



# North Somerset Local Plan 2038: Preferred Options Consultation (Reg 18)

## Consultation Statement

### Appendix 4: Summary of Responses to the Schedules

August 2022

# Contents

Schedule 1: Proposed large sites for residential development .....	3
Schedule 2: Proposed employment sites .....	30
Schedule 3: Proposed Local Green Space .....	35
Schedule 4: Proposed sites for community facilities .....	40
Schedule 5: Settlements with settlement boundaries. ....	42

**This appendix provides an overall summary of responses to the Site Schedules to indicate the range of issues raised. Detailed responses from individuals or organisations can be viewed on the online consultation page either against each policy within the document or for each respondent.**

## Schedule 1: Proposed large sites for residential development

A total of 307 comments were received against this schedule. 233 objections, 31 support with amendments, 43 support. Themes and issues which were raised were as follows:

(Key: O = object; SA = support with amendments; S = support)

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
<b>Strategic Growth Locations</b>					
Wolvershill (North of Banwell)	2	0	1	1	<p>Most comments received about this site were made against the Locational Policy LP1. A couple of additional comments were made here. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposed site will require considerable mitigation for impacts on protected sites and species.</li> <li>• Need to include clear GI requirements (linked to agreed standards).</li> <li>• The HRA/AA will need to inform locational and site-specific requirements for new development.</li> <li>• For sites within the Bat SAC consultation zones the HRA should include a calculation of the approximate habitat units and bat mitigation measures that will be required, based on the Bats SAC SPD methodology.</li> <li>• Support the proposed strategic growth location proposals, although there is insufficient information provided about the wider impacts of development at Wolvershill, this primarily relating to traffic.</li> </ul>
Yanley Lane (Woodspring Golf Course)	6	6	0	0	<p>Most comments received about this site were made against the Locational Policy LP2. A few additional comments were made here. These include:</p>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the proposed building of 215 houses North of Collitors Way as part of a larger plan to build 2500 houses in the land in North Somerset bordering South Bristol.</li> <li>• This area (HE201059 and HE20110) appear to cover large areas of ancient woodland known as Barrow Wood and Hanging Hill Wood (just south of the A370 for clarity). These woodland blocks MUST be removed from the areas considered for development as this is irreplaceable habitat and no compensation can adequately replace the loss.</li> <li>• Concern on impact on road network, services and facilities for residents in South West Bristol of this proposal as well as loss of green space.</li> <li>• Residents are concerned the Yanley allocation is a "dumpster fire".</li> <li>• Concern that because a developer has come forward with a site (Yanley golf course) that it already owns as an easy 'preferred' option, the Council is overlooking its legal responsibilities to prevent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It is the planning authority's responsibility to be effectual here and challenge such development.</li> </ul>
<b>Wider Weston-super-Mare area</b>					
Land west of Hutton	1	1	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection: The proposed site would contribute heavily to the amalgamation of the sprawling estates such as Haywood Village and Locking Parklands. It would be destroying many natural habitats and the species. There are alternative locations including the waste land behind Weston-super-Mare industrial site besides the Bournville.</li> </ul>
Elm Grove Nursery, Locking	2	1	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the site from the developer and suggestions that the site has capacity for an additional 15 dwellings and should be allocated for 65 dwellings. Additionally the developer proposed that the</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p>capacity of the site can be increased through the allocation of additional land to the west.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection due to previous refusals and unsuccessful high court challenge previously.</li> </ul>
<b>Weston-super-Mare</b>					
Parklands Village	3	0	3	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mead Realisations: The site has capacity to deliver extra houses due to the removal of the flood attenuation requirement off-site. The additional dwellings can be delivered in a phased manner alongside the already approved development.</li> <li>• Homes England: Propose that the schedule 1 is amended to include an additional allocation for the "Former Site B Locking Parklands" for up to 175 dwellings and supporting employment uses. We would also suggest the comments are amended to suggest potential intensification opportunities for these two sites. Also note that the schedule 1 site requirements include 'Further details in Weston Villages SPD' – however this was supplementary to the Core Strategy and therefore it is requested that the reference to the SPD be amended to 'Further details in Weston Villages SPD where not in conflict with the Local Plan 2038' to avoid carrying forward restrictions such as the 1.5 jobs per home.</li> </ul>
Winterstoke Village	0	0	0	0	
Locking Road Car Park	0	0	0	0	
Former Leisuredome allocation	3	0	2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homes England: Support allocation but can exceed the 216 as currently drafted. The capacity should therefore be increased to up to 270 dwellings.</li> <li>• Avison Young: Support allocation, capacity should be increased</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Homes England: Masterplanning shows that site can accommodate 270 dwellings and an additional parcel could be included for up to 175 dwellings.</li> </ul>
Weston Rugby Club	1	0	1	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement for active travel improvements is unjustifiable in viability and planning terms. The site is in an already sustainable location next to the railway station with easy access to the town centre and its facilities. There appears to be no justification from a sustainable point of view or indeed highways justification for the proposed improvements.</li> </ul>
Land west of Winterstoke Road	0	0	0	0	
Westacres Caravan Park	0	0	0	0	
Sunnyside Road	0	0	0	0	
Land north of Oldmixon Road	0	0	0	0	
Woodspring Stadium, Winterstoke Road	0	0	0	0	
Gas Works	0	0	0	0	
Dolphin Square	1	1	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Birnbeck Conservation Group: request that this carried-over allocation of 80 be reappraised in the light of an innovative proposal we have seen put forward which would install converted shipping containers to create a retail and hospitality hub close to the seafront.</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Land west of Trenchard Road	0	0	0	0	
Police Station/Magistrates Court/Victoria Church	0	0	0	0	
Land at Bridgwater Road	0	0	0	0	
Scot Elm Drive	0	0	0	0	
Former Bournville School site	0	0	0	0	
Lynton House Hotel	0	0	0	0	
Knightstone Road Hotels	1	1	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historic England: A circa 1840's terrace prominent on the seafront and within the Weston super Mare Conservation Area. Although its condition may have seen better days there appears no evidence to make the case for the loss of these heritage assets.</li> </ul>
Former Sweat FA site, Winterstoke Road	0	0	0	0	
Former Police Depot, Winterstoke Road	0	0	0	0	

