

Agenda item 6

For decision – Selwood Garden Community

Author: Jane Llewellyn, Planning & Development Manager

Summary

This report sets out a summary of the planning application for Selwood Garden Community and details of the revised plans and documents.

It includes details of the consultation/engagement that has carried been out and a brief summary of the main objections to the application that we have heard at the consultation and engagement events, and from the objections posted online. There is also a summary of the responses from statutory consultees/stakeholders.

The report recommends an objection to the planning application together with the proposed reasons for objection. Should the application be recommended by Somerset Council for approval, a list of additional requirements and conditions is also proposed.

As most of the application is within Selwood Parish, we have been working closely with Selwood Parish Council.

All of the plans, documents, consultation responses and objections, can be viewed here <https://publicaccess.mendip.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=OWLCX7KPo2100>

(Please note that the text in *italics* are quotes, standard text is a comment from the author of the report).

Application description for Ref - 2021/1675/EOUT

Application for Outline Planning Permission for the erection of up to 1,700 dwellings (Use Class C3), two care homes (Use Class C3), 6.7 hectares of employment land (Use Classes E, B2 and B8), a mixed use local centre for primary school (Use Class F1), cafes/restaurant and convenience store (Use Class E) and other supporting social and physical infrastructure (Use Classes F1, F2 and E), provision of greenspace and other supporting ancillary works. All matters (Access (within the site), Layout, Scale, Appearance, Landscaping) reserved except for four new vehicular site access points from the existing highway. (Revisions & further information in respect of the Environmental Statement submitted 21.02.24) | Land South Of Frome Bounded By Marston Road, B3092/railway Line And A361 (Frome Bypass) And Including Land To The South Of The A361 Frome

Background

Pre-application consultation and engagement on the above application started in Mid-2019. The Outline application was submitted in July 2021, since then there have been a series of consultations and public engagement meetings held by the Town Council. These meetings have been well attended both in person and online and have been a valuable exercise to hear

what residents think about the proposed development. To date, the Town Council has not formally submitted any comment on the application. Due in part that National Highways putting a hold on any decision being issued, because the proposal has the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the A36 trunk road. And we were aware that further amended plans would be submitted.

Whilst we have not made a formal consultation response, in response to the pre-application engagement, we have stated that we support a master planned approach to development as this is preferable to piecemeal developments that usually provide little or no infrastructure.

We also stated that we want to ensure that the development provides benefits to the existing community of Frome as well as future residents. The management and stewardship of open spaces and community facilities is key to the success of any development. If the application is approved, Frome Town Council has already expressed an interest in taking over the ownership of these, and to work with the local community to maximise community benefit, meet community needs and where appropriate enable community ownership.

Below is a very brief summary of the main objections to the application that we have heard at the consultation and engagement events and from the objections posted online. At the time of writing there are 454 objections and 2 letters of support.

- Outside of the development boundary
- Frome doesn't need any more houses
- Capacity of the sewage network
- Impact on flooding
- Loss of Greenfields
- Lack of infrastructure i.e. no doctor, dentist
- Frome's existing infrastructure is not coping with demand
- Impact on the existing road network
- The plan is designed around cars and there is insufficient public transport
- Loss of ancient hedgerows/trees and important habitats for biodiversity
- School/education provision
- We will not get what has been promised in the outline application
- Development is too far away from town to be sustainable
- Affordable homes will still not be affordable
- It will change the nature and character of Frome
- It will destroy a large area of agricultural land and its accompanying wildlife and habitat.
- Increased light and air pollution
- Can not guarantee the proposed employment
- The application is premature and should not be considered as part of the new Local Plan

Revised plans

A further set of revised plans was submitted on 21st February 2024, the revised plans include:

Amended parameter plans

- Land Use

- Building Heights
- Green Infrastructure
- Housing Density
- Access
- Phasing
- Illustrative Masterplan
- Preliminary Highway Improvements White Row Roundabout Phase 2
- Preliminary Highway Improvements Beckington Roundabout Phase 2
- Preliminary Highway Improvements White Row Roundabout Phase 3
- Cover Letter - Explanatory Note About Updated Documents
- Notice - Article 15
- Biodiversity Metric Calculator
- Horseshoe Bat Mitigation Strategy
- Design Principles Framework (In Eight Sections)
- Environmental Statement Addendum 2024

Please note the following extracts from the supporting statements -

“To be clear, in the event that the planning permission is approved the Illustrative Master Plan would not form part of that decision – it is a plan that simply shows one way in which the site could be developed in compliance with the Parameter Plans and Design Principles Framework, all of which would be bound into any consent.”

