

FLAX BOURTON PARISH COUNCIL
JSP CONSULTATION RESPONSE 10.1.18

POLICY 6 INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS (WITH REFERENCE TO THE NAILSEA CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT SCHEME)

N.B. FLAX BOURTON PARISH COUNCIL REGISTERS A HOLDING OBJECTION.

SOUNDNESS

1. **Supporting information.** The council believes the policy is unsound because of the lack of information on which to judge the impact of the transport infrastructure scheme – in particular, the lack of details on the exact alignment of Road 7 of the Nailsea Corridor Improvement Scheme in the vicinity of Flax Bourton. The village is split by the A370, has several bends and 5 roads exiting onto it. Delays currently build up in the village at peak travel times, with summer holiday traffic and when the M5 is closed. With increased traffic volumes from the proposed SDLs at Backwell and Nailsea, and potentially the M5, it is critical that the new road links directly to the existing interchange with B3130 at the western end of the Long Ashton by-pass. This, possibly, was the original intention of the interchange underpass which currently serves merely a 'B' class road junction.
2. **Traffic modelling.** The policy is unsound because of the lack of demonstrated traffic modelling work that underpins the final Transport Vision.
3. **Environmental Impact.** The policy is unsound in view of the lack of any assessment on the environmental impact of the proposed NCI corridor. In the vicinity of Flax Bourton, Road 7 would pass through or near to Greenbelt land, Ancient Woodland, Priority Habitats, SAM and Flood Zone 3, Listed Buildings and Registered Park and Garden.
4. **Metrobus scheme** – the policy is unsound without specific identification of available funding. The Bristol Metrobus scheme is reported currently to be £30m over budget.
5. **Rail Infrastructure.** The policy is unsound as no feasibility study has been included to demonstrate that increased capacity will be available for commuting and to serve 3275 additional households.
6. **Land assembly** – the policy is unsound because although dependant on an exact route, no range of projections or costings are shown for the land assembly that will be required for Route 7.
7. **Infrastructure Funding** – whilst a cost in the range £189/£265M is identified for the NCI, no source for this funding is identified in the JSP and for this reason the scheme is currently undeliverable and the policy unsound. This issue is particularly relevant as North Somerset Council is not part of the West of England Mayoral scheme.

MODIFICATIONS

1. **Supporting Information.** Exact route alignment of Road 7 of the NCI scheme with a direct link to the western end of the Long Ashton bypass to be incorporated into the JSP.
2. **Traffic modelling.** Full details of traffic modelling undertaken to show impact on traffic volumes, noise, emissions etc.
3. **Environmental Impact.** An Environmental Impact Study to be undertaken to show likely effect of the NCI corridor and necessary remedial work.
4. **Metrobus Scheme.** Specific and ring-fenced source of funding to be identified.
5. **Rail Infrastructure.** A feasibility study is required to demonstrate commitment from Network Rail and the appropriate rail franchise that additional capacity and funding are available
6. **Land assembly.** Projections are needed to demonstrate the feasibility of the required land assembly from a range of landowners with likely costings.
7. **Infrastructure Funding.** A “watertight” source of funding for the NCI scheme to be identified and confirmed in the JSP.
8. **All the above to be in place before any development of SDLs commences.**

POLICY 7 – STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT LOCATIONS SITE REQUIREMENTS

7.4 BACKWELL and 7.7 NAILSEA

SOUNDNESS

The Council believes that the policy is unsound as it has not been positively prepared, is not justified or effective as it is not deliverable as these locations have been chosen where the infrastructure, particularly road and railway, is already at capacity and where there is the highest need for new infrastructure investment in the least cost effective way. The need for significant new infrastructure to mitigate the impact of the development of these locations is not a feasible strategy to meet housing needs in a sustainable manner. Accordingly these two sites do not have locational sustainability.

MODIFICATIONS

To consider alternative Strategic Development Locations sites where there is existing infrastructure with capacity or where smaller and therefore achievable infrastructure investment is required.