedule 7, provide mitigation, provide a new route or a contribution?
- 44. The TA sets out cycle route plans, how do these translate to the Plan policies?
- 45. Is suggested modification PC39 necessary to make the Plan sound?

### **Policy DP17: Public transport accessibility**

- 46. Is it clear what is meant by 'a direct and frequent bus service'?
- 47. The Bus Service Improvement Plan is referred to in the supporting text. The TA suggests it is funded to 2030. How will this align with the requirements of the policy and the aspirations of the Plan to improve access to services for new development?
- 48. How do the improvement corridors relate to the strategic housing sites and allocations?
- 49. Are the bus frequency targets set out in the supporting text justified? Are they realistic?
- 50. Should the policy give consideration to scheme viability and the scale of a development particularly with regard to the requirement for the provision of community transport in residential schemes for the elderly or mobility impaired?

### **Policy DP18: Travel plans**

- 51. Is it clear when a travel plan would be required?
- 52. What are the 'relevant thresholds' in the third bullet point? Should this be set out for clarity in the supporting text?
- 53. Is the policy effectively worded?
- 54. Is suggested modification PC40 necessary to make the Plan sound?

### **Policy DP19: Parking**

- 55. How would a decision maker know what parking standard to apply? Where are these set out?

56. What is meant by 'sufficient' electric parking and associated infrastructure? Is this necessary when electric charging points are a requirement of Building Regulations?

57. Is it justified to make access to a car club vehicle a 'must'? Is it achievable?

**Policy DP20: Airport related parking**

58. Would the policy be effective in managing car parking provision for the airport whilst also supporting the strategic objectives of the Plan to reduce travel by car?

59. Is the last bullet point of the policy effective and justified?

60. Is the suggested modification PC41 necessary to make the Plan sound?

## **Matter 11 : Community Allocations**

**Issue : Are the proposed community allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?**

### **Policy LP6: Educational, sporting, leisure and community use allocations**

1. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
2. Is the approach to Schedule 4 clear and consistent? Is it justified by robust and up to date evidence of need?
3. Is the approach to identifying locations for these uses justified and effective?
4. Are the site-specific requirements set out in Schedule 4 actually site requirements? Do additions need to be made?
5. What evidence is there to show that the allocations listed in Schedule 4 are deliverable when anticipated during the Plan period?
6. A large amount of the schedule relates to education provision. Therefore, does this schedule adequately address all community facilities listed in LP6 which are identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) as being essential to supporting sustainable communities?
7. Do the locations of proposed new schools take cross border movement into account? Would they support sustainable patterns of development?
8. Is proposed change PC58 necessary to make the Plan sound?

## **Matter 12 : Strategic Locations**

**Issue : Are the proposed strategic locations justified, effective, developable and /or deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?**

### **Part A**

#### **General**

1. Should each housing allocation be given a reference number and should the site requirements also be numbered for ease of reference?

2. Is the deletion of the following allocations justified?

West of Engine Lane, Nailsea

Land south of The Uplands, Nailsea

Trendlewood Way, Nailsea

Land at Bridgwater Road, Weston-Super-Mare

Land at Atlantic Road South, Weston-Super-Mare

Land at Dinghurst Road, Churchill

Woodborough Farm, Winscombe

North Field, Claverham Works, Claverham

Barrow Hospital (1), Barrow Gurney

Cambridge Batch Garage, Weston Road, Long Ashton

3. What is the justification for the amalgamation of the allocations on Land south of Jubilee Lane, Churchill and Land east of Ladymead Lane, Churchill?

## Part B

### Policy LP1: Strategic Location - Wolvershill (north of Banwell)

*These questions concentrate on the principle of around 3300 homes and 6.1 hectares of employment land in this strategic location. Detailed questions about individual sites are dealt with below).*

1. Are the requirements of the policy clear, justified and effective?
2. Is the requirement for 990 affordable homes sufficiently justified and effective, or should the policy instead require provisions at the percentage set out in the policy DP43 (Affordable housing and rural exception schemes), so that the level of affordable housing remains proportionate to the number of homes ultimately delivered?
3. Is there sufficient certainty that the delivery of the Banwell Bypass will align with the proposed housing trajectory and development phasing? What would be the implications for development within the allocation if its delivery were delayed?
4. Has the viability assessment demonstrated that the full package of policy requirements can be delivered whilst maintaining housing delivery and affordable housing provision?
5. Does the proposed Strategic Gap strike an appropriate balance between maintaining settlement identity and achieving integration between the existing and new communities?
6. The Policy includes reference to the potential for smaller scale business land provision as part of the mixed use local centre. Is the policy effective in outlining the expectation in this regard? Should a minimum area be defined?
7. The third bullet point refers to a single masterplan covering the entire allocation, a delivery plan, supporting design codes and phasing strategy. Is it clear who is preparing these, when they will be required, what process should it go through?
8. The policy requires the creation of a new Nature Park. Is the Plan clear about who is providing this? Is the policy clear as to what would be expected of an individual development proposal in providing connections to it and ensuring its appropriate management?
9. In respect of the requirement for 18 gypsy and traveller pitches is such provision appropriate and justified within the strategic location? How would the possible alternative of off-site provision be secured and monitored?
10. Is the requirement for a public art strategy sufficiently justified and necessary to the delivery of the allocation? Should the policy provide greater clarity regarding the intended outcomes, scope and scale of the public art provision to ensure that the requirement is effective and capable of consistent implementation?

