

From: canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk <canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk>

Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 7:38 PM

To: Planning Comments North <PlanningCommentsNorth@somerset.gov.uk>

Subject: Planning application 13/23/00032 -Erection of 160 dwellings, Land East of Brymore Way, Cannington

Please find Cannington Parish Council's response to the above planning application

Kind regards

Aly

Aly Prowse

Deputy Clerk

Cannington Parish Council

[REDACTED]

canningtonparishcouncil@cannington.org.uk

www.cannington.org.uk

Cannington Parish Council
Community Room
Village Hall
Brook St
Cannington
TA5 2HP
14 February 2024

Somerset Planning – North Team
Bridgwater House
King Square
Bridgwater
TA6 3AR

Planning Application: 13/23/00032
Applicant: Strongvox Homes
Proposal: Erection of 160 dwellings, creation of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, public open space, landscaping & assoc. works
Location: Land East of Brymore Way, Cannington

1. Cannington Parish Council **objects** to this application in the **strongest possible terms** based on concerns set out in this response under the following policies within the Sedgemoor Local Plan 2011-2032 (adopted 20.2.2019): -

- a) S2 – Scale of new development
- b) S3 – Infrastructure Delivery
- c) S4 – Sustainable Development Principles
- d) S5 – Mitigating the Causes and Adapting to the Effects of Climate Change
- e) T2a – Tier 2 Settlements – Housing
- f) T2b – Tier 2 Settlements – Unmet Local Housing Need
- g) D1 – Flood risk and surface water management and surface water drainage
- h) D6 – Affordable Housing
- i) D13 – Sustainable Transport and Movement
- j) D14 – Managing the Transport Impacts of Development
- k) D19 – Landscape
- l) D20 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- m) D21 – Ecological Networks
- n) D22 – Trees and Woodland
- o) D23 – Bat Consultation Zones
- p) D24 – Pollution Impacts of Development
- q) D25 – Protecting Residential Amenity
- r) D26 – Historic Environment
- s) D27 – Education Provision
- t) D28 – Health and Social Care
- u) D29 – Protection and Enhancement of Existing Green Infrastructure Resources
- v) D30 – Green Infrastructure Requirements in New Developments
- w) D31 – Countryside around Settlements

2. CANNINGTON'S NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NHP)

- 2.1 The application makes reference to the NHP during its pre-application advice with the then Sedgemoor District Council in December 2022 noting in 3.24 "Cannington Parish Council (CPC) are in the process of preparing a NHP, albeit this remains in an early stage in preparation and may only be afforded limited weight in decision-making". CPC rejects this statement as significant progress has been made since December 2022. Somerset Council is hoping to be in a position to commence the full 6-week consultation in Spring 2024 with a potential examination late Summer. Arguably, were it not for the upheaval and subsequent resource implications of the formation of Somerset Council, the NHP may well have been approved by now.
- 2.2 Feedback from residents at the very well attended public meeting on 29.1.24 made several references to the NHP (familiar and wholly supportive of its contents) and in particular, the protection it affords the parish against certain elements within this application.

3. MISSING INFORMATION

- 3.1 The 'Cover Letter' from the applicant refers to a Planning Statement and Health Impact Assessment (to follow) neither of these documents appear to be on the portal and available for public consideration, contrary to the Council's validation requirements.
- 3.2 Given Policy S4 of the Sedgemoor Local Plan (SLP) and the Environment Act 2021, making biodiversity net gain mandatory, where is the Biodiversity Net Gain Report referred to in the submitted Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) prepared by ETHOS (para 1.3)?
- 3.3 Given the scale of the development, has a screening opinion been undertaken to determine whether an EIA is required, in circumstances set out in the Town and Country Planning (EIA) Regulations 2017? The site measures more than 8 hectares and reference should be made to Schedule 2, 10 (ii) and (iii) of the Regulations, and sensitive countryside location.

