

Bath and North East Somerset

Schedule of Rolling Changes to the Draft Core Strategy for consideration by the Inspector

February 2012

**Bath & North East
Somerset Council**



Bath and North East Somerset
Local Development Framework

Introduction

Set out in the table below are suggested changes to the draft Core Strategy that are being put forward as part of the Examination Hearings process. They have arisen out of consideration of comments made by the Inspector and objectors on the Core Strategy and through discussion at the Examination Hearings. If the Inspector considers that these changes are needed to overcome concerns about soundness of the Submission Core Strategy, they will need to be formally considered by the Council in due course and subject to consultation after the Hearings. As such it should be noted that all changes set out in this schedule are informal at this stage. They are being published and comments invited by the Inspector from interested parties.

For suggested change number 16 (relating to policy B1, section 8) the Council has suggested three alternative approaches all of which are considered to be sound. The Council's preferred approach is identified in the schedule below.

Please note that deletions to existing text are shown as ~~strike through~~ and additional text is shown as underlined.

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
1	20	Objective 5	Amend first bullet point of objective 5 to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enabling the delivery of new homes needed to respond to expected demographic and social changes and <u>as far as possible</u> to support the labour supply to meet our economic development objectives 	Change arising from the Hearings.
2	19	Paragraph 1.26	Amend first sentence of paragraph 1.26 as follows: The Core Strategy makes provision for around 11,000 <u>11,500</u> new homes and around 8,700 new jobs.	Change arising from BNES/26
3	19	Paragraph 1.31	Amend paragraph 1.31 by adding a sentence at the end of the paragraph: <u>The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan in order to address minor anomalies or other necessary minor</u>	Change arising from Hearings and representations

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<u>adjustments. Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed.</u>	
4	19	Paragraph 1.33	Amend first sentence of paragraph 1.33 as follows: The scale of new homes entails a significant uplift in past rates of delivery from around 380 to around 550 <u>575</u> per annum although as set out in the SHLAA, the overall trajectory of provision is determined by the performance of individual locations.	Change arising from BNES/26
5	20	Policy DW1	Amend Policy DW1 by inserting the following clause between existing clauses 5 and 6 (to be renumbered in the final version of the Core Strategy): <u>'Protecting, conserving and enhancing the district's nationally and locally important cultural and historic assets'</u>	Change arising from English Heritage's representations (see BNES/18)
6	20	Policy DW1, clause 2:	2: Making provision for a net increase of 8,700 jobs and <u>11,500</u> homes between 2006 and 2026, of which around 3,400 <u>3,000</u> affordable homes will be delivered through the planning system.	Changes arising from BNES/26 and BNES/2.
7	20	Policy DW1, clause 4	4: retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt within B&NES with no strategic change to the boundaries	Change arising from Hearings and representations
8	20	Policy DW1	Delete final sentence and insert new wording to confirm that whilst there is flexibility within the Western Corridor and MoD sites to respond to changing circumstances, this does not amount to these areas being contingency locations. <u>There is flexibility within the plan to respond to changing circumstances. In relation to the Western Corridor and MoD Sites in Bath the evidence base to the Core</u>	Arising from discussion at hearings re correct use of the term 'contingency'. SHLAA floorspace capacity figures used for sites in Central

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<u>Strategy reflects conservative urban capacity assumptions. The Placemaking Plan DPD will refine these assumptions.</u>	Area and BWR East are based on a 20% reduction against technical recommendation.
9		Policy DW1 (Last paragraph only)	Add to Policy DW1: <u>The Core Strategy will be reviewed around every five years and changes made to ensure that both:</u> a. <u>the objectives are being achieved particularly the delivery of the housing and work space targets set out in Table 9; and</u> b. <u>the Core Strategy is planning for the most appropriate growth targets, particularly housing and employment space/jobs.</u>	BNES/24
10	21	Diagram 4	Remove notation for Policy RA1 villages	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)
11	21	Diagram 4	Amend number of homes figure for Bath from 6,000 to 6,500	Change arising from BNES/26
12	21	Diagram 4	Amend urban area of Bath/Green Belt in the vicinity of Odd Down so that it more accurately illustrates the general extent of the Green Belt (to show the park & ride site and adjoining land within the Green Belt)	Change arising from Hearings and representations
13	34	Policy B1(1)to	Amend Policy B1(1) to read: 1. 'Natural and Built Environment	Change arising from English Heritage's representations (see BNES/18)