“Finally, a Design Principles Framework (DPF) has been prepared since July 2022 to support the outline planning application. This document sets a range of binding design principles that future design codes and reserved matters applications will have to adhere to. Various planning conditions will be linked to the DPF and parameter plans, and the effect will be to better ensure that all of the mitigation measures put forward are delivered as the scheme evolves to detailed design stage.”

In particular, I'd like to comment on the following three amended documents.

- Design principles

The design principles give greater reassurance that the development will be built in accordance with any outline consent and are to be welcomed. We have seen numerous outline applications change significantly once the reserved matters application is submitted, sometimes for viability reasons but often because the plans submitted with the original outline application were vague. These design principles and the later design codes will be assessed by Somerset Council's planning officer against any reserved matters applications. If the codes are not adhered to, the reserved matters applications can be refused on these grounds. Whether the design principles are acceptable is a matter for debate and there will be a variety of opinions on this.

- The Biodiversity Metric Calculator

This shows how the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for the site has been calculated, the updated development proposals have maintained a commitment to achieve at least 10% biodiversity net gain.

- Horseshoe Bat Mitigation Strategy

The outline Horseshoe Bat Mitigation Strategy has been provided following consultation comments received from Somerset Ecology Services and Natural England in relation to the previous planning application. Revised comments from these consultees have not been submitted yet.

Considerations

As set out earlier in this report, the application has been discussed in public on several occasions and Cllrs have had briefing sessions to help them understand what is being proposed. There are nearly 400 documents/plans to support the application and it is not possible to cover all the information provided in detail, so for the purposes of this report, I will focus on planning policy, against which this application will be determined and the responses of the Statutory consultees, accepting that their views may not be agreed with by everyone.

It should be noted that Frome Town Council are not the Planning Authority, and our response does not have to be based on policy, but for any objections to have weight, they should be material objections.

Main objections of consultee/stakeholder responses

1. Outside of the development boundary

The entire application lies outside established development limits for Frome. The Planning Policy Team for Somerset Council (formerly Mendip) have concluded that –

“While Frome is a principal centre for growth, a strategic extension of this scale remains contrary to the adopted Plan. The current five year supply position confirms that this proposal will need to be assessed with regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and full weight cannot be given to housing policies in the Local Plan. The five year position will be updated during 2022 and will depend on progress around phosphates mitigation on other allocated sites in the (Mendip) District. Even with a Somerset-wide plan, district housing targets are likely to be retained for some years.”

“This is a ‘strategic’ scale housing proposal which, if approved, would be developed out well beyond the current plan period. However, the council cannot commence the adopted review policy LP1 and joint working on a Somerset-wide plan is in very early stages. The SGV proposal is a speculative scheme but is a proposal which has been developed over a number of years including engagement with Mendip, the town council and infrastructure providers.”

It is clear that, as set out in the NPPF, where the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply, the presumption in favour of sustainable development comes into force. The Local Plan policies will still be used to assess whether the development is sustainable. However, the

“tilted balance” should then be applied. This means permission should be given unless the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole.

2. Frome doesn’t need any more houses

The housing supply figures for Frome are for a minimum of 2300 houses to be provided by the end of the plan period 2028.

Position as at 31 March 2023 including updates site in planning as at November 2023

Completions 2007 - 23	1880
Under construction	370
Permissions	353
Allocations	309
Other sites	48
Total comp and supply	2960

Frome will reach the minimum figure of 2300 homes before the end of the plan period. Whilst this figure is a minimum figure and is not in itself a reason for refusal, the biggest issue is that none of the developments in the above table have provided any infrastructure and there is already a strain on the existing infrastructure and services in Frome.

3. Lack of infrastructure i.e. no doctor, dentist

The proposed development does not make any provision for a doctor’s surgery. On behalf of the doctor’s surgery, the consultation response from NHS Somerset Integrated Care Board say –

“I have now had the opportunity to review this and can confirm that based on 1,700 dwellings, the position remains the same where NHS Somerset ICB will not be submitting a contribution request for primary care services associated to this development. Since our initial assessment and withdrawal back in January 2022, the potential impact of this development has now been re-assessed, concluding there continues to be sufficient infrastructure capacity for primary care services”.