4. POLICY T2A – TIER 2 SETTLEMENTS - HOUSING

4.1 Principle of development

We are not, as a parish council, opposed to development taking place in the village as demonstrated by the achievement of 108 dwellings of the required 163 (minimum) to be delivered within Cannington between 2011-2032 of the SLP; with 8 years remaining to fulfil the obligation for the remaining 55 dwellings.

4.2 Policy T2a

Policy T2a for a Tier 2 settlement outlines a set of criteria which states "proposals outside of the settlement boundaries that meet ALL of the criteria will be supported".

We object to the application as it does not meet all of the criterion, and in particular, the size and scale of the development as outlined below.

Criteria 1

The SLP requires that strategic housing developments are identified and come through either the allocation process or NHP plan (Policy S2).

This site is not identified as an opportunity site within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) published on the Somerset Council website, nor is it within Cannington's NHP.

The application land is identified in the SHLAA as land at Henfields Farm and Withiel Farm. It is clearly labelled as greenfield and falls into the category "rejected sites outside settlement boundaries". Figure 1 H005 Henfields Farm and Figure 1,1 H492 Land at Withiel Farm refers.

Criteria 2

The scale of development should be appropriate to the size, accessibility, character and physical identity of the settlement.

This application is to build 160 houses to the west of Cannington. This represents a 16% increase in housing, a 20% increase in population and a 190% increase in growth (from the residual figure of 55 to 160) thus failing to respect the scale and character of Cannington which will greatly change the nature of the village and cannot be justified. This aspect alone contributed to an overwhelming level of objection from residents.

The community has been very clear throughout the evolution of the Cannington NHP Regulation 14 (20/21) pre-submission draft NHP that the by-pass should not provide the new settlement boundary for Cannington.

"The Ridgeway" (northern ridgeline) was specifically identified in the NHP as an "important landscape feature/area of visual landscape quality (important to green infrastructure, landscape value, views, setting, biodiversity/habitat, public realm, air quality and character) that should be protected from development".

The NHP's evidence base demonstrates that the application site is visible within the local landscape, which plays an essential role in defining the character of Cannington. The NHP consultation suggests significant support for the need to protect the integrity and landscape of the village.

The proposed development has considerable impact on views to Cannington due to its elevated position especially from the west and southwest vantage points (from the Quantocks and more dominantly from Charlynch Hill – see photograph below) the PRoW and along the A39, a key tourist route.



The site and associated PRoW forms a key recreational amenity that provides existing residents with access to wide open space and countryside, this would be a significant loss.

Building on this land will irrevocably damage the local environment, landscape, character and appearance of the village and erode the rural landscape.

This application does not meet this criterion.

Criteria 3

The development should be well related to and complement the existing built form of the settlement, providing opportunities for walking and cycling to local services and facilities.

The vast majority of the application boundary is not well suited to the existing settlement boundary, particular to the north, east and west. Additionally, it does not complement the existing built form to the south where it imposes on the sanctity of the cemetery.

Access to/from the development through Chad's Hill for cyclists and walkers is not considered to be safe. This is likely to be the nearest access for services and facilities. The lane is very narrow and has only one passing place for vehicles and parked cars which may impede pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. There are no pavements for pedestrians and the road is not wide enough to provide for them. It will not be safe for pushchairs, wheelchairs or mobility scooters.

Access at Withiel Drive, a designated emergency route, is very narrow. The first 80m is only 4.5m wide which then increases to 6m further along. It is not wide enough for opposing traffic. It has no pavements for pedestrians and pushchairs, and no provision for wheelchairs or mobility scooters. Barrier baskets as proposed by the applicant do not appear to be a sensible idea, narrowing the lane further.

The residents have many valid questions to be asked of the applicant regarding maintenance, access for emergency vehicles, emergency barriers and parking along Withiel Drive.

It is very likely that the vast majority of residents would need/prefer to use their vehicles for local services and facilities – which will undoubtedly add to the villages' significant parking problems, such that it may discourage people from using the village. It is therefore questionable whether the development will be well related to the settlement and may not be easy to integrate into the community.