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			Protect, conserve, and where possible <u>appropriate</u> , enhance:’	
14	34	Policy B1	Insert the following text after Objective 1 in Policy B1: <u>‘All of the following objectives will be considered in the context of part 1 of this policy.’</u>	Change arising from English Heritage’s representations (see BNES/18)
15		Policy B1(3)	(a) Enable the development of <u>at least</u> 6,000 new homes within the city, increasing the overall stock of housing by 15% from 40,000 to 46,000.	To reflect that SHLAA identified supply is 6000-6,500 and intent to count off-campus student cluster flats towards supply.
16	35	Policy B1. 8 (b)	Amends PC19: (b) Enable the development of a new stadium and associated uses within the Central Area <u>(b) Adjoining the Central Area, at the Recreation Ground, and subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints, enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure arena. Associated uses may be acceptable but will be considered on their merits.</u> or; <u>(b) Adjoining the Central Area enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure arena, taking into account any unique legal issues and constraints. Associated uses may be acceptable but will be considered on their merits.</u> or; <u>(b) Enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure arena, taking into</u>	Change made in response to ID/24 and arising from discussion at the Hearings. Of the three approaches set out the Council’s preferred change is the first one. The alternative approaches are presented in order to enable the Inspector to be made aware of the full range of participant’s views. Further explanation of the change is set out in notes at the foot of this schedule.

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p><u>account any unique legal issues and constraints. Associated uses may be acceptable but will be considered on their merits.</u></p>	
17	33,37, 38,39	Diagrams 5,6 7 and & 8(i)	<p>Amend Central Area boundary so that it follows the riverside walk along the eastern riverside walk (outer bend) of the River Avon (between North Parade and Pulteney Bridge, rather than encompassing the Recreation Ground/North Parade Road.</p>	<p>Response to ID/24</p> <p>Following the outer bend follows the existing approach for the Central Area as one that seeks to embrace the riverside and the interaction of people and development with it.</p> <p>Any concern that the delineation of the Central Area along the eastern bank of the river, would, in this location, bring with it the possibility of a wide range of commercial uses (identified within Policy B2) along the river frontage is unfounded.</p>

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
				Any 'arena' type development at the Recreation Ground in the context of Policy B1 (b) could (at the interface of the Rec and the riverside) bring associated uses. These may be acceptable but will be considered on their merits.
18	38	Paragraph 2.16	The Central Area of Bath lies at the heart of the World Heritage site <u>and much of it lies within the Bath Conservation Area.</u> † The Central Area comprises the city centre and neighbouring locations at South Quays and Western Riverside East to the south and east. <u>A key objective of the plan is for the city centre to expand to encompass the entire Central Area. The precise extend of the city centre boundary is identified on the Proposals Map. This boundary will be reviewed every 5 years based on observable change.</u>	Accuracy & clarity
19	40	Policy B2/3	(f)The Recreation Ground and Leisure Centre	Response to ID/24
20	40	Policy B2/4	Deletes PC28: (h) a new sports stadium with associated uses including conferencing and banqueting facilities and active riverside frontage <u>(h) Existing uses within the Central Area that remain compatible with its future role and the scope and scale of change envisaged for it, should, where appropriate, be reincorporated as part of redevelopment proposals, unless this is not viable or would significantly reduce the capacity of the Central Area to accommodate jobs</u>	At the hearings concern was expressed that the second part of Policy GDS.1/B1 no longer applied to the Central Area and BWR East and only to the Western Riverside Zone. This is not the case as (despite the name changes to various land

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p><u>or housing development. In such circumstances reasonable efforts should be made to ensure such uses are relocated elsewhere.</u></p>	<p>parcels in this area) GDS.1/B1 still overlays BWR East as part of the Central Area.</p> <p>However, for clarity a change is proposed which extends the principle in the second part of GDS.1/B1 to the entire Central Area. The emphasis here is on land uses and mixed used development rather than specific businesses and the approach does not favour leaseholders over landowners. The ending of a lease for a specific business is commercial reality, whereas the desirability of creating appropriate mixed use environments is a key planning matter.</p> <p>See also changes 16 & 17 above.</p>
21	47	Policy B3 (4)	<p><i>Delete existing clause 4 (as proposed to be change by PC33) and replace with</i></p> <p>(a) <u>Newbridge Riverside will be retained for industrial type uses.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Twerton Riverside is prioritised for a range of economic-led development</u></p>	<p>Arising from consensus reached by participants at Hearings that this area should remain prioritised for economic</p>