11. Are the transport and healthcare requirements identified in the IDP sufficiently secured through the Plan's policies and mechanisms for implementation, or is it necessary and justified for the relevant requirements to be repeated within the strategic allocation policy to ensure they are clear, effective and deliverable?
12. Does the policy provide sufficient certainty regarding the delivery of healthcare infrastructure? Should the requirement extend beyond the provision of land to require the construction and fitting out of the healthcare facility, and should the policy specify how and when such provisions are to be secured and delivered?
13. Are the references within the policy to "medium" and "high" density sufficiently clear and precise to provide effective guidance for the preparation and assessment of development proposals? If not, should the policy define the terms, including by reference to appropriate density ranges or measurable criteria?
14. Is the anticipated rate of delivery as set out in the Housing Land Supply Site Template realistic? What assumptions have been made? Is the site deliverable/developable as anticipated?
15. Are there any significant constraints to the development that will need to be addressed?
16. The policy refers to the possible new junction on the M5 south of junction 21. How likely is it that this will come forward in the future? Is the Policy clear in setting out what a developer would be expected to do to not preclude such a proposal taking place?
17. The strategic location is in multiple ownership with a consortium of landowners and developers promoting the development. How would delivery be coordinated and phased? Is there an agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between the parties to secure a coordinated development with a mechanism to apportion contributions to the funding of the necessary infrastructure?
18. Are the proposed changes PC8-11 (SD6) necessary to make the policy sound? What is the justification for requiring two three form entry primary schools instead of three 420 place schools?

## Part C

### Policy LP2: Strategic Location - Woodspring (south west of Bristol)

*These questions concentrate on the principle of around 3500 homes and around 10 hectares of employment land in this strategic location. Detailed questions about individual sites are dealt with below).*

1. Are the requirements of the policy clear, justified and effective?
2. Is the methodology for release from the Green Belt for this allocation sound?
3. What exceptional circumstances are there to justify the release of land in the Green Belt? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully?
4. The allocation lies next to Green Belt in the administrative area of Bristol. Is the proposed allocation boundary effective in maintaining continued separation and a strategic green buffer with Bristol?
5. The policy requires all of the allocated land to meet the 'Golden Rules' set out in national policy. Is the policy clear how this would operate for each development proposal?
6. The fourth bullet point requires a single masterplan to be agreed prior to the submission of a planning application. Is it sufficiently clear who is preparing this, when will it be required, what process should it go through? What if agreement cannot be reached with all the site promoters/owners or a party does not engage in the process?
7. Is the requirement for development to address the severance caused by Colliters Way and the relationship to the A38 sufficiently clear and effective? Should the policy specify the particular measures or outcomes required to address these matters?
8. With regard to the requirement within the third transport bullet point, what is envisaged for the future mass transit route and how likely is it to come forward in the future? Is the policy sufficiently clear as to the extent to which development proposals are expected to safeguard and facilitate the future mass transit network? Should the references to opportunities for the route to pass through or alongside the site and to supporting integration with the future network be expressed as clear requirements rather than opportunities?
9. The policy refers to the delivery of transport hubs in the future. What transport hubs are envisaged within or in connection with the allocation and how likely are these to come forward in the future? Is the policy clear in setting out what a developer would be expected to do to not prejudice such proposals from taking place?
10. Should the policy identify more clearly the infrastructure required to facilitate direct access onto an extended Metrobus network?

11. Does the IDP identify with sufficient certainty the transport infrastructure required to support the allocation, including its timing, delivery mechanisms and funding? Should the key infrastructure requirements be identified within the allocation policy itself?
12. What is the justification for retaining the existing golf clubhouse, at least on a temporary basis, and for its use as a community hub? Is the requirement sufficiently clear regarding the period of retention, its intended use and the circumstances in which alternative provisions may be made?
13. Are the references within the policy to “medium” and “high” density sufficiently clear and precise to provide effective guidance for the preparation and assessment of development proposals? If not, should the policy define the terms, including by reference to appropriate density ranges or measurable criteria?
14. What evidence supports the reduction of employment land provisions from 10 hectares to 6 hectares? How has the Council demonstrated that 6 hectares would be sufficient to meet the identified employment need, taking account of the scale and nature of the proposed development and what are the implications of the reduction for the allocation’s role in delivering employment opportunities?
15. How will the requirement for education provision, including primary, secondary and early years provision be triggered and delivered as the allocation comes forward? Is the policy sufficiently clear regarding the circumstances in which financial contributions towards off-site provision may instead be required? What evidence supports the reduction of primary schools to two from three (PC14)? Is the policy sufficiently flexible in meeting the needs of the development?
16. How will the requirement for special educational needs provision and family centre services be triggered? If they are not provided on site, what provision or financial contribution will be required and how will this be secured? Does the Policy need to be modified for effectiveness?
17. The policy requires the creation of a new Nature Park. Is the Plan clear about who is providing this? Is the Policy clear as to what would be expected of an individual development proposal in providing connections to it and ensuring its appropriate management?
18. In respect of the requirement for 18 gypsy and traveller pitches is such provision appropriate and justified within the strategic location? How would the possible alternative of off-site provision be secured and monitored?
19. Is the requirement for a public art strategy sufficiently justified and necessary to the delivery of the allocation? Should the policy provide greater clarity regarding the intended outcomes, scope and scale of the public art provision to ensure that the requirement is effective and capable of consistent implementation?
20. Are there any significant constraints to the development that will need to be addressed?