This application does not meet this criterion on the grounds of safety and inadequacy of connectivity

Criteria 4

Development that is likely to have a significant transport impact will be supported by appropriate assessments as referred to under policy D14; D13 also relates.

It should be noted that at the time of this response, both Somerset Highways and Somerset County Rights of Way have not submitted their responses.

The parish council and residents have several and serious safety concerns over the primary access on Brymore Way.

- Transport Assessment Data – This clearly demonstrates how consistently busy the bypass is. The average flow of vehicles per day is 6803 (weekday highs are 7200).
- Vehicles routinely travel at speeds more than 45mph; 85% percentile speeds were 45.5 mph, thus an average 1020 vehicles in excess of 45mph. every day. Worryingly, extreme levels of speed are recorded. On one day only (3.7.23), 209 vehicles travelled at speeds between 50-80mph
- A fatality has already occurred on Brymore Way at the junction near Brymore School, on 5.10.22 which was speed related. This junction is 240m from the A39 roundabout that slows the speeds of approaching vehicles – unlike the proposed access to the development which will see much higher speeds.
- Another non-fatal accident in 2020 occurred when a car pulling out from Chads Hill towards Bridgwater was hit head on by a vehicle overtaking a HPC bus as they both came over the brow of the hill from the opposite direction. Only the quality of the safety features of the car hit saved a fatality. This was the stretch of road where a proposed entry to the development would be. Several other non-reportable accidents and near misses have been witnessed along this by-pass. These are not "accidents waiting to happen" these are factual.
- Introducing a junction onto Brymore Way for a development of this magnitude (typically 160 dwellings, 400+ vehicles and up to 500 residents) with restricted visibility from the north due to trees and vegetation planting, is likely to lead to a rise in traffic incidents given the data above.
- Safety concerns for the current cycle and footpath route, as there is no provision for crossing measures to be introduced.

- Residents are concerned that if subsequent to the development being built, a need will be identified to install traffic calming measures. If traffic is slowed along the bypass, it could almost certainly lead to an increase in traffic, once again, travelling through the village.
- Numerous, regular instances of road traffic accidents on the A39 in both directions, plus the C182 to Hinkley Point have had significant impact to Cannington and the surrounding parishes. An additional circa 400+ vehicles will only add considerable pressure to the network.
- The applicant has not considered “innovative and adaptable approaches that deliver higher quality and accessible public transport options” as per D13. The only mode of public transport for Cannington is an extremely limited bus service that could not sensibly provide transport options for commuters, recreation and further education. Therefore, private vehicle(s) will be essential.

This application does not meet this criterion on safety grounds, considerations for those with reduced mobility and no provision of sustainable public transport.

Criteria 6

Contribute to local infrastructure including education, service provision, accessible open space and community facilities

- Health - For the purpose of this application we respectfully suggest that the response from the LPAE-Somerset (Torbay and South Devon NHS Foundation Trust) dated 11.1.24 (attachment 1) should be dismissed as this does not reflect the reality of what is happening in Cannington.
- The letter from the Cannington Health Surgery dated 1.2.24 (attachment 2) strongly objecting to this proposal on the grounds of capacity, health and well-being is the actual reality of the situation, a fact overwhelmingly in accord with representations made to the Parish Council from Cannington residents. It should also be noted that Cannington Health Centre serves residents from local parishes including Combswich, Otterhampton, Steart and Stockland Bristol so the impact of this application will also affect the wider community.

On the basis of concerns raised by Cannington Health Centre, it is noted within the applicant’s cover letter that a Health Impact Assessment (Policy D28, Health Care Facilities, 7.245) is ‘to follow’. Currently, this does not appear on the portal. The Parish Council believes this must be undertaken and submitted prior to consideration of this application.