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p><u>uses. Such uses should not undermine the delivery of development within, or the role of, the Central Area or neighbouring district /local centres. Complimentary residential development will be acceptable subject to evidence that this area (or part thereof) is no longer required for economic development purposes.</u></p>	<p>development uses.</p> <p>This area provides flexibility (in addition to Newbridge Riverside) for the relocation of uses from within Western Riverside and the Central Area in order to unlock a higher intensity of development in these later areas.</p> <p>Given, that Twerton Riverside provides 'flexibility', that flexibility may not be required hence why non-economic development uses can also be envisaged. Further, wholly developing this area for economic development uses could (subject to the nature and quantity of the use) conflict with sequential objectives and negatively impact the delivery of space in more central locations.</p>
22	48	Paragraph 2.22	<p>Ministry of Defence of Land Within Bath's outer neighbourhoods the Ministry of Defence occupy three sites, at Foxhill (<u>Odd Down</u>), Ensleigh (<u>Lansdown</u>), and Warminster Road (<u>Bathwick</u>). <u>Together the sites amount to some 36ha in area. In July 2011 it was confirmed that</u></p>	<p>Update to supporting text to reflect MoD/ Defence Estates Statement on Issue 2 re certainty about Ensleigh,</p>

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p><u>all MoD personnel would be relocated (mostly to Abbeywood, Bristol) by March 2013 and that the sites would then be disposed of. It is anticipated that Warminster Road and Foxhill will become surplus to requirements within the next few five years as the MoD consolidates its operations at Enslough Abbey Wood, Bristol. It is also likely that the majority, if not all, of Enslough will be vacated. Drawing on the The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies that these sites can deliver well in excess of 1,000 new homes. Drawing on this strategic assessment the Placemaking Plan will consider refine the optimum housing capacity of these sites and consider their overall prospects for these sites in more detail, including the scope for business space and measures to enable sustainable travel to the city centre and local centres. For the purposes of the Core Strategy it is sufficient to highlight their suitability and availability for redevelopment and to observe that delivery by 2026 is an achievable proposition. The Placemaking Plan may reveal that a higher level of development here is appropriate than could be evidenced during the preparation of the Core Strategy.</u></p>	<p>confirmation of timetable for disposal and position on capacity.</p>
23	52	Paragraph 2.32	<p>Amend paragraph 2.32 to read as follows: The setting of the WHS, beyond its designated boundary, is important as inappropriate development here can impact upon the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. The setting is the surroundings in which the World Heritage Site is experienced. It includes a range of elements such as views and historical, landscape and cultural relationships and has no fixed defined boundary. In relation to the protection of the setting, the World Heritage Site Setting Study provides the information needed to assess whether a proposed development falls within the setting, and whether it will have a harmful impact. The Study is being taken forward as a Supplementary Planning Document. A formal buffer zone is not considered to be appropriate, as the assessment framework within the Setting Study presents a</p>	<p>Change arising from Hearings and representations</p>

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p>'smarter' tool, offering the same degree of protection. <u>The Green Belt, which closely surrounds the city, also plays an important role in protecting the setting of the WHS (see its purposes which are summarised in table 8). The general extent of the Green Belt is retained by the Core Strategy and its openness is protected from inappropriate development.</u></p>	
24	54	Policy B5	<p>Bath Spa University – Newton Park Campus Within the context of a strategic framework for all twelve sites that the University occupies <u>the University's entire estate</u> the strategy seeks the redevelopment and intensification of the Newton Park campus to provide additional study bedrooms and academic space. Proposals should seek to optimise opportunities within the existing Major Existing Developed Sites in The Green Belt in accordance with Policy GB.3 of the BANES Local Plan <u>Major Existing Developed Site (MEDS) designations</u> before seeking to justify very special circumstances for development beyond # them or a change to the MEDS boundaries. <u>In all circumstances regard should be had to the sites environmental capacity, the significance of heritage assets and the optimum development of the campus in this regard. The Placemaking Plan DPD will review the MEDS boundaries and determine whether there are exceptional circumstances that justify a change.</u></p>	<p>Change relating to environmental capacity and significance of heritage assets arising from English Heritage's representations (see BNES/18). Wording in BNES/18 slightly amended following response to issues raised in other representations. Other changes regarding review of MEDS boundaries in the Placemaking Plan made in response to representations. Clarification that Bath Spa University Newton Park campus is covered by two separate MEDS designations.</p>
25	56	Paragraph 2.44	<p>Further amends PC51 The Council's Ttransport Sstrategy for Bath is one of reducing the use of cars for travelling to and within the city, by progressing improvements to public transport and making walking or cycling within the city the preferred option for short trips.</p>	<p>Additional changes in response to objection from FoBRA. Change relating to specifying</p>

