

This 'Village' specific section forms part of a wide-ranging consultation on the Local Plan Part II. It is therefore strongly recommended that you first read the 'Mendip' section to gain a wider understanding of the issues and options relating to the district as a whole.

Norton St Philip (Primary Village)

Norton St Philip is a medium sized village located in the far north-east of the district, on the edge of the Mendip Hills and in close proximity to the towns of Frome, Trowbridge, Bradford-on-Avon and the city of Bath. This location, along with the proximity of the A36, means that many people live in the village but commute to work in these towns.

The village lies adjacent to an area designated as the Bath & Bristol Green Belt. This will be formally included Local Plan Part II.

The age profile for the village shows a greater proportion of people aged 45+ years compared to the Mendip average. A small number of households are in housing need and are on the Housing Waiting List.

KEY FACTS

Parish population: **858**

Age profile:		Mendip average:
20%	0-15 yrs	19%
6%	16-24 yrs	10%
17%	25-44 yrs	23%
47%	45-74 yrs	39%
10%	75+ yrs	9%

Approximate housing stock of village: **309**

Data sources:
ONS Census Statistics 2011
MDC Rural Settlement Role & Function Study 2012

Planning for Norton St Philip...

- Norton St Philip is designated in the Local Plan Part I as a Primary Village, which means it has a wider selection of services than many smaller villages.
- Part I of the Local Plan indicates that the village is expected to deliver at least **45** new homes over the period 2006-2029.
- To date, **108** houses have either been built or granted conditional planning permission. It is not therefore expected that the Local Plan Part II will seek to allocate any further housing sites in the village to 2029.
- However, we need to explore whether there are any reasons why further housing should be planned e.g. to respond to a need identified by local people.
- Landowners have requested that we consider **5** sites that they have put forward.

What you have said about Norton St Philip...

The community produced a Parish Plan in 2005 outlining what is important to residents in Norton St Philip and how the village may change over the next few years. The Parish Plan highlighted a few planning issues that were considered to be important:

1. There is a need for low-cost starter homes and affordable family housing, including self-build plots. There is also a need for accommodation for the elderly.
2. A wish for the Great Orchard area of open space to be protected.
3. A need for additional recreational facilities e.g. all weather sports pitch, small meeting room.

Key Facilities

Our most recent records show the village has the following facilities:

- **Journey to work bus service**
- **Shop**
- **Two pubs**
- **School**
- **Village hall**
- **Church**

Is this still correct? Are there any that we have missed?

What does this mean for the village?

- ❖ We do not expect to make further allocations of land for housing development in Norton St Philip. However, we need to explore whether there are any reasons why further housing should be planned e.g. to respond to a need identified by local people.
- ❖ Potential designation of Great Orchard as a Local Green Space.
- ❖ Potential allocation of sites for self build or older person accommodation.
- ❖ Potential allocation of a site for additional facilities in the village.

Have your say...

The following appendix has information on the designations in and around the village as well as the sites that have been put forward for consideration by landowners. To ensure that the views of local communities and stakeholders are reflected in the Local Plan Part II, we would welcome views on a number of issues. Please answer as many (or as few) of the following questions as you wish:

Local Distinctiveness and Character

NSPQ1: What makes Norton St Philip special? Are there any specific areas, features or characteristics that should be protected or improved? In the event that future development is needed, are there any broad areas of the village where this should be located / avoided? *Please answer in general terms – you can comment in detail on specific sites below.*

Housing

NSPQ2: Although Norton St Philip has met and exceeded its minimum housing requirement as set out in the Local Plan Part I, are there any reasons why we should consider identifying further sites for housing in the Local Plan Part II?

NSPQ3: If a need for further development is identified, would you support / not support any of the sites put forward by landowners which are set out in Table B. Why? Please include site reference(s) where applicable and have regard to the constraints outlined in Tables A and B in explaining your reasons.

NSPQ4a: Are there any other potential development sites that we have not identified which you would like to draw our attention to?

NSPQ4b: If further development is needed, what types of development would you like to see on any of the site(s) identified e.g. housing of a particular size or type, affordable housing, custom build or mixed use schemes?

Employment

NSPQ5: Are there any existing employment or commercial sites in or around the village that may be suitable for redevelopment? If so, where and for what type(s) of development?