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Nightingale Close, Mead Vale	0	0	0	0	
Land at Wilson Gardens/Scot Elm Drive	0	0	0	0	
Dauncey's Hotel, Claremont Crescent	0	0	0	0	
38-40 Birnbeck Road	0	0	0	0	
Land adjacent to Diamond Batch	0	0	0	0	
Former TJ Hughes Store, High Street	0	0	0	0	
Land at Atlantic Road South	0	0	0	0	
Land to the rear of Locking Road	0	0	0	0	
69-71 Locking Road	0	0	0	0	
Madeira Cove Hotel	1	1	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Birnbeck Conservation Group: The building should be converted, as opposed to demolition and redevelopment under the extant planning permission. We believe there is a real prospect that this</li> </ul>





Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					structurally sound Italianate style villa, one of a group, may be saved by conversion.
Plum Tree Farm, off Summer Lane	0	0	0	0	
<b>Clevedon</b>					
Land off Millcross	0	0	0	0	
Land at 173-175 Kenn Road	0	0	0	0	
Land north of Churchill Avenue	0	0	0	0	
Great Western Road	0	0	0	0	
2-6 Bay Road	0	0	0	0	
<b>Nailsea</b>					
Land South of Nailsea	8	3	1	4	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Persimmon Homes: support allocation for 600 dwellings at Land south of Nailsea and request inclusion of further additional land, suggest that a masterplan for the whole allocation be prepared, request that the allocation refers to use of the access at the junction of The</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p>Perrings and Youngwood Lane and that additional pedestrian and vehicular accesses to the site are explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support this proposal which will encourage active travel access to the station. The plan should incorporate all the area north of Youngwood Lane in the allocation.</li> <li>• Object – scale of development at Nailsea and Backwell is unacceptable.</li> <li>• Support development at the south and the north west of Nailsea, not east or north east.</li> <li>• Unclear how Policy DP53 would apply and whether the value of the agricultural land has been assessed against sustainability benefits.</li> <li>• The homes proposed here should be built elsewhere on less valuable amenity land and lower quality agricultural land.</li> <li>• Transport infrastructure such as moving the train station, re-routing the A370 around Backwell and creating a new M5 link required to make this and other Nailsea allocations work however this would be cost prohibitive so the allocation should not be taken forward.</li> <li>• Support allocation as a natural extension of the town due to proximity to station. Development should be limited to inside Youngwood Lane.</li> </ul>
Land at North West Nailsea	8	4	1	3	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vistry Group: There are no overriding constraints on this carried forward allocation, and a full planning application is being prepared for submission in 2022. A detailed response has been submitted.</li> </ul>



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Modwen: This site should be deleted given the uncertainties relating to its deliverability, land at South West Nailsea is more sustainable and deliverable.</li> <li>• Support development at the south and the north west of Nailsea, not east or north east.</li> <li>• Object – scale of development at Nailsea and Backwell is unacceptable.</li> <li>• This is an acceptable development following the removal of the pylons. A minimum 20 metre strip protecting the landscape along the Causeway is requested.</li> <li>• Object as there are sufficient allocations elsewhere around Nailsea, and major improvements would be needed to the B3130 through Tickenham.</li> <li>• Transport infrastructure such as moving the train station, re-routing the A370 around Backwell and creating a new M5 link required to make this and other Nailsea allocations work however this would be cost prohibitive so the allocation should not be taken forward.</li> <li>• Support this natural development around edge of town.</li> </ul>
Youngwood Lane	5	5	0	0	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear how Policy DP53 would apply and whether the value of the agricultural land has been assessed against sustainability benefits.</li> <li>• Object – scale of development at Nailsea and Backwell is unacceptable.</li> <li>• St Modwen: This site should be deleted as it benefits from an extant permission.</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the transport corridor goes nowhere and further detail is needed.</li> <li>This development would reduce green space separating the southern edge of Nailsea from Backwell.</li> </ul>
West of Engine Lane	3	2	0	1	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object – scale of development at Nailsea and Backwell is unacceptable.</li> <li>St Modwen: This site should be deleted as it benefits from an extant permission.</li> <li>Agreed to proposed allocation as long as the settlement boundary remains where it is currently proposed.</li> </ul>
Land south of The Uplands	1	1	0	0	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object, as this is a small development and green spaces should be preserved.</li> </ul>
Weston College site, Somerset Square	2	0	0	2	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support in principle and suggest that capacity could be increased by adding an additional floor.</li> <li>Support any good proposal on this site as it needs sorting out.</li> </ul>