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p>This will be achieved through a variety of measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bath Transport Package – comprising a range of measures including three extended Park & Ride sites; upgrading nine bus routes to showcase standard including upgrades to bus stop infrastructure and variable message signs on key routes into the city displaying information about car parking availability • Improvements to the bus network through the Greater Bristol Bus Network major scheme including key routes from Bristol and Midsomer Norton, • Rail improvements, such as the electrification of Great Western Railway mainline by 2016; the new 15 year GWR franchise (including the Greater Bristol Metro Project); and increasing the capacity of local rail services travelling through Bath Spa rail station, improving ease of access to and attractiveness of rail travel to and from Bath • The West of England authorities (including B&NES) have been awarded Local Sustainable Transport Fund key component funding for a number of measures and also been invited by the Department for Transport to submit a major bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund for £25.5 million • Creating a more pedestrian and cyclist-friendly city centre through the introduction of access changes on a number of streets and expansion and enhancement of pedestrian areas. • Other improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure through the Councils Integrated Transport annual settlement and the implementation of ‘Smarter Choices’ for transport e.g. Proposed Change Reason for change through the development of travel plans for new and existing sites and the expansion of car clubs 	<p>the measures being taken to reduce HGV through traffic responds to the fact that HGV's (including buses) is responsible for 54.7% of nitrogen oxides on London Road.</p>

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>seeking to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels in Bath by, for example, reducing the level of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic in the city through:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) <u>the continued support & promotion of the Council's Freight Consolidation Centre for deliveries to central Bath; and</u> ii) <u>by implementing an experimental weight restriction to remove through HGV traffic (of greater than 18 tonnes) from London Road.</u> • <u>Creation of one or more Park & Ride sites on the eastern side of the city to reduce commuter traffic</u> 	
26	38	Diagram 7	Amend notation Central Area – City Centre (<i>indicative boundary only - detailed boundary is shown on the Proposals Map</i>)	To improve clarity (see BNES/7, 6.1.2)
27	68	Paragraph 3.19(a)	Amend 3.19(a) to read: ‘English Heritage currently considers the historic characteristics of the town centre Conservation Area to be are currently undermined ‘at risk’ due to by unsympathetic post-war development, resulting in damage to the historic grain and character, loss of traditional shop fronts and loss of small building frontages and therefore on the national Heritage at Risk Register.’	Change arising from English Heritage’s representations (see BNES/18)
28	80	Diagram 15	Remove notation for Policy RA1 villages	Response to Inspector’s questions 8.2 and 8.3 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
	93	Paragraph 5.12	<p>Although rural Bath & North East Somerset is made up of a wide variety of settlements with locally distinctive character, there are a number of strategic issues (both challenges and opportunities) that are common across most of the rural area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of affordable housing to meet local needs may impact on the social sustainability of the rural areas and exacerbate difficulties for an ageing population. • For much of the rural area poor access to public transport affects the functionality of the rural economy and leads to isolation for those without access to private transport. • Access to facilities, services and shops. • Reliance of the rural economy based on farming, the self employed and small businesses that require support to flourish. • <u>The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business</u> • Potential opportunities to diversify the rural economy e.g. centred around local food production or renewable energy. 	Change arising through Hearings to clarify broadband is a strategic issue for the Rural Areas
29	95	Diagram 18	<p>Amends PC72.</p> <p>Remove notation for Policy RA1 villages</p> <p>Amend title to key on Diagram 18:</p> <p>Indicative Policy RA1 Villages <u>Rural Villages</u></p>	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)
30	96	Paragraph 5.17	<p>Amends FPC3</p> <p>A number of villages have been identified <u>There are a number of villages</u> where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to facilities and public transport is best 	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 in ID/7 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is capacity for development • there is community support for some small scale development <p>These villages are to be the focus for new small scale development under Policy RA1.</p>	
31	96	Paragraph 5.18	<p>Amends FPC4</p> <p>The villages which currently meet these criteria set out in policy RA1 and that have some capacity for development are: Batheaston, Bishop Sutton, Farmborough, Temple Cloud, Timsbury and Whitchurch. These villages are shown on the diagram 18. This indicative list of villages may be subject to change over the lifetime of the Core Strategy. It will be formally reviewed as part of will be included in the review of the Core Strategy and consideration will be given to any demonstrated change of circumstances against the criteria in the interim. Local community support for the principle of development is demonstrated by the views of the Parish Council as the locally elected representative of those communities or through alternative mechanisms introduced in the Localism Bill.</p>	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 in ID/7 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)
32	96	Paragraph 5.19	<p>The inclusion of Farmborough in this list is subject to provision of a sustainable transport link to local shopping facilities. Paulton and Peasedown St John are not identified in this list. This is <u>In</u> accordance with the Spatial Strategy for the Somer Valley (Policy SV1) <u>Paulton and Peasedown St John are not considered under the rural areas strategy</u>. A significant level of residential development is already committed at Paulton and Peasedown St John and the strategy does not make additional provision for housing.</p>	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 in ID/7 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
33	96	Paragraph 5.20	Policy RA1 should be considered alongside Core Policy CP8 Green Belt. Proposals for development that adjoin housing development boundaries in the Green Belt will therefore not be acceptable unless very special circumstances for development can be demonstrated.	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 in ID/7 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)
34	96	Paragraph 5.21	Amends FM9 The 250 additional dwellings to be accommodated within the rural areas under the District-wide spatial strategy will be distributed as appropriate with small scale housing developments of up to and around 30 dwellings at each of the villages which meet the criteria referred to in paragraph 5.17 (see of Policy RA1). This will be considered in more detail through the Placemaking Plan <u>in conjunction with Parish Councils as the locally elected representatives of their communities</u> . The Housing Development Boundaries shown on the Proposals Map (saved from the existing Local Plan) will also be reviewed as part of the Placemaking Plan <u>to incorporate the sites identified. Sites identified in adopted Neighbourhood Plans that adjoin the housing development boundary of villages meeting the criteria of Policy RA1 will also be appropriate and these may come forward for inclusion as a part of the Placemaking Plan or subsequent to it.</u>	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 in ID/7 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)
35	96	Policy RA1	POLICY RA1 Development in the villages meeting the listed criteria Proposals <u>at the villages outside the Green Belt</u> for residential and employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable <u>within</u> in and adjoining the housing development boundary provided the proposal is in accordance with the spatial strategy for the District set out under policy DW1 and the village has:	Response to Inspector's questions 8.2 and 8.3 in ID/7 to clarify policy RA1 (see BNES/9)