21. Has the viability assessment demonstrated that the full package of policy requirements can be delivered whilst maintaining housing delivery and affordable housing provision?
22. The strategic location is in multiple ownership. Is there sufficient certainty that the allocation is capable of being brought forward comprehensively? Is there an agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between the parties to secure a coordinated development with a mechanism to apportion contributions to the funding of necessary infrastructure. Is there sufficient certainty that the necessary land interests can be secured to enable delivery of the allocation and its infrastructure?
23. Is the anticipated rate of delivery as set out in the Housing Land Supply Site Template realistic? What assumptions have been made? Is the site deliverable/developable as anticipated?

## Part D

### Policy LP3: Strategic Location - Nailsea and Backwell

*(These questions concentrate on the principle of around 3500 homes and 6.1 hectares of employment land in this strategic location. Detailed questions about individual sites are dealt with below).*

1. Are the requirements of the policy clear, justified and effective?
2. The policy requires access improvements to Nailsea and Backwell Railway Station. The Plan also refers to possible future expansion of the station and a proposed change (PC24) put forward by the Council adds reference to the possible relocation of the station. How feasible are these proposals? Have options been investigated? Have discussions taken place with Network Rail?
3. The policy seeks the identification of facilities and contributions for enhanced leisure provision in line with the IDP. In terms of this strategic location, the IDP seeks financial contributions secured through planning obligations. Should the policy wording be modified in the interests of clarity to make the expectations clear?
4. The penultimate bullet point requires contributions to a new Nature Park. Has a site been identified within the strategic location? Is the Plan clear about who is providing this? Should it form a site requirement for a specific allocation/s? Is the Policy clear as to what would be expected of an individual development proposal in providing connections to it and ensuring its appropriate management?
5. The last bullet point of the policy requires the provision of a new wetland area on Nailsea Moors. Has a site been identified? Is the policy clear on who is to provide this, how will it be funded and managed?
6. Is the proposed Cross Rail Link deliverable and is it viable?
7. The Link Road is to be funded by public sector grant funding and development contributions. Developer contributions would amount to around 15% of the overall cost. What progress has been made in securing public sector grant monies?
8. How much development could come forward in the Plan period if the Cross Rail Link Road is delayed or fails to come forward?
9. Delivery of this strategic location relies on multiple sites coming forward without a binding framework to coordinate infrastructure. Is the policy effective in ensuring coordination so that infrastructure will be delivered when required? Is the Council's Proposed Change PC25 justified and effective?
10. How are allocations with consent contributing to the infrastructure requirements needed to support growth at this strategic location?

11. Are there any other infrastructure needs that should be included in the Policy eg health provision, libraries, leisure, convenience retail?

## **Allocations**

12. Are the sites allocated for housing in Nailsea and Backwell sound, and in particular:-

- a) Have the site constraints been appropriately considered in the allocation of the site?
- b) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective? Are there any omissions?
- c) Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
- d) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for the development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?
- e) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and deliverable/ developable during the Plan period?
- f) Where applicable, are the main modifications suggested to the site allocations necessary to make the Plan sound?

NB. The above questions are still relevant to allocated sites with extant planning permission, particularly where development has not yet commenced. We acknowledge that not all questions will be applicable to each case. Reference may be made to the Council's Housing Land Supply Site Templates where they answer the above questions.

## **Additional questions for specific allocations**

### **Land at North West Nailsea**

13. Is the last bullet point in the site requirements relating to future parcels of development ambiguously worded? Is it clear which land parcels this relates to?
14. Should the protection and avoidance of the aviation fuel pipeline be a site requirement?

### **Land North of Nailsea**

15. What exceptional circumstances are there to justify the release of land in the Green Belt? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully? What compensatory work is proposed and how would it improve environmental quality and accessibility?

16. Is it clear what is expected of a development to meet the requirement of the last bullet point seeking the vehicular access to be coordinated with the allocation at Pound Lane, Nailsea?

### **Poplar Farm, Nailsea**

17. The last bullet point in the site requirements requires public transport provision. Is this justified and proportionate to the development proposed? Should a modification be made to state the development should contribute towards public transport improvements?

### **Land South of Nailsea**

18. The third bullet point requires a single masterplan. Is it clear who is preparing this, when will it be required, what process should it go through? Should a Design Code be required to ensure high-quality design throughout the allocation? Should the Masterplan also include a phasing plan to achieve coordination of development?
19. Is there a risk that this development would result in the settlements of Nailsea and Backwell coalescing?

### **Land East of Backwell**

20. What exceptional circumstances are there to justify the release of land in the Green Belt? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully? What compensatory work is proposed and how would it improve environmental quality and accessibility?
21. Master planning is referred to in several site requirements for different purposes. Is it clear what is expected from a Masterplan? Is it clear who is preparing this, when will it be required, what process should it go through?
22. Should the Movement and Access Framework form part of the Masterplan?
23. How is the development expected to demonstrate that the strategic functionality required for the Link Road will be delivered (Seventh bullet point). Is this necessary considering the need for the Link Road has already been established?