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Trendlewood Way	1	1	0	0	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>St Modwen: This site should be deleted as it benefits from an extant permission.</li> </ul>
West End	3	1	1	1	<p>Some general comments regarding growth around Nailsea were made against policy LP3. In addition, the following comments were made against this particular site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support this development and development at the south and the north west of Nailsea, not east or north east.</li> <li>Do not object or support, unclear on proposals.</li> <li>St Modwen: This site should be deleted as it benefits from an extant permission.</li> </ul>
<b>Portishead</b>					
Old Mill Road	7	1	4	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allies and Morrison: Suggest following addition to comments on this site, <i>'The potential capacity of the area to be tested and confirmed through the placemaking study'</i>. Under requirements the first bullet point should be amended to <i>'Mixed use redevelopment delivering an increase in employment and homes'</i> and the third bullet should be replaced with <i>'Delivery of a network of streets and spaces and improvements to existing streets to support active and sustainable travel'</i>.</li> <li>Phoenix Life: Support the allocation and scope for approximately 350 dwellings, although this figure should be kept under review pending the outcome of the WWSA placemaking study.</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portishead Town Council: Support, subject to the number of new houses being determined by the Wyndham Way Area study.</li> <li>Supported as sensible proposal.</li> <li>Should be renamed as Wyndham Way Study Area in the next version of the plan as 'Old Mill Road' is an old designation and should be replaced.</li> <li>As this is a mixed use site any new retail outlets should not be at the cost of existing small businesses on the High Street.</li> <li>350 homes is too many if existing businesses are to be protected.</li> </ul>
Harbour Road/Gordano Gate	1	0	1	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no Gordano Road in Portishead.</li> </ul>
Land south of Clevedon Road	3	1	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongvox: Support allocation as a sustainable location.</li> <li>Portishead Town Council: There is no Gordano Road within Portishead. Object to the proposal as the land is Green Belt.</li> <li>Concern re: proximity to flood plain. If this site is removed from the Green Belt some of it should be used for commercial use as there is a shortage of land for this in Portishead. If for housing, it should be small units not executive homes.</li> </ul>
Site V2 Harbour Road	1	0	1	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Portishead Town Council: There is no Gordano Road within Portishead.</li> </ul>
Land south of Downside	3	3	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object as this is a valued open green space with very narrow access.</li> <li>Portishead Town Council: recent neighbourhood plan consultation shows that people treasure this local urban green space.</li> <li>Site should not be allocated as there is clear local opposition.</li> </ul>
<b>Backwell</b>					

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Grove Farm	45	38	2	5	<p>In addition to the comments regarding growth in general at Backwell made under Policy LP3 the following responses were made against this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taylor Wimpey: support proposed allocation. Have submitted vision statement and masterplan showing how a 20 minute neighbourhood containing c600 dwellings, primary school, community hub, play areas, open space, allotments, orchard, landscaping, a nature park and infrastructure can be provided. Amendments to proposed allocation boundary are suggested, to include additional land.</li> <li>• Backwell Parish Council: object. Major infrastructure would be needed, impacts on wildlife, insufficient capacity at services and facilities to accommodate scale of growth proposed.</li> <li>• Backwell Residents Association: strongly object to this allocation for the reasons set out against Policy LP3.</li> <li>• Some comments of support for proposal by local residents, that this site is preferable to others proposed in Backwell .</li> <li>• Some support qualified by requesting that the site specific requirements are strengthened in respect of type and quality of housing required with a priority given to small and medium sized houses suitable for first time buyers and downsizers.</li> <li>• Multiple objections due to impact on wildlife, particular references to horseshoe bats, owls, birds and insects.</li> <li>• Public transport improvements referred to in Policy LP3 would need to be secured, many comments regarding inadequacy of Nailsea and Backwell railway station.</li> <li>• Comments that development would lead to increased pollution which is contrary to climate emergency declaration.</li> </ul>



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding access, particular reference to Moor Lane/Station Road junction, Rodney Road, Westfield Drive, Westfield Close, Rushmoor Lane, Rushmoor Grove and Backwell crossroads.</li> <li>• Responses that insufficient additional capacity is available on the local highway network.</li> <li>• Site specific requirements refer to a new school if required, multiple comments this will definitely be needed.</li> <li>• Development would impact upon West Leigh Infant School and the scout hut. Some respondents would support a smaller version of the proposal if the field off Rodney Road between the school and scout hut was removed from the allocation and designated as protected green space.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding impact on local public right of way network and in particular the well used footpaths that cross the site.</li> <li>• Multiple comments regarding insufficient capacity in local service provision.</li> <li>• Most local resident responses consider the scale of development proposed is excessive.</li> <li>• Multiple comments raising concern regarding loss of agricultural land, farms and rural landscapes and significant opposition to how these proposals would urbanise Backwell.</li> <li>• Many responses refer to a lack of employment in the area, meaning people will need to commute to Bristol, exacerbating traffic congestion.</li> <li>• References to issues with historical localized flooding in the area.</li> </ul>
Land east of Backwell	52	48	2	2	In addition to the comments regarding growth in general at Backwell made under Policy LP3 the following responses were made against this site:



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Backwell Parish Council: object. Major infrastructure would be needed, impacts on wildlife, insufficient capacity at services and facilities to accommodate scale of growth proposed.</li> <li>• Backwell Residents Association: strongly object to this allocation for the reasons set out against Policy LP3.</li> <li>• St Modwen: this site should be deleted since exceptional circumstances for its removal from the Green Belt have not been demonstrate, there are other suitable alternative non-Green Belt sites at South West Nailsea.</li> <li>• Some preferences for this site over the Grove Farm proposals.</li> <li>• Responses that level of growth proposed for Backwell is excessive.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• Objections to loss of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Concern that insufficient capacity exists in local facilities and services and that development here will exacerbate existing traffic congestion around Backwell.</li> <li>• Some support qualified by requesting that the site specific requirements are strengthened in respect of type and quality of housing required with a priority given to small and medium sized houses suitable for first time buyers and downsizers.</li> <li>• Multiple objections on basis of scale and loss of valued open green space, rural landscape and Green Belt.</li> <li>• Comments that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated.</li> <li>• Numerous objections regarding impact on wildlife, references to deer, bats, badgers, owls, other animals and plants.</li> <li>• Concern that Backwell Common is an unsuitable route for traffic and prone to flooding on occasion.</li> </ul>