Conversely, the consultation response from Royal United Hospital Bath is –

“S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) allows the Local Planning Authority to request a developer to contribute towards the impact it creates on the services. The contribution in the amount £1,805.285.00 sought will go towards the gap in the funding created by each potential patient from this development. The detailed explanation and calculation are provided within the attached document. Without the requested contribution, the access to adequate health services is rendered more vulnerable thereby undermining the

sustainability credentials of the proposed development due to conflict with NPPF and Local Development Plan policies.”

If the view of the RUH is that the development will have an impact on its services and they are asking for a contribution towards dealing with the increased number of people, it is hard to understand why Somerset ICB are not asking for a similar contribution. As stated in the reply from RUH, lack of access to *adequate health services* will undermine the sustainability credentials of the proposed development. Whilst the medical practice may feel they have adequate capacity in their existing building complex, it is clear from all the consultation responses that there is an issue with their service provision, which needs to be addressed. A s106 contribution towards mitigating that impact on services in Frome would seem the obvious answer.

The Design & Access statement makes reference to the provision of a Dentist within the Community Hub building. However, it is assumed this would be dependent on a practice wanting a business here (regardless of whether that is an NHS dentist or not) and the “market” for dental services. It is hard to forecast future demand but if we assume impact it would correlate with the view of the RUH, it is important to err on the side of caution and contribution should be included in the s106 agreement to support additional or new dental services if need be.

4. Capacity of the sewage network

Wessex Water’s current Wastewater Management Plan acknowledges that *“The Frome area has a high risk for sewer incapacity, and high groundwater levels from prolonged rainfall periods affect areas of this catchment.”*

The latest sewer storm overflow figures for Frome are below -



An extract from Wessex Water’s consultation response is below -

“With regard to foul sewerage discharge sewer network modelling has identified a point of discharge in the neighbouring Marston Trading Estate for the entire site. In order to provide sewer capacity for the proposed site and other potential sites in the area downstream improvements will be required which will be constructed and managed by Wessex Water to match the rate of development.”

Friends of the River Frome have stated that -

“Foul Drainage/Potential River Pollution

1. *The proposed development will increase the risk of raw sewage overflows into the river and will negate recent and planned infrastructure improvements in sewage disposal capacity.*
2. *Specifically, the proposed development is upstream of sewerage restrictions, principally the siphon and CSO (Combined Sewer Overflow) at Chateau Gontier in the centre of Frome. Wessex Water have recently increased capacity at this restriction but overflows will still occur and FoRF objects to a large volume being discharged into the system and negating this long awaited improvement in capacity.*

In addition, the following issues would need to be properly addressed if the proposed development was allowed;-

1. *The proposed development must not result in any foul drainage entering the river at any time, either directly or indirectly.*
2. *Foul drainage infrastructure must be constructed and fully operational to ensure the above before any dwellings or commercial premises are occupied.*
3. *The construction of all foul drainage infrastructure must be properly phased to ensure that piecemeal development of the site does not result in any foul drainage into the river at any time.*
4. *The above requirements should be guaranteed through relevant conditions and legal agreements.*

The view of Selwood Parsh Council is that,

“pumping all of the sewage and waste water from SGC's proposal up a very large steep hill and across the town is utter madness and that the LPA should be urged to be consistent in their decision-making and insist on a gravity based 'sustainable foul water solution by insisting on a sewage treatment plant at the bottom of the hill.”

The works required by Wessex Water will be paid for by the developer. However, the proposed works do not appear to build additional capacity to cope with the current overflows into the network, which, given the number of overflows recorded, is required. It appears that no consideration has been given to the construction of a new water treatment plant on site to deal with this issue.

5. Traffic impacts

A Traffic Assessment Report has been submitted, which is a comprehensive technical report. A development of this size will inevitably have impacts on the existing highway network and works to mitigate the impacts are proposed at Marston roundabout, Gorehedge and The Butts.

Highways England requested that an additional assessment be undertaken to enable them to determine the impact of the development on the safe and efficient operation of the A36 and its junctions. The revised plans include details of these preliminary highway improvements. Highways England have not yet responded.

Somerset Highways have not objected to the application, see their summary comments below.

“Summary: The Highway Authority does not object to this proposal, subject to the conditions as set out below, and the securing of an appropriate S106 agreement for the contents of the Travel Plan and the contributions as necessary under Policy DP27 of the Mendip District Council Local Plan (adopted December 2021) for the identified infrastructure improvements at Marston Roundabout Works (£20,000), 2 x signal-controlled junctions (£175,000), Gorehedge (£102,000), The Butts (£60,000) and A36 (£228,000)”.