## Part E

### Policy LP4: Strategic Locations - Pill and Easton-in-Gordano

*(These questions concentrate on the principle of 1100 homes and the creation of a new community across four sites in this strategic location. Detailed questions about individual sites are dealt with below).*

1. Are the requirements of the policy clear, justified and effective?
2. Is the methodology for the selection of the sites that have been selected for release from the Green Belt for this allocation sound?
3. What exceptional circumstances are there to justify the release of land in the Green Belt? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully?
4. The policy requires all of the sites to meet the 'Golden Rules' set out in national policy. Is the policy clear how this would operate for each development proposal?
5. How would the policy be effective to deliver the improvements to local infrastructure set out in the bullet points?
6. Is the policy clear as to what would be expected from each development site? In particular, in the absence of an overarching framework, would the policy be effective?
7. What evidence is there that the development of the sites in the strategic location are viable and deliverable/developable during the Plan period as anticipated in the housing trajectory?
8. What are the implications for deliverability of development at the strategic location if the transport improvements fail to come forward?
9. Is suggested modification PC26 necessary to make the Plan sound?
10. The policy seeks buffers to the M5 motorway. Is it clear how this would be done, by who and are the expectations clear?
11. Have the site constraints been appropriately considered in the allocation of the sites?
12. Are the strategic transport requirements associated with the delivery of the LP4 allocations realistic, funded and deliverable?
13. Where mitigation is required is it clear what would be required, who would be responsible, time frames and how this would be managed across the sites?
14. There are several active travel requirements across all of the LP4 allocations. Is it clear what would be required from each development proposal? Would the policy be effective in co ordinating the provision of these requirements?

## **Allocations**

15. Are the sites allocated for housing in Pill and Easton-in-Gordano sound, and in particular:
- a) Have the site constraints been appropriately taken into account in the allocation of the site?
  - b) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective? Are there any omissions?
  - c) Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
  - d) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for the development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?
  - e) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and deliverable/ developable during the Plan period?
  - f) Where sites are in the Green Belt, have exceptional circumstances to justify the release of land been demonstrated? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully?
  - g) Where applicable, are the main modifications suggested to the site allocations necessary to make the Plan sound?

NB. We acknowledge that not all questions may be applicable to each site. Reference may be made to the Council's Housing Land Supply Site Templates where they answer the above questions.

## **Land at Lodway Farm**

16. What is the justification for the increase in site capacity from 160 to 215 dwellings?
17. In particular given the reference to noise and capacity (bullet 2, Schedule 1) is the indicative yield deliverable?
18. There are several references to master planning. Is it clear what is required, who would prepare it, when it would be required and the process that would apply?

## **Land East of Gordano Services**

19. Is the policy clear and effective regarding noise modelling in relation to the motorway? In particular, given the reference to noise and capacity (bullet 2, Schedule 1) is the indicative yield deliverable?

20. There are several references to master planning. Is it clear what is required, who would prepare it, when it would be required and the process that would apply?

21. Is suggested modification PC54 necessary to make the Plan sound?

### **Pill Green**

22. What is the justification for the increase in site capacity from 600 to 700 dwellings? What implications does this have, if any, for infrastructure provision?

23. Are there any other infrastructure requirements, other than the provision of land for a primary school, that should be included in the policy?

24. Is it clear how the requirements for active travel, buffers to the Markham Brook and improvements to the River Trail would be provided? Is it clear what is required, who would prepare it, when it would be required and the process that would apply?

25. Is suggested modification PC55 necessary to make the Plan sound?

### **Land at Pill Road**

26. Is it clear how the requirements for active travel, buffers to the Markham Brook and improvements to the River Trail would be provided? Is it clear what is required and when?

27. Given the suggestion in representations and pre application discussions that the site could also accommodate a 70 bed care home, should this be referenced in the policy? Would this satisfy a local need?

28. Is suggested modification PC56 necessary to make the plan sound?

### **Land at Ham Green**

29. This is a previously developed site with existing built development. In the interest of effectiveness, should the Policy be clear that redevelopment or conversion may be acceptable on this site?

## **Matter 13 : Other Residential Allocations**

**Issue : Are the proposed residential allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?**

### **Weston-Super-Mare, Wider Weston-Super-Mare, Clevedon and Portishead**

1. Are the sites allocated for housing in Weston-Super-Mare, Wider Weston-Super-Mare, Clevedon and Portishead sound, and in particular: -
  - a) Have the site constraints been appropriately taken into account in the allocation of the site?
  - b) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective? Are there any omissions?
  - c) Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
  - d) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for the development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?
  - e) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and deliverable/ developable during the Plan period?
  - f) Where sites are in the Green Belt, have exceptional circumstances to justify the release of land been demonstrated? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully?
  - g) Where applicable, are the main modifications suggested to the site allocations necessary to make the Plan sound?

NB. The above questions are still relevant to allocated sites with extant planning permission, particularly where development has not yet commenced. We acknowledge that not all questions will be applicable to each case. Reference may be made to the Council's Housing Land Supply Site Templates where they answer the above questions.

### **Additional questions for specific allocations**

#### **Parklands Village, Weston-Super-Mare**

2. Is the requirement for the allocation to be developed in accordance with the outline planning consent and Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document effective? Should any substantive requirements contained within the SPD be incorporated into the policy itself?

#### **Winterstoke Village, Weston-Super-Mare**

3. Is the requirement for the allocation to be developed in accordance with the outline planning consent and Weston Villages Supplementary Planning Document effective? Should any substantive requirements contained within the SPD be incorporated into the policy itself?

#### **Land west of Winterstoke Road, Weston-Super-Mare**

4. Given the location of the Cross Rhyne along the southern boundary of the allocation and the need to maintain unrestricted operational access along the bank of the Cross Rhyne, should this be included within the site-specific requirements?

#### **Knightstone Road Hotels, Weston-Super-Mare**

5. The site requirements contain a number of detailed design, heritage and restoration expectations. Should any specific requirements relating to the restoration of historic features, treatment of frontages, extensions, materials, boundary treatments and seafront character be more precisely defined within the policy to ensure its effective implementation and provide greater certainty for applicants and decision-makers?