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many responses refer to a lack of employment in the area, meaning people will need to commute to Bristol, exacerbating traffic congestion and there are inadequate references to necessary infrastructure in the schedules.</li> <li>• Suggestion that any housing on this site must be zero carbon.</li> <li>• Concern there is no evidence of deliverability particularly given the mitigations and infrastructure required.</li> <li>• Comments that a smaller proposal may be preferable, as it would not extend so far into the countryside.</li> </ul>
Land at Moor Lane	22	15	2	5	<p>In addition to the comments regarding growth in general at Backwell made under Policy LP3 the following responses were made against this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some support for development in this location, and some neutral responses.</li> <li>• Objections on the basis that access, traffic and parking are an issue in this location and that no further developments should exit on to Moor Lane or Rodney Road.</li> <li>• Comments regarding hedge boundary to Moor Lane and trees on site being lost.</li> <li>• Responses refer to lack of employment opportunities in the area.</li> <li>• Acknowledgement that this site has been consented and is largely built out. Request to not allocate additional land beyond the current development .</li> <li>• Confusion regarding the residual capacity of this site.</li> <li>• Comments that Backwell is being swamped with a disproportionate amount of growth.</li> </ul>
<b>Yatton/Claverham</b>					

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Land at North End, Yatton	0	0	0	0	
Yatton Rugby Club/Moor Road, Yatton	4	1	0	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persimmon: support this allocation, note that appeal allowed for 60 dwellings on this site in April 2022.</li> <li>• Strongvox: support the proposed allocation of Yatton Rugby Club site.</li> <li>• Historic England: Yatton Rugby Club site is adjacent to the Grade II Listed Grange. There is no clear and proportionate evidence of how the significance of the asset and its setting has been assessed to inform the principle and response. Strongly recommend that The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans (Historic England Advice Note 3) is applied by the local authority to provide clear evidence.</li> <li>• Important that the protection of Grange Farm and the orchard is adhered to.</li> </ul>
Former UTAS site, Bishops Road, Claverham	0	0	0	0	
Land north of Egret Drive, Yatton	0	0	0	0	
<b>Banwell</b>					
Land west of Wolverhill Road	0	0	0	0	

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Land south of Knightcott Gardens	2	0	2	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newland Homes: support the allocation for 37 dwellings.</li> <li>• Layout plan submitted.</li> </ul>
Land at Western Trade Centre	0	0	0	0	
<b>Bleadon</b>					
Bleadon Quarry	0	0	0	0	
Land off Purn Way	0	0	0	0	
<b>Churchill</b>					
Land east of Ladymead Lane	9	8	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Churchill Parish Council: site requirements need expanding, Pudding Pie Lane is already subject to on-street parking, the lanes become dangerously congested as school times. During closures of the M5 this is a rat-run to avoid queuing on the A38.</li> <li>• Active travel not possible in this area due to volume and speed of cars.</li> <li>• Resources - No mention of additional resources such as emergency services and policing. Churchill Primary and Secondary schools are full and contributions would be sought by the Parish to build a new village hall.</li> <li>• Disproportionate amount of growth directed to Churchill, this is countryside and at odds with the spatial strategy.</li> <li>• Concerned about increased traffic and lack of footpaths.</li> <li>• Burrington Parish Council: the site requirements in schedule 1 are only general statements and there is no evidence they can be achieved.</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p>This is of concern as Burrington parishioners use the Churchill facilities and have a direct interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient infrastructure is in place to support this growth over and above that already built and planned.</li> <li>• Access via Ladymead Lane is unsuitable.</li> </ul>
Land north of Pudding Pie Lane	6	6	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsuitable location.</li> <li>• Churchill Parish Council: site requirements need expanding, Pudding Pie Lane is already subject to on-street parking, the lanes become dangerously congested as school times. During closures of the M5 this is a rat-run to avoid queuing on the A38.</li> <li>• Overdevelopment of this area which is already congested.</li> <li>• Resources - No mention of additional resources such as emergency services and policing. Churchill Primary and Secondary schools are full and contributions would be sought by the Parish to build a new village hall.</li> <li>• Burrington Parish Council: the site requirements in schedule 1 are only general statements and there is no evidence they can be achieved. This is of concern as Burrington parishioners use the Churchill facilities and have a direct interest.</li> <li>• If these sites do come forward then funding should be made available for villages amenities and improvements, not just road improvements.</li> </ul>
Land south of Bristol Road	6	6	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is too much development along this road already.</li> <li>• Churchill Parish Council: site requirements need expanding, Pudding Pie Lane is already subject to on-street parking, the lanes become dangerously congested as school times. During closures of the M5 this is a rat-run to avoid queuing on the A38.</li> <li>• This site is adjacent to the Mendip Hills AONB boundary and therefore within its setting. Any impact should be considered.</li> </ul>