The conclusion of the Frome Civic Society on the harmful traffic impacts is –

“The proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of NPPF para 110 (d) that “any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree”.

Selwood Parish Council also have concerns about the safety of the proposed access points. [Appendix 6.1, can be viewed on the website here](#), sets out in detail the reasons for those concerns and has been sent to Emma Meecham at Somerset Highways for further comment. Their recommendations are below.

- “1. A361 between Marston Gate and Blatchbridge roundabouts, install overtaking/crawler lanes up these steep slopes*
- 2. Crossing point over A361 to Nature Reserve should be a bridge not a Pegasus crossing and moved to Little Keyford Lane closer to amenities*
- 3. Access into the Blatchbridge industrial Estate should be off the SGC’s new roundabout on the A361 via a bridge over the River Frome*
- 4. Bus Access on Little Keyford Lane needs supporting with a defined parking plan*
- 5. Traffic lights and improvements at the A361/A362 junction*
- 6. Install no right turn signs on B roads entering A361 between A362 and Marston Gate roundabout”*

6. Impact on flooding

Many of the objections submitted have raised concerns about the increase in flooding of the area.

The Environment Agency has no objection, subject to conditions. The Local Lead Flood Authority had asked for a more integrated approach to surface water drainage and, we understand from the applicant that the LLFA are now happy with the revised proposals, although their formal consultation response has not been submitted yet.

Friends of the River Frome (FoRF) have submitted a detailed response and their summary is below. The detailed response contains a series of issues that would need to be properly addressed if the proposed development was allowed.

In summary FoRF have made the objection for the following reasons;-

- *Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk - The proposed development will result in additional downstream flooding, particularly at Wallbridge where flooding is already a serious problem and is likely to worsen with climate change. The proposed development does not fully meet Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) published guidance and as such is not compliant with either local or national planning policy, (National Planning Policy Framework NPPF, 2023).*
- *Foul Drainage and Potential River Pollution - The proposed development will increase the risk of raw sewage overflows into the river (including from the CSO in Frome town centre) and will negate recent and planned infrastructure improvements in sewage disposal capacity.*
- *Riverside Country Park - The proposed playing fields and play area planned as part of the country park are located within a floodplain and are therefore likely to be flooded and unusable for large parts of the year. Furthermore, the proposed playing fields and play area and associated engineering works will have an adverse impact on the landscape setting of the river corridor. In view of the above the proposed riverside park is not in accordance with the adopted River Frome Strategy vision for this area which proposes a Water Park intended to provide public amenity, habitat diversity, water storage and quality improvement through the creation of new wetland habitats.*

7. School/education provision

There is concern that the proposed primary school will not get built, as seems to be the case at Edmund Park and with the sale of the proposed school site at Packsaddle. In recent discussions with the applicant, they have advised that discussions with Somerset Council Education Authority are ongoing about what provision is needed and when it should be provided. Somerset have indicated that they want existing capacity in local school to be taken up first.

The provision of the school will be set out in the S106 agreement, and this will include whether it is only the land that is supplied or whether the developer also builds the school. We are advised that the preference is currently that the developer builds the school and that there will be a trigger point in the S106 for when this will happen, most likely once a certain number of homes have been occupied. FTC have previously said that we would like to see the provision of vocational training, the applicants have advised that this has been explored but that there was no take up.

8. Loss of habitat and agricultural land and landscape impacts

There are numerous documents covering the above issues, too many to summarise in this report.

The response from CPRE – *The countryside charity* is summarised below

“This proposal, if approved, would result in the wholly unacceptable loss of a large swathe of high-quality open countryside, much of it Best and Most Valuable agricultural land, in the river Frome valley. The site also lies within the landscape setting of the rural town, which would be substantially harmed. We see no justification for these harms in terms of identified housing need, whether in the town, or in the district as a whole.”

Somerset Ecology have objected to the application, mostly because of the impact on the Lesser Horseshoe Bats. However, the revised plans include a bat mitigation strategy. Somerset Ecology have not yet commented on the revised scheme.

As stated previously, the updated development proposals have maintained a commitment to achieve at least 10% biodiversity net gain. However, from the objections submitted, a lot of the objectors feel that the “best and most versatile” agricultural land should be used for food production while others have commented on the importance of the open countryside and how important it is for their mental health.

The consultee response from the Environment Team by Charles Potterton (Landscape Architect) states.

“I conclude that there are major to moderate adverse effects arising from the proposed development that cannot be fully mitigated.”