#### **Elm Grove Nursery, Locking**

6. Is there ambiguity within the second bullet point regarding what development is permitted within the northern part of the site identified as being at future risk of flooding? Does the wording clearly establish whether an access road may be provided within this area only where an alternative access from the eastern side of the site is secured, or whether other development would also be permitted?
7. Should the fourth bullet point be worded as 'additional capacity within primary, secondary and early years education' rather than 'expansion' to avoid ambiguity?

#### **Land to the west of Elborough**

8. Is it clear what is expected of a development to meet the requirement of the third bullet point seeking active and sustainable travel provision to Locking Village and the A371 strategic cycleway to link with the allocation at Land north of Banwell Road?
9. Should the policy clarify the nature of the bus service provision to which the contribution would relate (fifth bullet point) and the basis on which the proportionate contribution would be determined?

#### **Land north of Banwell Road, Locking/Elborough**

10. Should the second bullet point be worded as 'additional capacity within primary, secondary and early years education' rather than 'expansion' to avoid ambiguity?
11. Is it clear what is expected of a development to meet the requirement of the fourth bullet point seeking joined up safe active and sustainable travel provision to Locking Village and the A371 strategic cycleway to link with the allocation at Land to the west of Elborough?

### **Castlewood, Clevedon**

12. Is there an update to the position regarding the potential sale of site to Avon and Somerset Police?

### **Tower Farm, Portishead**

13. The policy requires a site wide masterplan at outline planning application stage. Is it clear what is required, who would prepare it and the process that would apply?

### **Villages, Other Settlements and Countryside locations**

14. Are the sites allocated for housing in Banwell, Bleadon, Churchill, Congresbury, Long Ashton, Sandford, Winscombe, Yatton/Claverham & Other settlements and countryside locations sound, and in particular:-

- a) Have the site constraints been appropriately considered in the allocation of the site?
- b) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective? Are there any omissions?
- c) Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
- d) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for the development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?
- e) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and deliverable/developable during the Plan period?
- f) Where sites are in the Green Belt, have exceptional circumstances to justify the release of land been demonstrated? Have all other reasonable options for alternative sites been examined fully?
- g) Where applicable, are the main modifications suggested to the site allocations necessary to make the Plan sound?

NB. The above questions are still relevant to allocated sites with extant planning permission, particularly where development has not yet commenced. We acknowledge that not all questions will be applicable to each case. Reference may be made to the Council's Housing Land Supply Site Templates where they answer the above questions.

### **Additional questions for specific allocations**

#### **Churchill - Land east of Ladymead Lane, Land north of Pudding Pie Lane, Pudding Pie Lane (west), Land south of Jubilee Lane**

15. Is it clear what is expected from a Masterplan? Is it clear who is preparing this, when will it be required, what process should it go through?

### **Land north of Colliter's Way**

16. The Policy requires a masterplan to coordinate the development of the site with the adjoining residential development in the administrative area of Bristol. Is it clear what is required, when it should be prepared and the process that would apply?
17. The first bullet point of the Policy states that no access should be taken from Colliter's Way. Is this justified? What alternatives are available? Should these be referenced in the Policy?

## **Matter 14 : Housing supply**

**Issue : Does the Plan provide an appropriate supply of deliverable and developable sites to meet identified needs and do these align with national policy?**

### **Delivery**

1. What evidence is there that the minimum housing requirement of 1580 dwellings per annum will be achieved bearing in mind past delivery rates?
2. The housing supply 2026-2041 is made up of a number of components. The Council intends to set this out more clearly in a main modification to Policy SP8.
  - a) Is it appropriate for a lapse rate/non implementation rate to be applied to sites with planning permission?
  - b) Is a buffer/headroom of approximately 691 dwellings (24,391-23,700) or 2.9% appropriate and justified to provide choice and competition in the market and make an allowance for the non-implementation of sites?
3. The Council's response to the Inspectors Preliminary Questions indicated that there are two components to the windfall allowance, a long-term trend and a predicted uplift. Is this approach justified? What evidence supports the predicted uplift?
4. What compelling evidence is there that the windfall allowance of 200 dwellings per annum will be achieved bearing in mind the average delivery of 167 dwellings per year over the period 2006 to 2026? What evidence is there to indicate that this level of delivery will continue over the Plan period?
5. What is the justification for the windfall allowance of 200 dwellings being applied at year 1 of the housing trajectory? Should it be applied from year 4 to prevent double counting of those sites which already have planning permission?
6. What assumptions have been made to inform the trajectory for the delivery of housing sites, in terms of lead in times for grant of full planning permission, outline and reserved matters, and conditions discharge; site opening up and preparation; dwelling build out rates; phasing; and number of sales outlets?
7. Is there an over reliance on strategic sites? Wolverhill and Woodspring amount for around 28% of housing supply. Is there a need for contingency if they are delayed or do not come forward?

### **Five-year housing land supply**

8. Is the Council able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption of the Plan (assuming this will be Spring /Summer 2027) and a rolling 5-year supply throughout the Plan period?
9. Has the appropriate buffer been applied in accordance with paragraph 74 of the Framework?

## **Matter 15 : Design and Place Making**

**Issue : Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies relating to the design and place making which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

### **Climate Change - Policies SP2, DP6-13**

#### **Policy SP2: Climate Change**

1. Is the approach to climate change set out in the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy? Are the policy expectations reasonable for all developments?