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdevelopment of this area which is already congested.</li> <li>Churchill Parish Council note that the required retention of strong hedge boundaries has not been implemented.</li> <li>Active travel not possible in this area due to volume and speed of cars.</li> </ul>
Pudding Pie Lane (West)	4	4	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pudding Pie Lane is not suitable for access, there are already traffic issues.</li> <li>Churchill Parish Council: site requirements need expanding, Pudding Pie Lane is already subject to on-street parking, the lanes become dangerously congested as school times. During closures of the M5 this is a rat-run to avoid queuing on the A38.</li> <li>Burrington Parish Council: the site requirements in schedule 1 are only general statements and there is no evidence they can be achieved. This is of concern as Burrington parishioners use the Churchill facilities and have a direct interest.</li> <li>This would be over development.</li> </ul>
Pudding Pie Lane (East)	3	2	1	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Churchill Parish Council: site requirements need expanding, Pudding Pie Lane is already subject to on-street parking, the lanes become dangerously congested as school times. During closures of the M5 this is a rat-run to avoid queuing on the A38.</li> <li>Burrington Parish Council: the site requirements in schedule 1 are only general statements and there is no evidence they can be achieved. This is of concern as Burrington parishioners use the Churchill facilities and have a direct interest.</li> <li>There has been an application for 83 dwellings on land to the west of this site which is not yet determined.</li> </ul>
Land south of Jubilee Lane	8	7	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Churchill Parish Council: site requirements need expanding, Pudding Pie Lane is already subject to on-street parking, the lanes become</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p>dangerously congested as school times. During closures of the M5 this is a rat-run to avoid queuing on the A38.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access unsuitable.</li> <li>• Active travel not possible in this area due to volume and speed of cars.</li> <li>• Too many houses proposed around Churchill which will destroy good agricultural land and habitats and make rural areas urban.</li> <li>• Burrington Parish Council: the site requirements in schedule 1 are only general statements and there is no evidence they can be achieved. This is of concern as Burrington parishioners use the Churchill facilities and have a direct interest.</li> <li>• Churchill has already had more than its fair share of housing.</li> <li>• Over development of the area.</li> </ul>
<b>Congresbury</b>					
Pineapple Farm	34	33	1	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congresbury Parish Council: request that this proposed allocation is deleted, as it is subject to so much local opposition and is against the current development plan policies. Concern it would lead to urbanisation of a rural community, cause flooding issues, impact on the landscape and biodiversity and cause significant highway impacts.</li> <li>• M7 Planning: promoting the site. The development could provide 90 dwellings, with a variety of house types and sizes, affordable units, open space and a children's play area.</li> <li>• Objections on the basis that this is not a sustainable site and it was not identified as suitable within the Congresbury Neighbourhood Development Plan.</li> <li>• Concern that there are inadequate references to mitigation in respect of protected species such as Greater and Lesser horseshoe</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p>bats, slow worms, grass snakes and otters and that this development would impact upon several local sites of nature conservation interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density proposed is too high for an edge of village location.</li> <li>• Area is currently heavily used for recreation and has been for many years, a planning application was refused in 2000.</li> <li>• Object to development so close to an area at risk of flooding.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding potential increase in traffic and pollution and adding a strain on other local infrastructure, services and community facilities.</li> <li>• Development would cause landscape harm and impact on heritage assets and archaeology.</li> <li>• References to inadequate access, highway safety and lack of public transport serving this part of the village.</li> <li>• Multiple references to alternative names for this site, such as Land off Mulberry Road, Park Road and Park Farm fields.</li> </ul>
Woodhill Nurseries	6	4	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congresbury Parish Council: as a brownfield site the parish may not object to this proposed allocation, however there is concern that the site would be isolated if not planned properly as part of a strategic development and therefore this site should be assessed in conjunction with the wider area, with road improvements and new pedestrian links integral to this being suitable for development.</li> <li>• Objections due to current unsafe and one way access and potential future reliance on private cars.</li> <li>• Development would impact on nearby allotments.</li> <li>• Risk that this development would lead to Congresbury and Yatton merging.</li> <li>• Lack of public transport serving this site.</li> </ul>
Land off Wrington Lane	2	2	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access is hazardous and the planning application should not have been approved due to land ownership issues.</li> </ul>