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p>a: at least 3 of the following key facilities within the village: post office, school, community meeting place and convenience shop, and</p> <p>b: at least a daily Monday-Saturday public transport service to main centres, and</p> <p>c: local community support for the principle of development can be demonstrated.</p> <p><u>At the villages which meet these criteria, development sites will also be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary will be reviewed accordingly to enable delivery of the 800 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals at villages outside the Green Belt for employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within and adjoining the housing development boundary.</u></p>	
36	110	Paragraph 5.43	Key transport infrastructure improvements that will support delivery of the strategy include the Greater Bristol Bus Network major scheme which will <u>has improved</u> two of the bus routes serving the rural areas.	Change arising through Hearings to factually update text
37	104	Paragraph 6.01	The spatial strategies set out in the place based sections cover the different areas of the District. There are also a number of generic issues which need to be addressed through district-wide policies in order to implement the vision and spatial objectives. As well as providing the long term policy framework for the District, they will support the delivery of development and corporate actions, and they will guide the content of other policies in the Local Development Framework such as the Placemaking Plan. <u>After each of the core policies the main planning mechanisms by which the Council will seek to deliver the policy are set out. The delivery section is</u>	Change arising through the Hearings for clarification.

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change										
			<u>not part of the relevant core policy.</u>											
38	106	Policy CP1	Add the text below at the end of the policy: <u>The policy will be supported by the Council's Sustainable Construction and Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document</u>	Change arising through the Hearings.										
39	106	Delivery section related to policy CP1	Amend point 2 to state: <i>2 This policy will provide a basis for Development Management and should will be supported by more detailed supplementary policy <u>the Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document</u>. The Sustainable Construction Checklist will be updated to include a section on sustainable refurbishment to raise awareness of the measures recommended in retrofitting existing buildings</i>	Change arising from the Hearings										
40	106	Delivery section related to policy CP1	Amend point 4 to state: <i>4 Signposting of retrofitting information including Government financial initiatives and schemes, public awareness and demonstration events can <u>will</u> also be provided by the Council.</i>	Change arising from the Hearings										
41	107	Policy CP2	Amend the table in policy CP2 as follows: <table border="1" data-bbox="622 1114 1709 1391"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of development</th> <th>201-2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2019</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Residential Development</td> <td>Code for Sustainable Homes Code 3 (in full)</td> <td>Code for Sustainable Homes code 4 (in full)</td> <td>Code for Sustainable Homes Code 6 (in full i.e.</td> <td>n/a</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of development	201-2012	2013	2016	2019	Residential Development	Code for Sustainable Homes Code 3 (in full)	Code for Sustainable Homes code 4 (in full)	Code for Sustainable Homes Code 6 (in full i.e.	n/a	Change arising from the Hearings
Type of development	201-2012	2013	2016	2019										
Residential Development	Code for Sustainable Homes Code 3 (in full)	Code for Sustainable Homes code 4 (in full)	Code for Sustainable Homes Code 6 (in full i.e.	n/a										