“Notwithstanding this conclusion, given the existing landscape character and quality, i) if the totality of the measures specified on the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan are implemented in full (with details of the landscaping including the provision of additional greenspace within parcels such as local equipped areas for play not currently defined on the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan being secured by condition) and ii) the green infrastructure is properly managed going forward through a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (appropriately funded and secured by condition), then these effects are not in themselves considered to be a reason for refusal.”

“Given the significant scale of impact and subsequent major to moderate adverse effects of the proposed development on the landscape will need to be assessed in the round with other material considerations.”

Concern has also been raised over the loss of ancient trees and hedgerows. However, there has not yet been a response from the Somerset Council’s Tree Officer.

9. Affordable housing

Design Principle 1 sets out the illustrative housing mix, showing 510 affordable houses, ranging from 1 bed flats to 4 bed houses, which will be provided in a mix of social rented, low-cost ownership, shared ownership etc.

The housing mix is informed by Somerset Council and will be reviewed at the Reserved Matters stage. The Somerset Housing Enabling Officer has not yet commented.

Unit Type	Market Housing		Affordable Housing		Overall	
	No. of Units	%	No. of Units	%	No. of Units	%
1-bed flat	0	0	172	33.73%	172	10.12%
2-bed flat	29	2.44%	31	6.08%	60	3.53%
2-bed house	298	25.04%	127	24.9%	425	25%
3-bed house	599	50.34%	141	27.65%	740	43.53%
4-bed house	159	13.36%	39	7.65%	198	11.65%
5-bed house	17	1.43%	0	0%	17	1%
Self-build plots	88	7.39%	0	0%	88	5.18%
TOTAL	1,190	100%	510	100%	1,700	100%

Figure 4. Illustrative Housing Mix

Frome Town Council has recently declared a housing crisis, due in part to over 600 households currently on the social housing list and a lack of affordable housing. If approved, housing will realistically take 14/15 years to complete, so there will not be an immediate impact on the provision of affordable housing. However, without new housing developments, wherever they may be, it is difficult to see how any additional affordable housing can be provided, especially in enough numbers to meet the current shortfall.

The view of Frome Civic Society is –

“Much is made of the allocation of 510 ‘affordable’ dwellings, but in practice this means, in the majority of cases, the provision of houses at 80% of market value. These homes would still be well beyond the means of the many local families on low incomes. There is a known requirement in Frome for rented social housing and other genuinely affordable tenures; the survey recently completed for Fair Housing for Frome confirms this need.”

“SGC would do almost nothing to meet the requirements of the 661 people currently on the register for social housing, for the younger generations wanting to make their first move into independent accommodation, or for older generations keen to downsize. The needs of these households will be best met close to town centre facilities, not in a remote ‘garden community’.”

Somerset Cllr Helen Kay has made the following comments in respect of affordable housing:

“Many people are asking why Frome must take this housing as it is not in our Local Plan and we have already had so many new houses on this side of town in last 20 years as mentioned above. Given that the application is not strictly compliant in that sense, but must be seriously considered anyway at great cost to the LPA in terms of time and resources, I cannot see why some leniency cannot be extended to the interpretation of our Local Plan policies, specifically regarding the % of Affordable Housing. In Wells developers are expected to provide 40% AH and they are still keen to build there on greenfield sites and they still make a profit.”

“ I would like to see the % of AH negotiated upwards, given that we did not for this large development. Also I note that NO one bed flats will be available for market and they are ALL for social housing, presumably all clustered together in the commercial area over shops which is not good practice in itself. Yet many young people in Frome are only on the housing register at all because there aren't sufficient one bed flats to buy to get on the housing ladder. Older people downsizing who no longer want a garden are also short changed by small number of 2 bed flats for market. ”

It is suggested that Frome Town Council should agree that the provision of affordable housing must be 40%, especially considering the Housing Crisis.

Recommendation

Whilst we appreciate the work SGC have put into the application and endorse the master planned approach, we feel that there are too many issues that need clarification before we would be able to support the proposals.

As a result, FTC objects to the application, based on the detail set out in report below, together with a list of additional requirements and conditions should the application be recommended for approval by Somerset Council.

Detail of FTC's objection

Despite that fact that, subject to conditions, there are no objections from the statutory consultees, we cannot support this application. It is also clear from the public comments that there is a vast amount of local opposition to this application.