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object on the grounds of landscape impact.</li> </ul>
Land east of Smallway	1	0	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is already under construction however there are concerns about how close the site is to the junction and high pollution levels.</li> </ul>
Land south of Cadbury Garden Centre	0	0	0	0	
Land south of Station Road adjoining Church Farm	1	0	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support this site as suitable for development.</li> </ul>
Land to the north of Bristol Road	1	0	1	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for further detail on proposed access arrangements.</li> </ul>
Land south of Station Road	2	0	0	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 comments of support for allocation.</li> </ul>
<b>Sandford</b>					
Land at Mead Farm	10	10	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landowner: promotes a wider area than the existing proposed allocation, and an additional parcel of land. This site could accommodate around 76 dwellings (rather than the proposed 30) and the additional field up to 40, all based on a density of 30dph and with associated green infrastructure and open spaces.</li> <li>Winscombe and Sandford Parish Council: object as this site is unacceptable, too far from the current settlement boundary.</li> <li>Concerns that the single point of access to Mead Lane from the A368 is hazardous, and that Mead Lane itself is only 4.3 metres wide which is not sufficient to accommodate two way traffic and a</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p>footpath. As this development would generate additional vehicle movements it would be dangerous.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disputes raised over extent of highways, land ownership and further comments regarding road widths and farm vehicles, horse riders and walkers.</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity in local school to accommodate growth</li> <li>• Object to loss of biodiversity rich, agricultural land currently used for low intensity farming.</li> <li>• Potential amenity issues from neighbouring Thatchers site.</li> <li>• Lack of services and facilities in Sandford, which is a small village unsuitable for the scale of growth proposed.</li> </ul>
Land west of Sandford	5	5	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landowner: objects to the inclusion of this site, stating that the allocation should not be considered available or achievable as has no intention to deliver. Rather, the landowner promotes two alternative parcels in the vicinity.</li> <li>• Winscombe and Sandford Parish Council: object as this site is unacceptable, too far from the current settlement boundary.</li> <li>• Unsustainable location, not suitable for further growth.</li> <li>• Disputes raised over extent of highways, and land ownership of verges.</li> <li>• Lack of services and facilities in Sandford, which is a small village unsuitable for the scale of growth proposed.</li> </ul>
Land north of Greenhill Road	2	2	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to any further growth on this site.</li> <li>• Lack of services and facilities in Sandford, which is a small village unsuitable for the scale of growth proposed.</li> </ul>
F Sweeting and Son site	3	3	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mendip Hills AONB Partnership: this site should only be allocated if it meets the exceptional circumstances tests, it may be suitable for an affordable housing scheme.</li> <li>• Unsustainable location, not suitable for further growth.</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of services and facilities in Sandford, which is a small village unsuitable for the scale of growth proposed.</li> </ul>
<b>Winscombe</b>					
Woodborough Farm	0	0	0	0	
Broadleaze Farm	2	1	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mead Realisations: support allocation for 74 dwellings.</li> <li>Mendip Hills AONB Partnership: without community support this allocation should not be progressed. To prevent urban sprawl and to retain the gap between Sandford and Winscombe green infrastructure and opportunities for community recreation should be promoted on the north of the site. Density should reflect village fringe at 20-35dph. Ridge heights should be in keeping with existing adjacent buildings.</li> </ul>
West of Hill Road	1	1	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winscombe and Sandford Parish Council: request more information on this proposed allocation, site is unacceptable due to distance from settlement boundary.</li> </ul>
Land at Shipham Lane	1	1	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mendip Hills AONB Partnership: without community support this allocation should not be progressed. Density should reflect that to the north and south of the proposed site at 20-35dph. Ridge heights should be in keeping with existing adjacent buildings. Request that significant green infrastructure and landscaping buffering is located along the east of the proposed site to mitigate against adverse impacts on the special qualities of the AONB.</li> </ul>
Land at Coombe Farm	1	1	0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mendip Hills AONB Partnership: without community support this allocation should not be progressed. Due to proximity to the AONB particular attention should be paid to density along the eastern edge, 20-35dph to reflect village fringe position. Ridge heights should be in keeping with existing adjacent buildings. Significant green</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					infrastructure and landscaping buffering is located along the east of the proposed site to mitigate against adverse impacts on the special qualities of the AONB.
<b>Other settlements</b>					
Barrow Hospital (1), Barrow Gurney	0	0	0	0	
Barrow Hospital (2), Barrow Gurney	0	0	0	0	
Unit C, Estune Business Park, Long Ashton	0	0	0	0	
Unit A, Estune Business Park, Long Ashton	0	0	0	0	
Tickenham Garden Centre, Tickenham	0	0	0	0	
Golden Acres Fruit Farm, Tickenham	1	0	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This development is largely built and the impact on the Green Belt is harmful and should not have been allowed.</li> </ul>
Land at Cox's Green, Wrington	0	0	0	0	
Land north of Colliter's Way	6	2	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bristol City Council: note the proposed allocation. The site is contiguous with Bristol's western boundary and within an area where BCC has proposed changes to the Green Belt. Comments made</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p>regarding infrastructure and community involvement. It is noted that land north of the A38 Bridgwater Road is proposed to remain undeveloped and this is supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barratt Homes: support allocation. Object to first bullet point which states 'no vehicular access off Colliters Way', as the Council's highways team have confirmed there would be no technical objection to this. Vision and draft masterplan submitted.</li> <li>• Object on the basis of this being Green Belt land which is rich in wildlife. The area is also overstretched in terms of resources and there would be transport implications.</li> <li>• Wring Family Trust: support allocation. Concept drawing submitted.</li> <li>• Concern that allocation of this site would open the way to development of the May-Hasell Playing Field. Development should not take place in the Green Belt, and this site would put extra pressure on local facilities.</li> <li>• Taylor Wimpey: supportive of the principle of the release of Green Belt land on the south western edge of Bristol. Presume that Taylor Wimpey's landholding is that referred to in the fourth bullet point 'to coordinate development with land in Bristol City'. This landholding can also assist with the owner of the Colliters Way site achieving the first bullet point 'no vehicular access off Colliters Way' by facilitating access via Elsbert Way. Would be agreeable to enter a collaboration agreement, plans and drawings submitted.</li> </ul>

## Schedule 2: Proposed employment sites

A total of 18 comments were received against this policy. 10 objections, 5 support with amendments, 3 support. Themes and issues which were raised were as follows:

(Key: O = object; SA = support with amendments; S = support)

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Edge of Bristol					
Yanley Lane (Woodspring golf course)	3	1	0	2	<p>Concern that allocation will damage last working farm and destroy a wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Supportive comments, on the basis that a far larger development in Ashton Vale should replace some of the proposals for towns and villages across the district. This is the obvious place for development. This would reduce pressures elsewhere - including transport congestion by developing homes close to work within Bristol. It should also include a new railway station to relieve pressure at existing stations further from Bristol.</p>
Weston-super-Mare					
Haywood Village Business Quarter	0	0	0	0	
Parklands Site A	0	0	0	0	