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change					Reason for change
						zero-carbon) <u>Government Zero Carbon Standard for Homes</u>		
			Non-Residential				BREEAM Excellent (to include zero carbon)	
42	117	Policy CP6(1)	<p>Amend Policy CP6(1) to read:</p> <p>1. High Quality Design</p> <p>The distinctive quality, character and diversity of Bath and North East Somerset's environmental assets will be promoted, protected, conserved or enhanced through:</p> <p>a: high quality and inclusive design <u>of schemes, including transport infrastructure</u>, which reinforces and contributes to its specific local context, creating attractive, inspiring and safe place.</p> <p>b: <u>assessing</u> all major development schemes with a residential component should be assessed using the Building for Life design assessment tool (or equivalent methodology). As a guide development should meet its “good” standard.</p>					<p>1(a) Change arising from English Heritage’s representations (see BNES/18)</p> <p>1(b) change to amend grammatical error</p>
43	117	Policy CP6(2)	<p>Amend Policy CP6(2) to read:</p> <p>2. Historic Environment</p> <p>The cultural and historic environment will be preserved or enhanced, and sites, buildings, areas and features of recognised national and local importance and</p>					Change arising from English Heritage’s representations (see BNES/18)

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p>their settings will be protected.</p> <p><u>The sensitive management of Bath & North East Somerset's outstanding cultural and historic environment is a key component in the delivery of sustainable development. The Council will protect, conserve and seek opportunities to enhance the historic environment including the character and setting of designated and other heritage assets.</u></p> <p><u>The sensitive reuse and adaptation of historic buildings and spaces will be supported, and in areas where regeneration is required the imaginative integration of new development with the historic environment will be promoted.</u></p> <p>Where development has a demonstrable public benefit, including mitigating and adapting to climate change, this benefit will be weighed against any harm to the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p><u>The Council will continue to develop strategies and guidance which ensure the historic environment and its significance is understood, recorded, promoted and enjoyed, and is sensitively and proactively managed, including those historic assets most under threat. A positive and proactive conservation strategy will be promoted through the Placemaking Plan.</u></p>	
44	117	Policy CP6 Delivery	<p>Delivery: Historic Environment</p> <p>Delivery will be principally through the Development Management process. And Conservation Area Appraisals and other supplementary planning documents and guidance will be <u>prepared and used</u> to guide decisions on development proposals that affect the historic environment. Working in partnership with bodies such as English Heritage, Mendip Hills and Cotswolds AONB Services and local groups;</p>	Change arising from English Heritage's representations (see BNES/18)

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p>and with conservation, archaeology and landscape experts will also be necessary to ensure effective delivery of the policy. The preparation of management plans and other <u>positive and proactive strategies will be encouraged-developed</u> to support policy delivery. <u>The strategy for the historic environment will include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>maintaining and applying an up-to-date and available Historic Environment Record and evidence base</u> - <u>producing and promoting guidance that will encourage good practice such as the World Heritage Site Setting SPD, Retrofitting & Sustainable Construction SPD and Bath Building Heights Strategy SPD</u> - <u>working with partners to resolve long standing high profile heritage assets at risk (including The Wansdyke and Cleveland Pool in Bath)</u> - <u>reducing the volume of traffic using historic streets and spaces (see paragraph 6.103) by implementing the Bath Public Realm and Movement Strategy</u> - <u>seeking to ensure that Conservation Area Appraisals and management plans are kept up-to-date</u> - <u>implementing the World Heritage Site Management Plan</u> - <u>ensure the Bath Urban Archaeological Assessment is used to inform management strategies and SPDs</u> - <u>conserving significance heritage features via the Green Infrastructure Strategy</u> - <u>consideration of the preparation of a 'local list' to ensure non-designated assets are sustained and conserved</u> - <u>consideration of use of Article 4 Directions as one measure for resolving conservation issues when appropriate</u> - <u>Seek contributions from development, where appropriate, to support the delivery of the above.</u> 	

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
45	120	Paragraph 6.63	<p>Amend paragraph 6.63 by adding the following text at the end of the paragraph:</p> <p><u>The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES. The detailed boundaries will be reviewed through the Placemaking Plan.</u></p>	Change arising from discussion at the hearings and consideration of representation.
46	120	Paragraph 6.64	<p>Amends FPC10</p> <p>In light of the opportunities for development in the plan period, <u>most of the urban area of Keynsham continues to be excluded from the Green Belt and an Inset boundary is defined on the Proposals Map. There are a number of villages which meet the requirements of national policy in PPG2 'Green Belts' paragraph 2.11 and continue to be insets within the Green Belt as established in the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan. These villages are those which are the most sustainable villages in the Green Belt rural locations for accommodating some limited new development in the plan period under the provisions of either policy RA1 where the criteria are met, or where not, policy RA2.</u> The Inset boundaries will be reviewed through the Placemaking Plan and through Neighbourhood Planning. Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for any changes to the Inset boundaries to be made. Some sites may come forward in the Green Belt under the Government's proposals for Community Right to Build.</p>	Response to Inspector's question 8.4 in ID/7 (see BNES/9)
47	120	Paragraph 6.64a	<p><u>Within the Green Belt a number of Major Existing Developed Sites (MEDS) are defined on the Proposals Map. Within the MEDS policy GB.3 in the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan allows for limited redevelopment or infill which does not harm the openness of the Green Belt or affect the purposes of including land within it. The Council will be reviewing the designated MEDS and the site boundaries through the Placemaking Plan.</u></p>	Change arising from the Hearings to clarify scope of Placemaking Plan.