- The plans propose to remove the allotments, established 65 years ago, in the north. This appears to be an unnecessary impact to biodiversity (contravention to Policy D20) and the loss of a community amenity (Policy D25).
- School and education - Similarly, as evidenced by Estates Planning Advisor at Somerset Council’s response dated 31.1.24 (attachment 3) to accommodate the proposal, new

build will be required for Cannington Pre-school and Cannington CofE Primary School which as at October 2023 is at net capacity and a single classroom for 30 places will be required. It should be noted that the school also serves the wider community. Obviously, a proposal of this size will impact Secondary and further education expansion.

- Notwithstanding financial investment from the applicant (Policy D27, Education Provision, 7.236) the Parish Council would like to see evidence that these necessary classroom extensions within the curtilage of Cannington CofE School are physically achievable, prior to any approval (or not).

This application does not meet this criterion as without a strategy to improve healthcare provision and school capacity within the area, this application cannot demonstrate compliance with policy.

Criteria 7

Highlights the importance to maintain and enhance the local environ, landscape, historic environment, including where appropriate habitat creation and community woodland planting

- This is particularly important given the community's acknowledgement of this site's importance for landscape visual quality, green infrastructure and biodiversity and in consideration of local plan policies including for example, Policy D29, D30 and D31.
- See also 3.2, 3.3 above.
- The application completely comprises of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural lands, containing 3 fields of cereal non-crop (Para 1.3 EIA prepared by ETHOS). Given the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023 highlights the significance of best and the most versatile agricultural land, it is important to understand if this development will result in the loss of natural capital (para 180 (b) NPPF) and what measures are in place to conserve and enhance this important economic resource.

This criterion is not met

Criteria 8

Provide affordable housing in accordance with the Council's requirements

(Nb At the time of this response the SC Housing Development (Affordable Housing) response has not yet been added to the portal)

- 5.166 - District wide requirements are set out in Policy D6: Affordable Housing. Policy D6 sets a target for greenfield sites as 30% affordable housing. The submitted Affordable Housing Statement relies on evidence that is more than 3 years old; the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2016 and Cannington Local Housing Needs Assessment 2018. It may be indicative to note however, that at that time, a need was identified for 32 houses. Subsequently, 22 of these 32 houses have been delivered by the Grange Meadows development. Of these 22, 8 have been allocated to residents (category 1); 1 house (category 2); 1 house (category 3); 2 houses (category 5) and 4 houses (category 6 via Homefinder's policy). The remaining 6 houses are under the Shared Ownership

Scheme (category 6 – unallocated Register Provider Units that were allocated in accordance with Home Finder Somerset housing policy and rules).

- This application refers to a blended policy approach between policies T2a and T2b. Under Policy T2b, where development comes forward to address an unmet need, there is a requirement for development outside of settlement boundaries to provide an up-to-date assessment of housing need to justify housing need, mix and tenure.

In addition, and in terms of housing delivery, Policy S2 states:

- “The Council will manage housing delivery positively and proactively through its housing trajectory, ensuring that a minimum of five years deliverable land supply for housing is maintained. The release of additional unallocated greenfield land for housing (i.e in addition to sites than can come forward under criteria-based policies T2a, T3a, T4 and D9) will only be approved where through monitoring it is demonstrated that there is a shortfall in the five-year supply of deliverable land supply for housing”.
- The last published Sedgemoor Annual Monitoring Report 21/22 highlighted a 6.94 year housing land supply (<https://www.somerset.gov.uk/planning-buildings-and-land/evidence-base-and-monitoring/monitoring/>) There is, therefore no justification for a departure from local plan policy or an urgent need to deliver housing numbers well in excess of minimum targets so early in the Plan period.
- Paragraph 5.165 of the SLP states that “whilst stated as a minimum, any specific proposal or combination of proposals that significantly exceeded this would need to demonstrate there were no significant adverse impacts”. From the information submitted within this application it does not demonstrate that there are no adverse impacts likely as a consequence (see other comments throughout this response).

The proposed quantum of development is unjustified and the scheme is contrary to Local Plan Policy S2 and T2a.

