

**Scott Schedule – FINAL Positions**  
**8<sup>th</sup> November 2022**

Ref	Application Ref.	Site Name	Council's 5YHLS	Appellant's 5YHLS	Difference	Summary of Appellant's Comments	Summary of Council's Comments
<b>LAND AT HARRY STOKE</b>							
0021b	PT17/5810/RM	Land at Harry Stoke	605	421	-184	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.6 – 4.18 of CC's PoE (pages 16 – 18) and 3.1 to 3.9 of CC's Rebuttal (pages 5 – 7).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's evidence to support the December 2021 AMR is extremely limited and did not provide any detailed analysis of lead-in times or build-out rates.</li> <li>The Council's completions data, which indicates 191 dwellings were completed in the year 2021 – 2022 alone, appears to be incorrect (refer to paragraph 3.2 and Figure 1 of CC's Rebuttal).</li> <li>The site has two developers – Crest Nicholson and Linden Homes. Linden Homes have built the majority of their units out (112 in total). Crest Nicholson control the rest of the site and Sovereign Homes have bought 376 units, they are not developing them as a separate outlet.</li> <li>Based on the appellant's assumptions about previous completion rates on the site, Crest Nicholson have delivered an average of 70 units per annum. The appellant has therefore applied this average across the next five years and included the remaining units from the Linden controlled land.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 5.2 – 5.10 of the Council's PoE (pages 13 – 15), as well as Appendix E and F.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council considers that as 191 units were completed in the 2021-2022 residential land survey, this indicates that developers are building with a high delivery rate and the council is confident that the site will deliver for the next 4 years.</li> </ul>
0021c	PT17/5847/RM	Land at Harry Stoke	125	0	-125	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.19 – 4.26 of CC's PoE (pages 18 – 20).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site does not have detailed planning permission.</li> <li>The reserved matters application (Application Ref: PT17/5847/RM) was submitted in December 2017 and has still not been approved.</li> <li>During a previous appeal for land south of Gloucester Road, Thornbury, evidence was given in relation to 'severe' physical constraints of this site, including the removal of power lines. As such, the Inspector removed the site from the 5YHLS. It is understood that the applicants are still in discussion regarding this issue.</li> <li>Developer responses on their own is not sufficient evidence to underpin deliverability.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 9.0 – 9.4 of the Council's PoE (page 35), as well as Appendix R.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is part of a joint venture between Crest Nicholson and Sovereign Homes.</li> <li>Negotiations have since restarted and would expect to be completed in 2023.</li> <li>Build out rates provided to us by Crest on 08/08/22 suggest that there are anticipating completions sooner than we had predicated in the 2021 housing trajectory.</li> </ul>
<b>LAND EAST OF HARRY STOKE</b>							
0135a	PT16/4782/O P22/01501/RM	East of Harry Stoke (South of Railway)	55	0	-55	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.31 – 4.33 of CC's PoE (pages 22 and 23).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's evidence to support the inclusion of this site in the December 2021 AMR is extremely limited. This is because at the time that the AMR was produced, no RM application was submitted.</li> <li>A pending RM was submitted after the base date of the AMR for 137 dwellings.</li> <li>There is no written agreement between the developer and LPA with respect to timeframes.</li> <li>There are significant outstanding comments from the transport and landscape officers as well as the Council's urban design officer that suggests a positive outcome is some way away and cannot be assured.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 7.31 – 7.38 (pages 28 and 29) of the Council's evidence and Appendix D.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reserved matters application P22/01501/RM has subsequently been submitted by Crest Nicholson on 9 March 2022 for 137 dwellings.</li> <li>Negotiations with Crest are progressing well and given the onsite infrastructure works and allowing for the determination of the application and discharging of conditions by 2024/25, I consider that it is a reasonable expectation that the Crest Nicholson will be constructing on site by 2025/26. This is also supported by Crest Nicholson's own construction</li> </ul>