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
48	121	Paragraph 6.69 footnote	¹ 'A guide to minerals safeguarding in England', BGS (2007) <u>'BGS/Coal Authority Guide to Minerals Safeguarding in England 2011'</u>	Factual change: footnote to paragraph 6.69 amended to correctly refer to updated guidance in response to The Coal Authority's request (response to Proposed Changes 19 October 2011)
49	123	Policy CP9 Large sites	Amend Large Sites paragraph to read: Large Sites Affordable housing will be required as on-site provision in developments of 10 dwellings or 0.5 hectare (whichever is the lower <u>threshold applies</u>) and above. An average affordable housing percentage of 35% will be sought on these large development sites. This is on a grant free basis with the presumption that on site provision is expected.	Change arising from the Hearings
50	123	Policy CP9 Viability	Amend Viability paragraph to read: Viability For both large and small sites the viability of the proposed development should be taken into account, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the site is likely to have market values materially above or below the average for the district • Whether grant or other public subsidy is available • Whether there are exceptional build or other development costs • The achievement of other planning objectives • The tenure and size mix of the affordable housing to be provided 	Change arising from the Hearings

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			A higher (up to 45%) proportion of affordable housing may be sought or provision below the average of 35% may be accepted.	
51	123	Policy CP9 Other	Other All affordable housing delivered through this policy should remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, <u>in the event of any sales or staircasing affecting affordable housing unit(s) delivered through CP9 then an arrangement will be made to recycle the receipts/subsidy for the provision of new alternative affordable housing located elsewhere within Bath and North East Somerset.</u> Affordable Housing should be integrated within a development and should not be distinguishable from market housing.	Response to Inspector's question 11.9 in ID/7 (see BNES/12)
52	124	Policy CP10	Add the following text to the end of policy CP10: <u>The specific accommodation needs of older people will be addressed through the Placemaking Plan, including considering the allocation of appropriate sites.</u>	Change arising from the Hearings.
53		Paragraph 7.05	Paragraph 7.05 The Core Strategy is anticipated to be reviewed about every 5 years after its adoption. The review process will commence around 2 to 3 years in advance of the review date in order to enable the timely and considered preparation and adoption of revised policies. New paragraph 7.05a: <u>Delivery</u> <u>If, after the first 5 years following adoption, monitoring demonstrates that the planned housing provision, including affordable housing, is not being delivered at the levels expected and there would be no reasonable prospect of the delivery of 11,500 homes to 2026, then the review of the Core Strategy will entail changes to</u>	Initial change in response to Inspector's question 2.16 in ID/7 (see BNES/5). Further changes to this wording set out in BNES/24.

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<p><u>rectify the housing shortfall taking account of the impact of the performance of the economy on the need for housing. This will include implementing the contingencies referred to in paragraph 1.36 of the Core Strategy but may also include changes to the spatial strategy if required.</u></p> <p>New paragraph 7.05b: <u>Review of growth targets</u></p> <p><u>The Council will also monitor economic growth rates, to assess whether targets being planned continue to be appropriate. If required that Council we agree revised targets and make any necessary changes to the spatial strategy to meet the new targets</u></p> <p>New Paragraph 7.05c (to include some text formerly in paragraph 7.05): <u>Duty to Co-operate</u></p> <p><u>These reviews will be undertaken in co-operation with neighbouring authorities, particularly in the West of England in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate to ensure that cross-boundary issues are addressed. This will to include a review of the plan period. The timetable for preparing other Local Development Documents is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme.</u></p>	
54	135	Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic	<p>Amend Indicator relating to policy CP1 by adding the following text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Number of Listed Building Consents issued annually for installation of insulation, secondary glazing, double glazing, solar photovoltaic cells, new</u> 	Change arising from the Hearings