If the proposal is being put forward as a Policy T2b ‘unmet local housing need’ scheme, it fails to satisfactorily address criteria e.g failing to deliver 40% affordable housing, not respecting the character and environment of Cannington and failing to demonstrate high quality placemaking

5. POLICY S5 – MITIGATING THE CAUSES AND ADAPTING TO THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Releasing Embodied Carbon

The submitted cross sections show cut and fill. Noting the current climate emergency, extensive engineering to manipulate and contain different levels incur costs in carbon. The proposal’s significant ground reforming will release embodied carbon and does not demonstrate a development taking full account of climate change contrary to national planning policy. The submitted Sustainability Statement does not take this into account

and fully consider the environmental objectives of the NPPF (para 124 (b)) and Policy S5 of the SLP.

6. POLICY D1 – FLOOD RISK AND SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

Whilst not technical experts in this field, we note the many recommendations and concerns identified within the Lead Local Flood Authority (Sustainable Drainage Systems) response. Clearly, these need to be addressed by the applicant before consideration of the application.

Given the elevated position of the land, together with the removal of 2-3ha of permeable ground, concerns have been raised about increased flooding in the lower parts of the village; specifically, Withiel Drive and further within the village that are in flood zones 2 and 3. Withiel Drive residents have advised that recent torrential downpours causing excess water runoff from the field, funnels through the shared driveway from the back of the garages to their houses. Gardens have been flooded and airbricks have been breached on occasion. Chads Hill and Withiel Drive are also likely to be impacted. These roads already experience high volumes of water running down the roads into the High St, and overwhelming the manholes during torrential downpours. Consideration must be given to the drainage capacity in these areas.

7. POLICY D21 – ECOLOGICAL NETWORKS (see also D23 Bat consultation zones below)

An Ecological Impact Assessment was carried out by ETHOS at various periods between April and November 2023. The summary of important ecological features identified in relation to the development and their importance are summarised below:

IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL FEATURES	SCALE OF IMPORTANCE
Exmoor & Quantocks Bat Special Area of Conservation	International
Native hedgerows	Local
NERC S.41 Mammals – Brown Hare and hedgehog	Local
Badger (Badgers & their setts are protected by law. Licences from Natural England are required if unable to avoid disturbing them) Govt . Website 12.2.24	Protection of Badgers Act 1992 in England and Wales
Bats – Barbastelle (commuting)	County
Bats – Lesser and greater horseshoe	Local
Bats – Other bat species	Local
Birds – Hedgerows	Local
Reptiles	Local

1. Brown Hare and hedgehog are listed as species of principle importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England.
2. Any animals using the site are likely to form part of a wider population within the local area, which would be of local importance for nature conservation. Indeed, several mammal holes were found on site in the southwest area of the southeastern field along H9, with a mammal trail found along H6.

3. The surveys recorded five Birds of Conservation Concern (BoCC) Red List species on site, namely song thrush, house sparrow, starling, swift and greenfinch.
4. The hedgerows are assessed to be the key ecological features on site, providing suitable foraging and commuting habitat for a range of species, including bats, hedgehog, brown hare, badger, birds, reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates.
5. There was evidence of slow worms but the count was too low to be considered in the assessment.
6. Common newts (not part of the survey) are present on land adjacent to the site.
7. Concerns have been expressed that circa 15m of the buffer zone of the commuting habitat for the bats will be removed to form the entrance to the site. Consideration of this aspect must be given in view of the international importance attached to the Exmoor and Quantocks Bat Special Area of Conservation.

It is very clear that the site supports a great deal of species of International, County and Local importance and the loss of habitat will have an adverse effect due to loss of foraging and wildlife corridors.

Whilst mitigation measures can be employed during construction, impacts on individuals could occur during site clearance, comprising injury or mortality of mammal foraging and commuting over site. This would be a great loss.

8. POLICY D22 – TREES AND WOODLAND

The development will remove significant lengths of hedges and some trees. This is contrary to the Hedgerow Retention Notice made by Sedgemoor District Council for this land in March 1988.