NSPQ6: Are there any existing employment or commercial sites in or around the village that you feel should be retained in their current use if at all possible? If so where and why?

NSPQ7: Is there a need for any additional land for employment/commercial development? If so, what types and where could such development take place?

Development Limit

NSPQ8: Does the current Development Limit reflect the existing and likely future built up area(s) of the village?

NSPQ9: Do you feel the current Development Limit should be changed? If so where and why?

Infrastructure/Facilities

NSPQ10: Is there a need for further infrastructure or facilities in the village e.g. open or recreation space, meeting place, car park? If so, please specify what and where.

Open Areas of Local Significance/Local Green Spaces

NSPQ11: Looking at the Open Areas of Local Significance/Local Green Space criteria (see Mendip Section Appendix 2), do you think all of the sites listed still warrant designation? If so, why are they special?

NSPQ12: Are there any sites from which you feel the designation should be removed? If so which one(s) and why?

NSPQ13: Are there any new areas of land that you feel merit designation? If so please provide details of where and why.

Other Matters

NSPQ14: Are there any other planning issues in Norton St Philip that you feel should be addressed in the Local Plan Part II?

NSPQ15: Is any of the information presented incorrect or in need of updating (e.g. existing facilities and services)? If so, please specify?

Norton St Philip Appendix

Table A: Key designations and other relevant planning information

Constraint	Information	Implications for Local Plan Part II
Agricultural Land Classification	The majority of the land surrounding the village is of Grade 3 quality. There is a small amount of Grade 4 land to the north west.	In choosing development sites, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality. The grades of agricultural land range from best and most versatile to poor.
Ancient Woodland	None.	Ancient woodlands are an irreplaceable natural habitat and development should avoid their unnecessary loss or deterioration.
Areas of High Archaeological Potential and Interest	The majority of the village is covered by an Area of High Archaeological Potential.	Any development within an area of known or potential archaeological interest will have to take into account this archaeological potential.
Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	None.	Development within an AONB is more strictly controlled and must be designed in a way which will not negatively impact upon the characteristics of the AONB.
Coal Referral Area	None.	The Coal Authority will need to be consulted on potential sites to see whether there are any possible issues from old coal mining works.
Conservation Area	The majority of the village is covered by a Conservation Area. Information on this can be found here .	Any development within the Conservation Area will need to be sympathetic.
Flood Zones	None.	Development should generally be directed away from areas designated as at most risk from flooding (Zones and 2 and 3).
Green Belt	Adjacent to the northern boundary of the village lies a significant area of the Bristol and Bath Green Belt.	Development in the Green Belt should be resisted in line with Chapter 9 of the NPPF.
Groundwater Source Protection Zone	None.	Particular care is needed in such areas to ensure development in such areas does not adversely affect the quality of groundwater.
Historic Parks & Gardens	None.	Recorded by English Heritage in recognition of their special historic significance. Any proposed development should be considered against whether it would be likely

		to impact on the special character of any Historic Park and Garden.
Landfill sites	None.	Areas of land which are, or have been subject to landfill may be contaminated and/or lead to abnormal development costs.
Listed Buildings	There are a number of listed buildings in the village: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Grade I listed building • 2 grade II* listed buildings • 43 Grade II listed buildings 	Listed buildings are protected by national policy and development policy 3 of the Local Plan Part 1. Any development will need to ensure the integrity of these listed buildings.
Local Wildlife Sites	None.	Development should be directed away from these sites to ensure no negative impact upon the potential biodiversity there.
Mendip Bat Consultation Zone	None.	Any development within this area will need to take account of the potential for bats.
Mineral Consultation Areas	None.	MCAs identify where mineral reserves exist which potentially could be needed at some point in the future.
National Nature Reserves (NNRs)	None.	National Nature Reserves are statutorily protected for their ecological and biodiversity value. Development should be directed away from such sites to ensure any adverse impacts.
Open Areas of Local Significance/Local Green Spaces	Six areas are designated as OALS/LGS (see Table 3 for details).	These areas are protected from development under development policy 2 of the Local Plan Part I. However, all of the areas designated as Local Green Spaces are being reviewed as part of the Local Plan Part II.
Protected Recreation Areas	Two areas of open space within, and around, the village are designated as protected recreation spaces.	These areas are protected from development under development policy 16 of the Local Plan Part I. Any development here will therefore be resisted.
Quarries – SMLP Quarries	None.	The existence of a quarry site may constrain the development of nearby sites due to noise etc...
Ramsar Sites	None.	A Habitats Regulations Assessment will have to be carried out to look at the possible impact of potential future development sites on the integrity of the Ramsar site.
Regionally	None.	RIGS are locally designated areas of