#### **Policy DP5: Climate change, adaptation and resilience**

2. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy? In particular:
  - (a) Does the policy unnecessarily duplicate other policies in the Plan and climate change provisions in Building Regulations?
  - (b) Are the requirements too onerous? Should the policy be more flexible?
  - (c) Is it clear what is expected of non-major developments?
  - (d) Should reference be made to building orientation to reduce overheating?
  - (e) Is it clear what is meant by a rain garden in the fifth part of the first bullet point?

#### **Policy DP6: Net zero construction**

3. Is the expectation for higher local targets going beyond Future Homes Standard and Building Regulations justified?
4. What evidence supports the target space heating demand, overall operational energy use and embodied carbon emissions?
5. The policy requires the inclusion of both regulated and non-regulated energy use in net zero calculations. Is this justified?
6. Is the approach to changes of use and conversions clearly set out in the policy?
7. Should the policy distinguish between full, outline and reserved matters applications and the expectations for planning applications at each stage?
8. Is it clear from the policy and supporting text what is expected at application stage to demonstrate policy compliance? Should the requirement for an energy statement form part of the policy?
9. What assumptions have been made in the Viability Appraisal about the uplift in build costs for different development types, both residential and non-residential to meet the

policy requirements? Are they supported by robust evidence including locally specific data?

10. Should the policy be more flexible to take account of development proposals where viability is an issue or there are technical constraints preventing compliance with the policy?
11. What is the renewable offset scheme? Should this be referenced in the policy and not just in the supporting text?
12. What viability assumptions have been made about the cost of offsetting relative to on-site measures.? As currently worded, how does the policy secure the delivery of an appropriate level and means of offsetting?
13. The Climate Change and Energy Topic Paper (EB39) makes reference to post occupancy monitoring. If it is intended to require this, should it be clearly set out in the policy and supporting text?
14. What evidence supports the imposition of the optional water consumption requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day?

#### **Policy DP7: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy**

15. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy? The Framework requires suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy to be identified in development plans. Is it appropriate that such areas would be identified in an updated guidance note (PC35) replacing the existing SPD?
16. What is the justification for requiring at least 5% community ownership in commercial led energy schemes over 5 MW?

#### **Flood risk, drainage and pollution - Policies DP8-11 and DP13**

##### **Policy DP8: Efficient use of land**

17. Is policy DP8 clear, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
18. Is the requirement that all parts of a site have a positive purpose sufficiently clear and effective for decision making? What constitutes a 'positive purpose' and how will it be assessed?
19. Is the minimum density target of 40 dwellings per hectare justified by robust evidence, is the policy effective and sufficiently clear in how the density requirement is to be applied, and is it sufficiently flexible to respond to local character, site constraints and viability considerations?

### **Policy DP9: Flood risk**

20. Is the policy's approach to defining Sequential Test search areas justified and fully consistent with the Framework and PPG?
21. Is reference to the overall planning balance consistent with national policy concerning the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests?
22. Is the requirement for development in flood zones 2 and 3 to meet certain criteria in the North Somerset Flood Risk Assessment justified and is the policy effectively worded to explain its expectations in this regard?

### **Policy DP10: Sustainable drainage**

23. Is the policy sufficiently flexible to account for site specific engineering, groundwater and contamination constraints?

### **Policy DP11: Rivers, watercourses and springs**

24. Is policy DP11 necessary and effective, or does it unnecessarily duplicate requirements contained in other policies of the Plan or requirements arising from separate legislation and regulatory regimes?

### **Policy DP13: Environmental Pollution, living conditions health and safety**

25. Is the policy sufficiently clear regarding the relationship between planning controls and other environmental permitting and regulatory regimes?

## **Design - Policies SP4, DP1-4 and DP12**

### **Policy SP4: Placemaking**

26. Is policy SP4 justified, effective and consistent with the Framework with particular regard to:-
  - (a) Whether the mandatory requirement for a Community Engagement Statement is justified and proportionate and is it clear what level of engagement is expected?
  - (b) Whether the mandatory design review panel is sufficiently clear to ensure consistent implementation and effective?
  - (c) Given the Framework generally referring to climate change mitigation, adaptation, biodiversity and environmental improvement rather than "emergencies", can the criterion to 'contribute positively to addressing the climate and nature emergencies' be applied consistently and will an applicant be able to clearly demonstrate compliance with this part of the Policy?

### **Policy DP1: High Quality Design**

27. Is policy DP1 justified, effective and consistent with the Framework? In particular: -

- (a) Does the policy unnecessarily duplicate other policies within the Plan, such as Policy SP4?
- (b) Is the requirement for on-site public art or a financial contribution justified, effective and supported by the evidence?
- (c) Is the requirement for Community Engagement Statements, parameter plans and long-term management plans on all major development proposals justified, proportionate and effective? What type of application would this apply to and when would the documents need to be provided?
- (d) Is the requirement for all major developments to provide management plans for the maintenance of all shared public and private spaces etc justified in light of policy DP64?
- (e) Are the words '*supplementary guidance and other documents*' (intended as replacement words for '*Supplementary Planning Documents and other documents in the Schedule of Proposed Changes SD6*') suitably effective and unambiguous?

#### **Policy DP2: Residential development within settlement boundaries**

28. Is the approach to residential development within settlement boundaries justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Are the policy criteria sufficiently clear and capable of consistent application? And is there sufficient flexibility to support the efficient use of land and windfall housing delivery?