9. POLICY D23 – BAT CONSULTATION ZONES

Thirteen species of bats have been identified using the buffer land along Brymore Way, running south to north as their commuting habitat. See also 7, D21 Ecological Networks above.

10. POLICY D24 – POLLUTION IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT

The lighting strategy document prepared by DFL conducted a desktop study against a proposed development site layout plans that is materially different to the proposals submitted under this application and does not accurately reflect the impact the impact of lighting from this application. The most notable differences include:

- Urban development to the southeast of the site (current plans; large open space)
- No dwellings and a large attenuation pond to the southwest of the site (current plans; significant number of dwellings)
- Large open space on the northern ridge (current plans; much smaller open space and a large number of dwellings)

Currently, the area of the proposed development offers a dark outlook at night as there are few low output streetlights. The proposed development light spill will significantly and adversely affect the area and due to its elevated position, will be seen for miles around.

11. POLICY D26 – HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

We acknowledge the applicant's Historic Environment Assessment findings with regard to the site's Archaeological Potential, specifically 8.5 that states "*Overall, the site is considered to have a moderate archaeological potential. A higher potential might have been expected given the topography and nearby findings, but the geophysical survey results are suggestive of a relatively low level of archaeological activity within the application site*".

If not already done so, we respectfully request that the application is submitted to Steve Membery (Archaeologist, South West Heritage Trust) for consideration to determine whether further assessment is required.

12. POLICY D31 – COUNTRYSIDE AROUND SETTLEMENTS

This area provides buffer between the bypass (Brymore Way) and existing developments in the village. It also helps to retain a link with the surrounding countryside and also a corridor for wildlife. A public footpath runs from east to west across the site, crossing Brymore Way and continuing to the countryside to the west of the bypass. This proposed development would detract from the entrance to the village. The elevation of the development dominates the landscape and is of too large a scale for the village.

From: LPAE-SOMERSET (TORBAY AND SOUTH DEVON NHS FOUNDATION TRUST) <tsdft.lpae-somerset@nhs.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2024 9:49 PM
To: Planning Comments North <PlanningCommentsNorth@Somerset.gov.uk>
Cc: LPAE-SOMERSET (TORBAY AND SOUTH DEVON NHS FOUNDATION TRUST) <tsdft.lpae-somerset@nhs.net>
Subject: FW: Somerset Planning North: 13/23/00032/POA Land to the East of Brymore Way, between Withiel Drive and Chads Hill, Brymore Way, Cannington, Bridgwater, TA5

FAO: The North Planning Team (Awaiting Officer Allocation)

The application has been reviewed from a primary care perspective and the response has been informed by the Health Contributions Technical Note (<https://www.sedgemoor.gov.uk/article/5348/Health-Contributions-Technical-Note>) which was jointly prepared with NHS England.

13/23/00032/POA - Land to the East of Brymore Way, between Withiel Drive and Chads Hill, Brymore Way, Cannington, Bridgwater

The GP surgeries within the catchment area that this application would affect, currently have sufficient infrastructure capacity to absorb the population increase that this potential development would generate. However, due to the nature of the planning process, please be advised that this response from NHS Somerset is a snapshot of the capacity assessment at the date of this letter. Should there be any change to this position, as a result of any current planning applications that may or may not affect the capacity at **Cannington Health Centre and Quantock Medical Centre** being approved prior to a final decision on this particular development, then this will potentially initiate a further review on the NHS's position.

Such factors could include but are not limited to:

- Increases in the patient list size which then exceed the practices' capacity during the period between this application being validated and prior to a planning decision
- Consideration for future 'consented or commenced' planning applications that lead to an increase in the patient list size which then exceed the existing practices' capacity during the period between this application being validated and prior to a planning decision

Therefore, at this stage, it is important to highlight the NHS reserve the right to re-assess and respond to this application at any time, as a result of any planning application(s) received and approved subsequently by the Council that will have an associated impact on the assessed GP Practices linked to this application, which in turn, could have the potential to initiate an NHS contribution request in accordance to regulatory and legislative obligations. With this in mind, whilst at this time there is no requirement for a Section 106 contribution towards NHS Primary Care from this application, as a contingency, we would recommend you take this into consideration, factoring in an estimated sum of £680 per dwelling towards NHS Primary Care to any viability assessments.