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A third party, BoKlok, has also objected to the proposals because they consider it undermines <i>‘the requirement for the East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood...to be comprehensively planned and phased’</i>, because it does not provide sufficient access links.</li> <li>As such, it is considered the Council has provided insufficient evidence to demonstrate the site will deliver in five years.</li> </ul>	projections in Appendix D, which suggest 61 dwellings would be constructed in 2023/24.
0135b	PTI6/4928/O	East of Harry Stoke (North of Railway)	100	0	-100	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.36 – 4.27 of CC’s PoE (page 23 and 24).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site has outline planning permission only. There is no application for reserved matters nor any evidence of progress towards this.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 7.39 – 7.42 of the Council’s PoE (pages 30 – 31).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council now intends to sell their part of the site. It is understood that the sale is at an advanced stage. A reserved matters application is therefore expected to follow in 2023. Allowing for the determination of the reserved matters application in 2023/24, the discharge of any relevant conditions, and given the fact that the site is ‘infrastructure ready’, there would be ample time for the construction of 50 dwellings in 2024/25 and 50 dwellings in 2025/26.</li> </ul>
0135da	P22/02357/F	East of Harry Stoke (Land off Old Gloucester Road, Hambrook)	100	0	-100	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 3.10 – 3.15 of CC’s Rebuttal Evidence (pages 8 and 9), and Appendices 2 and 3 of this document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The application that the Council relies on relates to a site which only partly lies within the development parcels shown in the East of Harry Stoke NN allocation. The remainder of the site is designated as Green Infrastructure within the approved East of Harry Stoke New Neighbourhood Development Framework SPD.</li> <li>There are no comments from the planning policy team which set out whether the application is acceptable or not in respect of a proposal to build on land that is committed as Green Space in the SPD and there are objections from the Council’s highways team, public open space and urban design.</li> <li>The PPA provided in Appendix U of the LPA’s evidence does not provide the Council with an obligation to grant planning permission.</li> <li>As such, the appellant considers there is insufficient evidence that homes will be delivered within five years.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 10.0 – 10.7 of the Council’s PoE (pages 38 – 39).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new application for 92 dwellings has since been made (P22/02357/F) by Taylor Wimpey on land just off Hambrook Lane on the western side of the allocation. It was validated on the 22<sup>nd</sup> April 22 and is currently pending. Negotiations are ongoing. This application is subject to a Planning Performance Agreement which can be found in Appendix U.</li> <li>In addition, application P20/17979/O for up to 80 units was submitted in September 2020 by Waverley Development South West Ltd. This is an outline application with all matters reserved. Negotiations are now at an end point and the application is expected to be determined by the end of the year. This would allow three years for the reserved matters to be discharged and for construction of some dwellings to have taken place by 2025/26. I consider that this is sufficient time to enable this to occur.</li> </ul>
0135d	PTI7/5873/O	East of Harry Stoke (Residual Land)	53	0	-53	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.38 – 4.39 of CC’s PoE (page 24 and 25).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site does not have detailed planning permission at the base date, at the publication of the AMR, nor at the time of writing.</li> <li>There is no clear evidence of progress being made towards an application for reserved matters.</li> <li>As such, the appellant considers there is insufficient evidence that homes will be delivered within five years.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 7.43 – 7.46 of the Council’s PoE (page 32).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taking account of the parcel’s position in an allocated site, it is directly accessible off the Old Gloucester Road and it is known that the site has been out to the market for some time as Council officers have had discussions with interested parties. I anticipate a reserved matters application will be forthcoming by October 2023, and that there would be sufficient time for the application to be determined, and conditions discharged as necessary. This would allow for construction to start in 2025/26 with 53 dwellings being delivered within the five years.</li> </ul>