#### **Policy DP3: Residential Extensions**

29. No questions.

#### **Policy DP4: Houses in Multiple Occupation and residential subdivision**

30. Is the criterion preventing 'sandwiching' and a continuous frontage of three or more HMOs justified by proportionate evidence, effective and consistent with national policy?

#### **Policy DP12: Development in the Green Belt**

31. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with the Framework in its approach to development within the Green Belt. In particular: -
- (a) Is the distinction between inset villages and smaller settlements/hamlets justified, and is the resulting approach to infilling consistent with national Green Belt policy?
  - (b) Is the policy's use of a 50% threshold for extensions and replacement dwellings justified and consistent with national policy, having regard to the Framework's emphasis on proportionality and planning judgment rather than prescribed numerical limits? In particular, should the threshold be regarded as a guideline rather than a rigid limit, and does the policy provide sufficient flexibility to take account of the individual circumstances and visual impact of proposals which fall marginally above or below the threshold?

- (c) Is it justified, effective and consistent with national policy for policy DP12 to require that infilling or redevelopment of previously developed land in the Green Belt outside defined settlement boundaries be well related to an existing settlement and satisfy specified accessibility criteria? In particular, are these requirements appropriate sustainability considerations, or do they unduly restrict forms of development which the Framework identifies as not inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to the relevant tests concerning openness and Green Belt purposes?
- (d) Is the policy's approach to renewable energy development consistent with national policy, including in circumstances where such development may benefit from an exception to the general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt? Is there sufficient flexibility and clarity to ensure that renewable and low carbon energy proposals are not subject to a more restrictive approach than that set out within the Framework?
- (e) Is the policy consistent with the Frameworks' approach to Grey Belt land? Does it provide a sufficiently clear and effective framework for identifying and assessing development on Grey Belt land, including the circumstances in which development should not be regarded as inappropriate, and does it appropriately reflect the relevant requirements concerning Green Belt purposes, sustainable locations, demonstrable need and, where applicable, the Golden Rules?

## **Matter 16 : Historic and Natural Environment**

**Issue : Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies relating to the historic and natural environment which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

**Policies SP11, LP15, LP21, DP34-42**

### **Policy SP11: Historic and Natural environment**

1. Is the policy justified and effective? Is it consistent with national policy in particular with regard to heritage, trees and best and most versatile agricultural land?
2. Does the policy have a clear purpose? Does it unnecessarily duplicate national policy and other development management policies in the Plan?
3. Is it clear from the policy and supporting text what is expected from development proposals to support the delivery of Nature Parks? What progress has the Council made in identifying their location? How they will be delivered and managed?

### **Policy LP15: Local Green Space**

4. Is the policy effective? Does the supporting text include elements that should be in the policy itself to ensure it is positively prepared and consistent with the Framework?
5. The Framework requires that areas of Local Green Space (LGS) should be local in character and not be extensive tracts of land. How do sites on land north east of Long Ashton (298.01 ha), Ashton Hill Plantation (61.10ha) meet these criteria?
6. What is the justification for allocating LGS sites within the Green Belt when they are adequately protected by Green Belt policy?

### **Policy LP21: Coastal Change Management Areas**

7. No questions.

### **Policy DP34: Green Infrastructure**

8. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
9. Is it clear what the policy expectations are for developments of over 10 dwellings? Should a main modification be made to clarify what is meant by the statement that requirement will be higher in such cases?
10. The Proposed Changes to the Plan add reference to Nature Parks in the second paragraph of the policy. What progress has been made in identifying strategic

Nature Park sites in North Somerset which will provide mitigation options for developments where it has been demonstrated that adequate on site mitigation and or compensation is not feasible?

#### **Policy DP35: Nature Conservation**

11. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy, in particular paragraph 193 b)? Are the Policy and the supporting text aligned in this regard?
12. What is the justification for the policy requiring development to demonstrate the principles in Building with Nature, a non-statutory document? Should the policy be more flexible to recognise that this document provides a voluntary approach to enable nature to be at the heart of a proposal?
13. How are notable species and habitats defined? Should this be made clear in the policy or supporting text?
14. What progress has been made in preparing the Recreational Management Strategies for the Severn Estuary and other European sites mentioned in the third paragraph of the supporting text?

#### **Policy DP36: Biodiversity Net Gain**

15. The PPG states that Plans 'do not need to include policies which duplicate the detailed provisions of this statutory framework'. Is this policy necessary? What additionality does the policy provide?

#### **Policy DP37: Trees, Woodland and Hedges**

16. What is the justification for the requirements in the table setting out the required number of replacement trees for those that are lost? Is this too prescriptive?
17. Is the requirement for one tree per dwelling justified?
18. The supporting text states that loss of trees on a site that have occurred 24 months prior to an application being submitted will require compensation. Is this justified in all cases for example where a damaged, diseased or unsafe tree is removed?
19. How will the requirement for off-site provision where tree planting on site is not appropriate or practical be secured? Would it be appropriate for financial contributions to be secured for planting elsewhere?

#### **Policy DP38: Landscape**

20. No questions.

### **Policy DP39: Mendip Hills National Landscape**

21. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
22. The first two paragraphs of the policy repeat national policy? Is this necessary having regard to paragraph 16f) of the Framework?
23. Is the policy wording internally inconsistent leading to contradiction? For example, do the bullet points reflect the other parts of the policy?
24. Should the policy and or supporting text be clearer that the decision maker has a duty to seek to 'further the purposes' of the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the National Landscape as required by Section 245 of the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act 2023 and this will be proactively considered in the determination of planning applications?
25. The policy distinguishes between development within and development within the setting of the National Landscape. Is it appropriate and justified that the same policy test applies to developments sited outside the National Landscape within its setting?