1. The application is outside of the development limits and has no allocation for development. Whilst we appreciate that the Mendip Local Plan is currently out of date and therefore the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, this development is not sustainable and does not meet the test of sustainability from an economic, social and environmental perspective.
2. The site is too far from major facilities such as the hospital, college, and town centre amenities. Whilst we applaud all the active travel proposals, we believe that most people will still travel by car, putting further strain on the highway network. There is also no guarantee that the proposed public transport can or will be delivered.
3. The existing town infrastructure, including medical facilities, education, water and sewage, public transport and the highway network cannot support a development of this size. Although the Statutory Consultees have not raised any objection in respect of the above issues, we urge the Planning Authority to discuss further this application with them and ensure that sufficient evidence/information is provided to those consultees to enable them to make an informed response. And that any conditions that they have requested will mitigate any concerns, and are enforceable. We request that FTC and SPC be involved in further discussions with the relevant Statutory Consultees and the Planning Authority.

4. This is an outline application and despite the detailed Design Codes, we are still not confident that these can or will be adhered to. There needs to be greater certainty that what is proposed in the masterplan plan and parameter plans is adhered to by any individual developer of the various parcels/phases, to ensure that all the proposed infrastructure is provided. Too often, developers change the plans based on viability issues. Ways must be found to ensure this is avoided if this application is approved.
5. We welcome the 30% affordable/social housing and acknowledge that this would go some way to dealing with the current housing waiting list. However, the development could take 15 years to complete, so would not resolve the problem in the short term. The development must provide 40% affordable/social housing and that a high percentage of the affordable housing must be built first.
6. The development would result in the unacceptable loss of open countryside and valuable agricultural land, again we applaud the proposed landscape and green infrastructure proposals within the application but do not feel that these are sufficient to mitigate the loss.
7. The existing sewage network can not cope with frequent overflows and this is currently unacceptable. This development will have an even more unacceptable impact on the network in future. A new pumping station must be incorporated into this application to deal with the increase from the proposed development.

If this application is approved.....

We applaud the master planned development approach. All the landowners have signed up to a consortium with the intention of their land being developed. If this application is not approved, there is a danger that we will see piecemeal development coming for smaller parcels of land, which will result in little or no infrastructure being provided. The overall impacts on transport, landscaping, active travel and connectivity etc. will be greater.

There are some specific issues that still need to be resolved.

1. The highways recommendations from Selwood Parish Council must be incorporated.
 1. *A361 between Marston Gate and Blatchbridge roundabouts, install overtaking/crawler lanes up these steep slopes*
 2. *Crossing point over A361 to Nature Reserve should be a bridge not a Pegasus crossing and moved to Little Keyford Lane closer to amenities*
 3. *Access into the Blatchbridge industrial Estate should be off the SGC's new roundabout on the A361 via a bridge over the River Frome*
 4. *Bus Access on Little Keyford Lane needs supporting with a defined parking plan*
 5. *Traffic lights and improvements at the A361/A362 junction*
 6. *Install no right turn signs on B roads entering A361 between A362 and Marston Gate roundabout*

2. Frome Town Council would want to own the freehold of the open spaces and community buildings to ensure that they are managed as community facilities with the input of the local community. We appreciate that this would require an agreement with Selwood Parish Council (SPC) but believe this would be the best outcome for any future residents. Therefore, it is imperative that Frome Town Council & Selwood Parish Council work with the Planning Authority to agree the content of any S106 agreement to ensure that all the public and community spaces are protected and deliver what the community needs at the appropriate time, as given the time it will take to deliver the site, priorities will change.
3. We want to ensure that the community spaces/buildings are protected for a broad range of uses that may be required in the future. Therefore, sufficient S106 funding should be provided to enable this to happen. Including provision for health, education (including vocational/tertiary education), open spaces, leisure and community uses.
4. The issues set out by Friends of the River Frome must be properly addressed
 1. *The proposed development must not result in any foul drainage entering the river at any time, either directly or indirectly.*
 2. *Foul drainage infrastructure must be constructed and fully operational to ensure the above before any dwellings or commercial premises are occupied.*
 3. *The construction of all foul drainage infrastructure must be properly phased to ensure that piecemeal development of the site does not result in any foul drainage into the river at any time.*
 4. *The above requirements should be guaranteed through relevant conditions and legal agreements.*
5. To ensure that the housing supply benefits local people, a condition or unilateral undertaking by the developers should be added that secures the prioritisation of local people in the marketing of the proposed housing for an initial period of 6 months.
6. There must be the construction of a new water treatment plant on site and
7. There must be an increase the provision of Affordable Housing to 40%.
8. The outline application must be “non-severable” to ensure that any permission cannot be amended later by a 'drop in' permission.