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Parklands Site B	3	3	0	0	<p>Comments from Homes England and Avison Young seeking the re-allocation of Site B for residential led development. Request that Schedule 2 is amended accordingly to reflect a reduction in site area to 0.5 hectares. Comments that the Parklands employment sites broadly correspond with the approved land use parameter plan and that they will work with the Council to agree the accurate boundaries going forward into the next iteration of the Plan.</p> <p>Further detailed comments against Policies SP8 and SP9 explain reasons for seeking the reallocation of Site B for residential led development.</p>
Parklands Site C	0	0	0	0	
Parklands Site D	0	0	0	0	
Parklands Site E	0	0	0	0	
Parklands Site F	0	0	0	0	
Parklands Site G	0	0	0	0	
Parklands Site H	1	0	1	0	<p>Comment that Parklands Village Site H (new site entrance south of phase 5) boundary broadly corresponds with the approved land use parameter plan for the site, but Site H for example falls within a wider mixed use land parcel and the site area boundaries do differ in places. The proposals map may reflect the masterplan which is illustrative only, with future reserved matters expected to define the exact location and</p>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					nature of the parcels as they come forward. Homes England will work with the Council to agree the accurate boundaries going forward.
Parklands Site I	1	0	1	0	<p>Comment that Parklands Village Site I (adjacent to the Radio Wing) broadly corresponds with the approved land use parameter plan with future reserved matters expected to define the exact location and nature of the parcels as they come forward. Home England will work with the Council to agree the accurate boundaries going forward into the next iteration of the Plan.</p> <p>Homes England have also set out within response to Policy SP9 the need to consider the potential use of Site I for employment uses which may include a pre -school which is required on site within the Section 106 agreement.</p>
Wolvershill (north of Banwell)	0	0	0	0	
West Wick Business Park	0	0	0	0	
Summer Lane, North of A370	0	0	0	0	
Moor Park, A371	0	0	0	0	
Aisecombe Way	0	0	0	0	



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Other towns					
Clevedon 5/20 Kenn Road Business Park	1	0	1	0	Robert Hitchens Limited (RHL) support the proposed re-allocation of land for employment uses at "Clevedon 5/20 Kenn Road Business Park"; in particular that part of the proposed re-allocation shown on a plan submitted with the response. The land adjoins the existing business park and is suitable, available and deliverable as an extension to the business park. The land has previously benefitted from planning permission for the erection of buildings for B1, B2 and B8 uses.
Land at Nailsea and Backwell	7	5	2	0	<p>Support encouraging employment at sustainable locations. Such initiatives should have access to appropriate roads and should not be on good quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Concern that the types of employment opportunities that may be suitable for Nailsea and which build on existing companies and operations, (industrial and distribution), may not be suitable for Backwell.</p> <p>Objections on the basis that the Draft Plan provides no clarity about what types of new employment are envisaged. The employment opportunities are described as being shared between Nailsea and Backwell, but specific locations are not identified. This could include part of the site to the east of Backwell. These fields are Green Belt and should only be used for building in 'exceptional circumstances'. Currently this is top grade agricultural land and contains many popular footpaths. That 8ha of new employment land is not mentioned or shown on any maps anywhere else in the plan document. Concerns that if the Green</p>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					Belt land next to the Leisure Centre is declassified, this could lead to urban sprawl between Backwell and Flax Bourton.
Gordano Gate, Portishead	1	0	0	1	Portishead Town Council support proposed allocation.
Villages					
Park Farm, Yatton	1	1	0	0	Objection that the Park Farm site should not continue to be allocated for employment use owing to the fact that the site has not come forward for employment development despite its employment allocation designation since 2007. Suggestion that the site should be allocated for retail use i.e. for a foodstore of an appropriate scale to the village of Yatton.
Estune Business Park, Long Ashton	0	0	0	0	

### Schedule 3: Proposed Local Green Space

A total of 29 comments were received against this schedule. 5 objections, 10 Support with amendments, 14 support. Themes and issues which were raised were as follows:

(Key: O = object; SA = support with amendments; S = support)

Place	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Abbots Leigh	1			1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the plan</li> </ul>
Backwell	9	3	3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly support the above (LGS sites in Backwell), very important to the community.</li> <li>There are many other green spaces in Backwell greatly valued and used by the community, including the fields around the Scout Hut, and the fields from the swimming pool to the allotments. Footpaths through all are enjoyed daily by many local people.</li> <li>A field between West Leigh School and the Scout Hut, at the end of the Rodney Road, should also be retained as green space. Land affected by the proposed 65 dwellings is used daily by hundreds of people for walking, jogging and dog walking, and is full of wildlife.</li> <li>Farleigh Fields, with footpaths across, and Backwell Lake are critical locations in Backwell village that help provide its character and quality of life for residents. The 2014 Neighbourhood Plan shows them as not suitable for housing development. They are affected by an appeal and nearby housing proposals. There should be more of Farleigh Fields left. Backwell Lake is a lovely place to go, good for running around, wildlife, flood prevention. No traffic worries for pedestrians.</li> <li>It seems disingenuous to call Backwell Lake local green space, being on the far side of the railway, so really not in Backwell.</li> </ul>

Place	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is questionable whether just one area of local green space, Farleigh fields, is appropriate for a large village. There is green space surrounding the park and behind the secondary school. Taking so much local green space to build on seems not very sustainable.</li> <li>If an area has to have more housing Farleigh Fields would be a good place: good link to the A370; doesn't change the aesthetic look to the village.</li> </ul>
Congresbury	3		1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In favour of the Congresbury proposed LGS; they must be retained intact.</li> <li>Congresbury has not a lot of public open space, so countryside walks along public rights of way are vital. Development should not take these important green fields for people and wildlife.</li> <li>Where development is allocated, it should be in line with the Congresbury Neighbourhood Development Plan, with enough provision for high quality new GI and open space for recreational space for new residents, to not add pressure to heavily used public open space and countryside in the village.</li> <li>It would be good to see more ambitious plans for more public open space creation / allocation within the plan.</li> </ul>
Long Ashton	4		3	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain these spaces</li> <li>Add the area known locally as 'Dawson's Walk' .</li> <li>Also add: 'The Brake' to the North of Long Ashton, and woodland areas surrounding the Long Ashton Golf course.</li> <li>All ridges/elevated areas should also be listed, preserved and enhanced as green infrastructure, alongside riverside woodland. Eg. Toboggan hill and ridge to the south of Long Ashton.</li> </ul>