Furthermore, please note this does not reflect any operational pressures, such as workforce or patient activity levels, that might be affecting the surgeries and is purely based on an assessment in relation to the current premises' capacity for infrastructure only.

Best wishes,
Kelly

Kelly Drew

Commercial Development Manager (**Monday-Thursday**)
NHS Local Planning Authority Engagement (LPAE) Team

On behalf of NHS Somerset Integrated Care Board (ICB)

Direct Line: [REDACTED] | **Email:** [REDACTED] | **Website:** www.torbayandsouthdevon.nhs.uk

From: REID, Alison (CANNINGTON HEALTH CENTRE) [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, February 1, 2024 5:12 PM

To: Planning North <Planningnorth@somerset.gov.uk>

Subject: Opposition to new building plans in Cannington - Planning application 13/23/00032 – Brymore Way Development

Good afternoon,

Please find attached electronic copy of the letter the doctors at Cannington Health Centre submitted at the public meeting on Monday 29th January 2024.

The surgery wish for it to be recorded by Somerset Council (North) that we oppose the development of the new housing plans - **Planning application 13/23/00032 – Brymore Way Development.**

The surgery commenced contingency planning for the retirement of a GP over three years ago and been unable to attract any applications for the role. The NHS Somerset LPA Engagement is based on the internal size of the practice, it does not consider the actual number of clinical staff the surgery has. The increase of housing will add to the burden of the surgery already at capacity for the number of doctors and appointments we have available.

We therefore, wish for the planners to recognise that the health needs of the existing and proposed additional residents of Cannington will not be safely met with the additional demands placed on the clinical team at the surgery and we strongly oppose the plans for the Brymore Way Development

Kind regards,

Alison

Alison Reid
Practice Manager

Cannington Health Centre, Mill Lane, Cannington, Bridgwater TA5 2HB

[REDACTED] Direct Dial

Please note my working days are Monday - Thursday



Cannington Health Centre

Mill Lane, Cannington, Bridgwater, Somerset, TA5 2HB

Telephone: 01278 652335

Website: www.canningtonhc.nhs.uk

VAT No: 879 1256 84

GP Partners: Dr Wendy Searle, Dr Craig Bobbett, Dr Katharine Allen, Dr David Sheasby

Cannington Parish Council

25th January 2024

Dear Members of the Parish Council,

Opposition to New Building Plans in the Village

We would like to begin by sending our apologies for the Parish Council meeting that we believe is being held on Monday evening. Unfortunately, we were only made aware of the meeting yesterday and do not have any senior members of the Practice Team that will be able to attend.

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed new building development in our community. Whilst we understand the importance of progress and growth, we believe that the current strain on us as a practice makes this proposal unsuitable and potentially harmful to the well-being of our residents.

We are proud to be part of the community and we play a crucial role in providing essential healthcare services to the residents. The proposed development, if approved, could exert additional pressure on our already stretched healthcare facilities and exacerbate the challenges faced by the GP surgery.

The following points highlight our concerns:

1. **Capacity of the GP Surgery:** Our surgery is a vital resource for our community, and it is currently operating at or near full capacity. Introducing a new building development without addressing the capacity constraints of the existing healthcare facilities may lead to longer waiting times, reduced access to services, and diminished quality of care for patients.
2. **Community Health and Well-being:** A thriving community requires accessible and effective healthcare services. Introducing a new development without a comprehensive plan to support the increased demand for healthcare services may negatively affect the health and well-being of residents.