Important Geological/ Geomorphological Sites (RIGS)		importance for geology or geomorphology. Any new development would need to be assessed against whether there would be likely to be any adverse effects on such areas.
Rights of Way	There are a number of ROW surrounding and leading into the village.	Routes over which the public enjoy a legal right to access by foot and sometimes other means. All public rights of way would need to be incorporated into, or reasonably diverted around, new development.
Road Infrastructure	The A366 runs through village and the A36 lies approx 1.5km to the east.	The standard of local roads may dictate the scale of development a settlement can accommodate.
Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs)	None.	Any development to the west of the village must ensure that the integrity of the SAMs is not damaged.
Sewage Treatment Buffer Zones	A sewage treatment buffer zone lies to the south of the village.	Buffer Zones may constrain areas which are capable of being developed for housing in particular.
Sites of Special Scientific Interest	None.	Development should be directed away from these areas and from sites which may have a negative impact upon the integrity of these designated areas.
Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)	None.	A Habitats Regulations Assessment will have to be carried out to look at the possible impact of potential future development sites on the integrity of the Special Area of Conservation.
Special Landscape Feature	None.	Any new development should not have a negative impact upon the special landscape feature and should ideally be located away from it.
Special Protection Areas (SPAs)	None.	A Habitats Regulations Assessment will have to be carried out to look at the possible impact of potential future development sites on the integrity of the Special Protection Area.
Tree Preservation Orders - Areas and Trees	There are a number of Tree Preservation Orders in the village and two Tree Preservation Areas.	Any new development should take account of these areas and ensure that there is no negative impact upon them.

Table B: Sites put forward for Consideration by Landowners*

PLEASE NOTE: The sites listed below are NOT proposals for development put forward by the Council. They are simply a range of options that we need to consider should any additional development be needed.

Site Reference Number	Area (ha)	Key Site Characteristics	Constraints and Considerations	Initial Assessment	Option IF Development is Needed
NSP014 Land to the south of Longmead Close (promoted for a number of uses including affordable housing, exceptional affordable housing, care home and B1 commercial uses).	1.67	This site is a fairly level paddock on the eastern edge of Norton St Philip. It lies to the south of an area which was granted consent for retirement homes on appeal in 2014. The site adjoins the existing Development Limit and existing dwellings off High Street, Town End, Tellisford Lane and Upper Farm Close. Access is proposed to be across the permitted site and onto the A366 via Longmead Close.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crossed by two public rights of way. • Impact on rural setting of village. • Highways issues. 	Site is potentially suitable for development and could form a coherent planning unit as an extension to the permitted scheme.	Potentially
NSP001 Land off Vicarage Lane	0.22	The site consists of a partially grassed and partially wooded area lying due south of the village primary school. There are a number of large detached residences to the east running along Vicarage Lane. The area provides a play space for the associated school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation land. • School playing field. 	This site is not considered suitable given its current use.	No
NSP010 Land north of Farleigh Road	2.66	Substantial greenfield site to the east of the village, outside but adjacent to the development limit. Access to Farleigh Road.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site lies within the Green Belt. • Impact on rural setting of village. 	The site is not considered suitable as it is within the Green Belt.	No

NSP013 East Site, Laverton Triangle, High Street	0.35	Site is outside the development limit to the north of the Fortescue Fields development. Residential development to east and south.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of Archaeological Interest. • Conservation Area. • Replacement planting requirement. • Impact on rural setting of village. • Listed buildings. 	While this site is developable, it is not considered suitable given its impact on the countryside and conservation area. This has been considered in detail at a recent appeal.	No
NSP012 West site, land adjacent to Fortescue Street	1.54	A greenfield site outside but adjacent to the development limit. It lies adjacent to the Fortescue Fields development and is promoted as a further phase.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Area. 	While this site is developable, it is not considered suitable given the impact of built development on the conservation area. This has been considered in detail at a recent appeal.	No

*Please note that this excludes sites which have already been given planning consent.