LAND AT LYDE GREEN FARM						
0036ca	P19/1275/F	Land at Lyde Green Farm	50	0	-50	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.47 of CC's PoE (pages 27 and 28).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The original decision was quashed in the High Court in March 2021.</li> <li>There is no evidence of progress being made towards the approval of the application and no updates have occurred on the Council's website since March 2021.</li> </ul>
						<p>Please refer to paragraphs 8.0 – 8.8 of the Council's PoE (pages 33 and 34).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since March 2021 there have been several meetings and discussions with the applicant (Edward Ware Homes) to resolve the access issue. Also there have been discussions with the applicant and National Highways to ensure that the previously approved access arrangements which extended onto land in the ownership of National Highways are acceptable to National Highways. National Highways are considered the acceptability of the multi-use path being on their land which forms part of the motorway designation. Once National Highways are satisfied with the engineering drawings thereby resolving the issue, the Council will determine the application promptly. As this proposal has previously been approved by the Council, I see no reason why the application ref P19/1275/F should not be approved again with the access arrangement resolved. It is anticipated that this application will be determined later this year.</li> </ul>
LAND AT NORTH YATE						
0133	PK12/1913/O	Land at North Yate	200	0	-200	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.48 – 4.52 of CC's PoE (pages 28 – 30) and paragraphs 3.16 – 3.21 of CC's Rebuttal (pages 9 and 10).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The appellant considers insufficient evidence has been provided with respect to the three pending RM applications by Barratt Homes.</li> <li>The appellant considers that if one applies previous delivery rates by Barratt Homes over the last four years (including the Council's recent completion figures), the average delivery per annum is 80 dwellings. The appellant has therefore reasonably applied this across Barratt's parcels.</li> </ul>
0133ak	P20/16804/RM	Land at North Yate (PL7, 8, 9 & 11)	183	100	-83	
0133an	P21/03161/RM	Land at North Yate (PL19, 20, 28 and 29)	100	40	-60	
						<p>Please see paragraphs 5.18 – 5.32 of the Council's PoE (pages 16 – 18).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thus far, six reserved matters at North Yate are completely built out which have a combined total of 730 units. There are also ten permissioned reserved matters applications, the majority of which are currently under construction and have seen completions.</li> <li>A further three reserved matter applications are currently working their way through the development management process and will likely start building as soon as approved.</li> </ul>
						Please see the Council's 5YHLS addendum.
						Please see the Council's 5YHLS addendum.

0133af	P21/04892/RM	Land at North Yate (PL15a, PL16)	106	18	-88	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 3.22 – 3.25 of CC’s Rebuttal Evidence (pages 10 and 11).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The appellant considers that the completion rates provided by the Council appear to be incorrect, based on aerial imagery (figure 7 of CC rebuttal).</li> <li>Accordingly, dwellings have been removed from the supply to account for the remainder that were likely to have been completed before April 2021.</li> </ul>	Please see the Council’s 5YHLS addendum.
0133al	P21/02473/RM	Land at North Yate – PL15c and PL16	157	105	-52	<p>Please see paragraph 3.28 of CC’s Rebuttal Evidence (page 12).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that Taylor Wimpey are not advertising this site on their website and works at yet to start, it seems unrealistic that there will be 52 completions before April 2023. The appellant has therefore adjusted the figures accordingly to reflect the anticipated first recorded deliveries in 2023-24.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see paragraphs 5.29 – 5.32 of the Council’s PoE (pages 18 – 19).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This application for 157 dwellings was lodged by Taylor Wimpey in March 2021 and approved by the Council on 11/03/2022.</li> <li>Since publishing the 2021 Housing Trajectory the Council has received a new developer form from Taylor Wimpey which can be found in Appendix H although the figures are different to those shown in the table below, the units all due to finish within the 5-year period and thus the Council maintains its position for this site.</li> </ul>
<b>CRIBBS / PATCHWAY NN</b>							
0134aa	P21/04349/RM	Land at Cribbs Causeway (Berwick Green / Haw Wood)	162	125	-37	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.66 – 4.67 of CC’s PoE (page 34) and paragraphs 3.31 – 3.32 of Rebuttal Evidence (page 13).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bellway Homes have confirmed the site will ‘launch’ in Winter 2022. Accordingly, given that it is now October 2022, it is unrealistic to assume that 37 will be completed before April 2023.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see paragraphs 5.33 – 5.39 of the Council’s PoE (pages 19 and 20), as well as Appendix I.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The infrastructure works commenced in Autumn 2021 and are ongoing, with completion of these works expected by Autumn 2022. Once the infrastructure works are complete, housebuilding will be able to commence.</li> <li>Email confirmation of the build out rates from Bellway shown in the table below can be found in Appendix I.</li> </ul>
0134ab	P21/04748/RM	Parcels 14 – 19 Land at Cribbs Causeway	244	100	-144	<p>Please see paragraphs 4.68 – 4.69 of the appellant’s PoE (pages 34 and 35).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a pending RM application which was submitted in July 2021 (Application Ref: P21/04748/RM) which is still pending permission.</li> <li>A suite of recently revised plans have been submitted to address officer concerns and it is considered reasonable that some dwellings are included in the 5YHLS.</li> <li>The appellant has used UK average delivery rates (i.e. 50 dwellings per annum) and pushed back the trajectory to account for the timescales associated with the approval of the RM, discharge of conditions and infrastructure works on site.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see paragraphs 9.5 – 9.9 of the Council’s PoE (page 19).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application P21/0478/RM for 244 dwellings was submitted in July 2021 by Taylor Wimpey. The application has been the subject of discussions between the applicant and the Council, and these are at an advanced stage. The application will be determined later in 2022.</li> <li>A deliverability form can be found in Appendix V.</li> </ul>
0134b	PT12/1930/O	Cribbs / Patchway NN – Wyck Beck Road / Fishpool Hill	100	-100	-100	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.70 of the appellant’s PoE (page 35).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site does not have detailed planning permission at the base date, at the time of the publication of the AMR, nor at the time of writing.</li> <li>There is no evidence of progress being made towards an application for reserved matters.</li> <li>The appellant considers insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate deliverability of these dwellings.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 7.7 – 7.11 (pages 23 and 24) of the Council’s PoE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The outline application was approved subject to a s106 obligation, and the approval was issued in July 2020.</li> </ul>

