

COMBE HAY PARISH COUNCIL

14 November 2025

Response to the BANES Local Plan Options document – Chapter 9

1. Sulis Down – paras 5.1.1.3- 5.1.1.5

CHPC supports the statement that it is not proposed to amend Policy B3a which limits development within the allocated site to around 300 dwellings but would like to see added to the section a statement that makes it clear that an agreed Masterplan for the allocated site as a whole is a prerequisite for the grant of permission for any development on the allocated site.

2. Odd Down – land to the SW of the Park and Ride – paras 5.1.2.2 – 5.1.2.6

Combe Hay Parish Council notes that the original plans attached have now been corrected to show that the Derrymans field is not an “ Emerging Residential development “ and that the options set out in the plan are for employment uses only

CHPC is concerned that :-

- a. Any further development on the skyline in this part of the south of Bath will have a negative visual impact on the Cotswold National Landscape . Lighting will need to be strictly controlled given the prominence of the site
- b. The suggestion of an access to the site being formed from Combe Hay Lane is misguided given the nature of Combe Hay Lane and the proposal that the access is sited very close to a sharp right hand bend
- c. The traffic impact of any proposed development is properly considered (using micro simulation models) given the substantial developments proposed for Peasedown St John, Radstock and Midsomer Norton which will undoubtedly lead to increased traffic on the A367 and the Park and Ride roundabout which already suffers from long queuing in the morning
- d. Any employment opportunity created here should take full account of the environment - the nearby green belt, woods and housing.

3 . Somerset Coal Canal

3.1 Option1 – the option to retain Policy HE2 needs to be carefully considered particularly when it is clear that many residents were unaware of the buffer

zone that affects their properties. A sensible approach to development in the buffer zone needs to be adopted taking into account not only the benefit of the proposed development (particularly where there is a community benefit) but also an assessment of the realistic likelihood of the canal being restored at that time and in that location.

3.2 Option 2 – this new policy should not be included in the new Local Plan. The Council believes that the idea of restoring the canal to its original state is speculative at best – the logistical, financial, legal and environmental issues raised by the project are enormous . In our view the project is not feasible added to which the consequences in terms of planning blight and uncertainty for residents are both considerable and unjustified and the impact of the construction works on the natural ecology in the Cam Valley would in our view completely outweigh the limited benefits of the full restoration of this canal. In terms of the specific diversion proposed in Combe Hay the Council objects to the proposal requests that it is removed. It is unclear how the proposed diversion can be achieved given compromising the existing cemetery, the proposed site for an extended cemetery, the access road and Holly Tree Farm.

Olga Shepherd
Combe Hay Parish Clerk