We respectfully urge the planning department to reconsider the approval of the proposed building development and to conduct a thorough assessment of its potential impact on our local healthcare infrastructure. It is essential to prioritise the health and welfare of our community members and ensure that any development aligns with the capacity and capabilities of our existing healthcare services.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We trust that the planning department will carefully consider the concerns raised by residents and make decisions that prioritise the long-term health and well-being of our community.

Yours faithfully



Electronically signed by Alison Reid Practice Manager on behalf of Drs Searle, Bobbett,
Allen & Sheasby

From: estates@planning.somerset.gov.uk <estates@planning.somerset.gov.uk>

Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:54 PM

To: Planning North <planningnorth@somerset.gov.uk>

Subject: Response To Application Number 13/23/00032 at Land to the East of Brymore Way, between Withiel Drive and Chads Hill, Brymore Way, Cannington, TA5

Please find attached my representation in relation to the above planning application.

Regards

Mrs Frances Gully

Planning North
Bridgwater House
King Square
Bridgwater
TA6 3AR

Please ask for:
Mrs Frances Gully

Telephone: [REDACTED]

email: [REDACTED]

my reference:
PLNN/2024/027902

your reference:
13/23/00032

31 January 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

Erection of 160 no. dwellings, creation of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, public open space, landscaping and associated works at Land to the East of Brymore Way, between Withiel Drive and Chads Hill, Brymore Way, Cannington, TA5

I refer to the above-mentioned planning application received on 5 January 2024. I have the following observations on the education aspects of this proposal:-

A proposal of 160 dwellings in this location will generate the following number of pupils for each education type:

Early Years - $0.09 \times 160 = 15.2$ pupils

Primary - $0.32 \times 160 = 51.2$ pupils

Secondary - $0.14 \times 160 = 22.4$ pupils

SEND - $0.0092 \times 160 = 1.472$ pupils

Education contributions will be required for the following schools:

Childcare Centre or other nurseries and pre-schools in the area: There is currently some capacity in Cannington, however taking into account other planned housing and the increased demand estimated from the expansion of the Early Years Entitlement for children aged 2-years-old and under, places are likely to become limited

Cannington CofE Primary School: Cannington primary school had 181 on roll at October 2023 census. They have a net capacity of 180 with a netted off classroom taking the max capacity to 210. Therefore contributions are required for a single classroom (30 places) to be built.

Secondary: contributions are required to ensure we have sufficient funds to cover the cost of the expansions at Bridgwater College Academy and Robert Blake and the future expansion of Chilton Trinity.

SEND school development: There are a good selection of SEN schools in the area, however they have been expanded in advance of the housing coming forward with funding which needs to be refunded by developer contributions.

for more guidance on the need for education funding please see the recently published guidance here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/delivering-schools-to-support-housing-growth>

All expansion projects which this education funding will go towards will enable the pupils generated from this proposed development to have local school places.

The current cost to build education places is as follows:

Build type	Cost to build per pupil	Net zero uplift (10%)
EY/Primary new build	£23,061.33	£25,367.47
EY/Primary expansion	£19,261.81	£21,188.00
Secondary New Build	£27,924.12	£30,716.53
Secondary Expansion	£26,745.00	£29,419.50
SEND new build	£101,970.91	£112,168.01
SEND expansion	£92,014.29	£101,215.72

Early Years - $15.2 \times 21,188.00 = £322,057.60$ for expansion projects

Primary - $51.2 \times 21,188.00 = £1,084,825.60$ (although this total may be able to be reduced for the actually extension required, subject to further key decisions)

Secondary - $22.4 \times 29,419.50 = £658,996.80$ for expansion projects across Bridgwater

SEND - $1.4 \times 101,215.72 = £141,702.00$ to pay for the required expansion & development of SEND facilities in the area.

If the planning authority is minded to approve this application these totals should be secured in a S106 legal agreement.

If you would like further information regarding the education obligations please contact me again.

Yours sincerely,

Frances Gully

Estates Planning Advisor BSc MSc MRTPI