### **Policy DP40: Heritage**

26. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
27. Is the second bullet point too restrictive and conflict with the Frameworks requirement for harm to be weighed against the public benefits?
28. Is it clear how paragraph 5 of the supporting text is to be applied? What is meant by buildings of individual merit or group value? Does this relate to the demolition of unlisted buildings?

### **Policy DP41: Archaeology**

29. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
30. Should the policy better reflect the Framework to 'conserve and enhance' the significance of heritage assets, not 'preserve and enhance' their significance?

### **Policy DP42: Historic parks and gardens**

31. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
32. Should the policy better reflect the Framework to 'conserve and enhance' the significance of heritage assets, not 'preserve' their significance?

## **Matter 17 : Life Prospects and the Countryside**

**Issue:** Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies relating to the life prospects and the countryside which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

### **Policies DP49-62**

#### **Policy DP49: Healthy Places**

1. What is the justification for the requirement of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) from residential developments of over 50 dwellings or more than 1 hectare in area?
2. Should the supporting text provide greater clarity on the type of HIA required depending on the scale of the development?

#### **Policy DP50: New community facilities, open space and sports pitches**

3. No questions.

#### **Policy DP51: Protection of Built Community Facilities**

4. What is the justification for the requirement to market a redundant or surplus property for 6 months? Is this too short?

#### **Policy DP52: Protection of open space and recreation**

5. Is there ambiguity between the last paragraph of the policy relating to other green and blue spaces and the supporting text in terms of which areas the policy would apply?

#### **Policy DP53: Best and Most Versatile Land**

6. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy in particular paragraph 187 b) and FN65 of the Framework?
7. In relation to Grade 3a land and residential uses, should the policy be more flexible to recognise that it may not be feasible in all cases to achieve a layout preserving better quality land for gardens, allotments etc. to support food production?

#### **Policy DP54: Rural workers housing**

8. What is the justification for the requirement to market a property for 6 months? Is this too short?
9. What is the justification for a restriction of the floor area of a dwelling to 150 sq. metres?

#### **Policy DP55: Agriculture and land based rural business**

10. No questions.

#### **Policy DP56: Equestrian development**

11. No questions.

#### **Policy DP57: Replacement Dwellings in the countryside**

12. The first bullet point of the policy requires the dwelling to be replaced to have an existing lawful permanent residential use and be in occupation. What is the justification for the dwelling to be occupied? Why is it insufficient for the use to be lawful and the property not abandoned?
13. What evidence supports the requirement that the replacement dwelling be no more than 50% increase in the size of the external floor area? Should an increase in volume also be restricted to protect the character and visual amenity of the countryside?
14. Is there a contradiction between the fourth bullet point relating to designated and non-designated heritage assets and the supporting text? Should the policy be modified in the interest of effectiveness?

#### **Policy DP58: Conversion or reuse of rural buildings**

15. Is the fourth bullet point relating to architecture and historic significance consistent with the Framework? Should 'preserved' be replaced with 'conserved and where possible enhanced'.

#### **Policy DP59: Previously developed land in the countryside**

16. In the interest of clarity should reference be made to policy DP58 in the fourth bullet point relating to buildings on a site?

#### **Policy DP60: Employment on greenfield land in the countryside**

17. Is the policy justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
18. Having regard to paragraph 88a) of the Framework, is the policy too restrictive by excluding businesses other than those relating to the processing of local produce or other land based rural business?

**Policy DP61: Existing business in the countryside**

19. The policy states that proposals to extend outside the curtilage into the surrounding countryside will need to be fully justified and 'not be harmful' to the character and appearance of the countryside. Is this too restrictive? Should this be modified to read 'no unacceptable harm'?

**Policy DP62: Visitor Accommodation in the countryside including camping and caravanning**

20. What is the justification for requiring accommodation to accord with a national quality assessment scheme? Is it clear what would be expected of a development and how it would be assessed?
21. What is the justification for not permitting applications to change the use of holiday accommodation to permanent residential uses until after a 10-year period has lapsed unless the use is shown to be unviable?
22. The supporting text in the second paragraph states that caravan parks and lodges are not regarded as suitable for permanent residential use. Does this contradict the last section of the policy permitting the use of mobile homes for permanent residential accommodation subject to certain criteria being met?

## **Matter 18 : Delivery and Monitoring**

**Issue : Are the infrastructure delivery policies of the Plan effective, justified and consistent with national policy and will the monitoring framework be effective in assessing the implementation of the Plan?**

### **Delivery**

#### **Policy DP63: Infrastructure delivery and development contributions**

1. Should the policy and /or supporting text recognise that there may be a need for flexibility where viability issues arise?
2. Is it intended to provide further guidance to set out how the policy will be implemented, what contributions will be sought and how they will be calculated? If so, should this be mentioned in the supporting text?

#### **Policy DP64: Adoption of open space and green infrastructure**

3. Is the policy positively prepared and justified?
4. Is the policy effectively worded? Is it necessary for it to include detailed requirements in relation to resident led management structures? Would these be better set out in the supporting text or a separate guidance note?

### **Monitoring Framework**

5. Is the proposed Monitoring Framework provided in response to the Preliminary Questions, (Document PS1a) appropriate and robust?
6. How will the implementation of the Plan be measured? Should the Framework include specific targets against which the success of the Plan will be measured?