0134ba	P21/05421/RM	Land at Wyck Beck Road and Fishpool Hill	235	136	-99	<p>Please see paragraph 3.33 and figure 10 of the appellant's rebuttal (page 13 and 14).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the evidence provided by the Council (Appendix T of their PoE) which also reflects national delivery rates and other empirical evidence, I have revised the trajectory accordingly.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see paragraphs 9.10 – 9.13 of the Council's PoE and Appendix T (page 37).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Groundworks are currently being carried out on site by Persimmon and the application will be determined later in 2022. It is considered that this site will commence building houses in 2023.</li> <li>Persimmon sent us their buildout projects for the reserved matters on 14/10/2022 which are attached in Appendix T. The extract from the 2020/2021 Housing Trajectory reflects these figures.</li> </ul>
0134c	P22/05223/RM	Cribbs/Patchway Former Filton Airfield	300	0	-300	<p>Please see paragraphs 4.72 – 4.73 (pages 36 and 37) of CC's PoE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council's evidence presented at the time of the publication of the 2021 AMR is extremely limited. This is because there was no RM application at this time.</li> <li>The appellant considers that there is still limited evidence to confirm that the site will deliver homes within five years.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see paragraphs 7.21 – 7.30 (pages 25 – 28) of the Council's PoE and Appendix Q.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a pending RM application for 399 units (222 flats and 107 houses) which was validated on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2022 (Application Ref: P22/05223/RM).</li> </ul>
0251	P20/21983/F	University of the West of England – Phase 1	270	0	-270	<p>Please see paragraphs 4.80 – 4.87 (pages 39 – 41) of the appellant's PoE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The appellant contends that the authority has not provided evidence to demonstrate that general market housing will be released into South Gloucestershire.</li> </ul>	<p>Please see paragraphs 6.0 – 6.13 of the Council's PoE (pages 21 and 22) and Appendices K, L, M, and N.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A2:5 ratio has been applied to the figure to ensure we are counting the development within the NPPF guidelines for C2 shared accommodation and thus the figure in our housing trajectory anticipates a total of 270 units. A technical note explaining the calculation can be found at Appendix K.</li> <li>UWE has also provided the Council with a letter confirming that they do not have any plans for a significant increase in the overall student numbers in the current planning period. This can be found at Appendix M.</li> </ul>
0252	P20/10080/F	Block B Cheswick Village	37	0	-37		

**Sites which do not need to be discussed at the Inquiry but require adjustment in the trajectory:**

- 0135aa: East of Harry Stoke South of Railway – +2 dwellings to account for correct numbers.
- 0256: The Hoodlands, Hambrook Lane – it is agreed to remove 50 dwellings from the supply.
- 0036az: Parcel 30 Emersons Green East – it is agreed to remove 5 dwellings from the supply.
- 0226: Watermore Junior School, Lower Stone Close – it is agreed to remove 22 dwellings from the supply.
- 0227: Cleve Park, Thornbury – it is agreed to remove 14 dwellings from the supply.
- It is agreed a further 66 units can be included within the supply for small sites delivery.

**Other Notes:**

- The appellant is no longer challenging the inclusion of Parcel 0133ah in the supply.
- The appellant is no longer challenging the inclusion of dwellings in 0035 in the supply.