Place	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alongside the railway cutting south of Long Ashton on Fenswood Farm, land should be earmarked for joining up the cycle path to Backwell, avoiding it meandering through residential areas.</li> <li>A reservoir South of Long Ashton could be improved as a community/wildlife area, compensating for any disamenity from the Plan proposals</li> </ul>
Pill and Easton in Gordano	1	1			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule omits a number of open spaces approved as NSC policies in the Abbots Leigh, Ham Green, Pill and Easton-in-Gordano Neighbourhood Plan</li> </ul>
Portishead	1	1			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object</li> </ul>
Uphill	1			1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the minimum that should be allocated, given proposed removal of green wedge between Uphill and Weston.</li> </ul>
Weston super Mare	1		1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the Shrubbery Terrace/Shrubbery Avenue, there are 3 green areas which should be marked. (Not just the main Shrubbery Park, but West Park managed as nature reserve, and East Park with wildflower border and planted hedge for wildlife).</li> <li>Please define HER; (not in the glossary.)</li> </ul>
Winscombe	1			1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These allocations should be discussed with residents.</li> </ul>
Wraxhall and Failand	2		1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly supported; this space is popular with residents from the parish and Nailsea. Suggest adding the following to the justification:  <i>"Parts of both areas of the green space have been used for re-wilding. The Parish Council has a duty to provide allotments, if there is sufficient demand; the western area has been considered</i> </li> </ul>

Place	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<p><i>for this. As there are no other suitable sites in the parish, this provision should be maintained".</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This and the fields are so important to many; it's extremely attractive with the view up to Wraxall Church.</li> </ul>
Wrington	4		1	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In favour.</li> <li>Land at the junction of Alburys with West Hay Road, green and unfenced, is hardly ever used for recreation.</li> <li>Add the Mike Bush Paddock on west side of Wrington Hill, near entrance to Old Quarry, 0.16ha. Grassed, lovely views; includes trees and picnic benches. Used for picnics and informal recreation. Given to Parish Council by a resident in memory of a deceased resident in 1989. Owned and maintained by the local council. Freely accessible.</li> <li>Add the Recreation Ground, 1.9 ha, Silver Street, Wrington. Owned and managed by the local council, with football and cricket pitches/practice nets, tennis courts, skatepark, children's play equipment, bench seating, trees and pavilion. Very well used for formal and informal recreation.</li> <li>Add Wrington Village Green, High Street, to the LGS. 0.03ha. Attractive open green area, with bench seating, near Plough public house near village centre. Used for village Christmas Tree and events like apple day. Registered as village green.</li> <li>Add Old Surgery Green, Station Road 0.03ha. Small restful green area between houses with visual amenity. Trees and bench seating.</li> <li>Add Redhill Playing Field, Church Road, Redhill 0.44ha. Next to Village Hall, used for informal recreation, sports and events by village club etc. Has children's play area.</li> </ul>

Place	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In fact there is a record on HER for the Land at Church Road Redhill.</li> </ul>
Yatton	1	•		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In favour</li> </ul>

## Schedule 4: Proposed sites for community facilities

A total of 23 comments were received against this schedule. 14 objections, 0 support with amendments, 9 support. Themes and issues which were raised were as follows:

(Key: O = object; SA = support with amendments; S = support)

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
<b>Primary schools</b>					
South of Church Lane Backwell - paying field	2	1		1	No proposals are made for the increased numbers of secondary school pupils  Schools should have playing fields
Parklands village central	1	1			Object on the grounds of interfering with the helicopter flight path at the helicopter museum.
<b>Secondary schools</b>					
Yatton	1			1	Support. It's much needed to cater for recent and proposed housing developments
<b>Other education provision</b>					



Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
Land adjacent to Brookfield Walk Clevedon	1			1	Site supported
Land at Ladymead Lane Churchill	11	10		1	<p>There were 10 objections to this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access issues on Ladymead Lane which already has doctors surgery and primary school additional 146 pupils and staff would further increase congestion</li> <li>• Pupils have to travel far (not sustainable) from homes at Portishead and W-s-M by taxi. Site in one of the towns would be more appropriate.</li> <li>• Other sites in Churchill would be more appropriate if there was a case for the school being in Churchill</li> <li>• Better placed at Wolvershill alongside other proposed educational facilities</li> <li>• Loss of area known for its rich wildlife</li> <li>• Suggest better located at Monaghan Mushrooms on the edge of Churchill.</li> </ul> <p>One response in support of the site from the DoFE</p>
<b>Allotments</b>					
Maltlands triangle	2	2	•	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current allotments in Nailsea/Backwell have long waiting lists. Another two allotment sites should be allocated to the east of Backwell and near Youngwood Lane to accommodate need for allotments from the new residential sites which will have small gardens.</li> </ul>

Site name	Number of comments	O	SA	S	Summary of comments
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allotments should be allocated for all strategic development sites.</li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>					
Land adjacent to Portbury village hall	5			5	All in support. This will help alleviate parking problems on the main road

### Schedule 5: Settlements with settlement boundaries.

For specific comments on settlement boundary changes please see summary of responses to LP6: Settlement Boundaries in Appendix 2.