

Response to NSC [Local Plan Regulation 19 - Additional Sites Consultation](#)

21st March 2025

North Somerset Council (NSC) via Mike Bell has previously stated that it wants Weston-super-Mare (WSM) to be second largest settlement behind Bristol, therefore keep any additional development within the urban growth areas i.e. the strategic growth locations of Weston, Nailsea, Backwell, South Bristol; leaving Clevedon as a semi-rural seaside town. Whilst NSC might have this urban aspiration, Bleadon has been a small rural agricultural parish for over five thousand years, supporting the farming industry and local food production to this day.

We believe that Bleadon, with its approx. 1K residents, has been mis-categorised as category B. It is not *“a larger, most sustainable villages which either contain a relatively good range of facilities, services, jobs and public transport or are well-related to higher order settlements”* It consists of approx 540 dwellings within the Parish, with approx. 350/two thirds of these dwellings, within the settlement boundary, therefore making it a smaller village. It has no school or healthcare. The road network is not capable of accommodating the current levels of traffic in and out of the village (as evidenced by recent multiple road closures and consequential diversions creating traffic chaos), and would not sustain an increase in volumes. There is no bus service through the parish, other than along the A370, a long way from the village settlement and parish extremes, therefore residents are highly dependent on private transport.

Bleadon was originally scheduled for 42 houses at the quarry - now potentially 191! From an approx 12% village increase to an unacceptable 55% increase!! This would cause irrevocable damage to this small rural community. None of the sites identified should be built with such high density housing - HE20357 West of Willow Drive (32 houses) is stated to be an existing wildlife site. HE2083 Purn House Farm Industrial Estate (60 houses), HE2051 Land north of Amesbury Drive (45 houses) along with additional sites identified outside the settlement boundary (some previously refused for development on appeal) should not be built on.

Inclusion of these proposed areas into an assumed expanded settlement boundary would also presumably prevent the sites from being used as exception sites for affordable housing for local Bleadon residents. Will Bleadon residents get a chance - what will happen with 'Rural Exceptions' and local priority housing .

NSC has not declared who are these houses are for, just that government has demanded an extra 8,620 more houses than NSC officers has calculated NSC residents will need over the next 15 years. Has NSC challenged the govt on these extra 8,620 houses as they do not appear to be for North Somerset residents? Have they challenged MPs - Where is the publicly accessible information that discusses and explains these key issues and valid concerns?

The UK is not food secure, especially considering the situation in Europe and the Ukraine, climate and nature emergencies. According to the [UK Food Security Report 2024](#), *“The production-to-supply ratio was at 62% for all food and 75% for indigenous food”* and is highly dependent on imports. This is a significant reduction on the [1984 figure when the UK was 95% self-sufficient in indigenous food types](#). Also there is a *“notable decrease in food secure households.”* No more agriculture land regardless of its grade should be lost to housing, solar, BNG, etc. projects that put our food security at risk. Any agriculture grade land can be improved to be a better and more versatile land especially those of grade 3a and 3b, and should not be sacrificed for short term housing gains. Bleadon has been an

agricultural community since the Bronze Age and is still producing. How will the new residents and wider enlarged population be fed if agriculture land is continued to be built on?

Any development on the northwest boundary of Bleadon with WSM on Bleadon Hill (HE2035 Land South of Bleadon Hill & HE201030 Leighton Crescent) will adversely affect the rural character of the hills, remove the buffer against the rural community of Bleadon as well as potentially encouraging the urban sprawl southwards and eastwards towards the village settlement boundary.

The previous appeal reasons for refusing HE2035 Land south of Bleadon Hill previously dismissed on appeal still stands (Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/16/3142927) including NSC statements, e.g. *“... at its meeting on 9 March 2016, the Council’s Planning and Regulatory Committee decided that had it determined the application, it would have been refused for the following reasons: 1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale and location, will appear as a long extension of the built-up area in to the countryside. This will cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the landscape, including views to and from the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies CS5 and CS12 of the Core Strategy, Policy GDP/3 of the North Somerset Replacement Local Plan, Policy E1 (Mendip Ridges and Coombs) of the North Somerset Landscape Character Assessment, Policy DM10 of the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 – Development Management Policies (Publication Version) and Paragraphs 58, 64, 75 and 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework. 2. The location of the site, by reason of its distance to the nearest services and facilities and the nature (gradient and intermittent footpaths) of the routes leading to it will not encourage walking or cycling. Instead residents of the development will be over-reliant on vehicle use, even when undertaking local journeys. This is not conducive to sustainable development and the proposal is contrary to Policies CS1 & CS10 of the North Somerset Core Strategy, Policy T/10 of the North Somerset Replacement Local Plan, Policy DM24 of Appeal Decision APP/D0121/W/16/3142927 the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 – Development Management Policies (Publication Version) and Paragraph 35 of the NPPF.”* It also should not be allowed due to refusal reasons for 19/P/2243/OUT.