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
		Objectives	<u>boilers, wood burners and heat pumps</u>	
55	136	Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives	<p>Amend Indicator and Target for Strategic Objective 3 (policies DW1, B1, KE1, SV1 and RA1 &2) as follows:</p> <p>Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of floor space developed type (office/ industrial) in sqm, by place annually and total since 2006. Gains, losses and net. • Amount of floor space on previously developed land by type (office/industrial) in sqm, by place annually and total since 2006. Gains, losses and net. • Employment land available by type • <u>Change in work place jobs by sub-area</u> • Number of planning consents for business premises in rural areas • <u>Economic growth forecasts from the Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR) as well as from bodies such as Oxford Economics, Cambridge Econometrics, NIESR</u> <p>Target</p> <p>Deliver space to provide 8,700 net additional jobs between 2006 & 2026 as set out in the places below</p> <p>Bath: 2006-2026</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office floor space – net gain of 70,000 to 100,000m² • Industrial floor space – net loss of about 30,000 m² • <u>Net increase in 5,700 jobs</u> <p>Keynsham: 2006 – 2026</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office floor space – net gain of about 10,000 m² 	Change arising from BNES/24

Ref	Page No Draft Core Strategy	Plan Reference	Proposed Change	Reason for change
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial floor space – no net change • <u>Net increase in 1,500 jobs</u> <p>Somer Valley: 2006-2026</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office floor space – net gain of about 10,00 m2 • Industrial floor space – net loss of about 10,000 m2 • <u>Net increase in 1,000 jobs</u> 	
56	136	Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives	Amend Target for Strategic Objective 5 (policy DW1) as follows: Deliver 11,000 <u>11,500</u> homes by 2026	Change arising from BNES/26
57	137	Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives	Amend Target for Strategic Objective 5 (policy B1) as follows: Bath Deliver 6,000 <u>6,500</u> homes between 2006 & 2026	Change arising from BNES/26

Proposed Change Ref 16 (policy B1, section 8) – Explanatory Notes:

Set out below are further notes explaining the rationale behind the proposed change to policy B1, section 8.

The submitted Core Strategy gave the impression that the whole recreation ground and neighbouring land was identified for a wide range of city centre type uses. This was not the intention of the plan. The intention of the plan was to enable only stadium/arena type development on part this area. It was not appropriate to specifically identify which part of the area was suitable without drawing a boundary that was tantamount to a site specific allocation. Given that such a development would not be 'strategic' in nature, a 'strategic site' allocation within the Core Strategy would not have been justified. Further, the precise extent of any future developable area is subject to separate statutory processes, the result of which is not yet known.

Whilst the submitted plan, including Policy B1 (1), together with existing Local Plan Policy SR.1A could have successfully managed development in this area, for reasons of clarity a revised approach is now proposed. The only reference to this matter is now made in a bolstered policy B1 8(c). Associated changes (deletions) have been made to Diagram 7 and Policy B2 (f) and B3 (h).

Of the three approaches set out in the schedule above (under proposed change reference number 16), the Council's preferred approach is the first one. The other (more strategic approaches) are not unsound, but, in this instance, perform less well in relation to a number of considerations. All three approaches are presented for consultation so that the Inspector is aware of participant's views on the alternatives that this matter can be dealt with.

The Council considers that specific reference to the Recreation Ground is, in the circumstances, justified. Evidence supporting the Core Strategy clearly shows that this is the only area adjoining the Central Area (or within the city) where such a facility could be accommodated without inherent conflict with the plans housing and employment space objectives.

In this instance a specific reference ensures that the Core Strategy is clear and effective. The alternative is a 'fuzzy' approach which performs less well in respect of the 'proactive', 'driving' and 'supporting' role for Local Authorities set out in the Ministerial Statement: *Planning for Growth*. Elsewhere in the Core Strategy specific mention is made of key areas of change e.g. the MoD sites and Bath Press (as part of Twerton Riverside) without a full site specific allocation being made. The appropriateness of this has not been questioned.

Further, there is already a stadium in situ at the Recreation Ground performing a less than optimum role for the city. The preferred approach recognises this and would also enable moderate enhancements to be made independently of the realisation of any future more significant proposals. These might include improved floodlighting, or the erection of temporary structures.

The principle of development at the Recreation Ground for a significantly enhanced facility and the identification of specific locational parameters shaping delivery will be conditioned by the outcome of separate statutory processes. Subject to the outcome of these processes any planning application for a new arena at this location will be subject to all other Development Plan policies contained within the Core Strategy and Local Plan.

Consideration has been given as to whether to include a reference to ancillary and associated uses. Ancillary uses are not mentioned in the policy as, by definition, they come along with the concept of a stadium and require no additional justification e.g. club shop/ hospitality. Associated uses (perhaps separately managed), would require additional justification and are therefore mentioned.

Finally, the desirability of incorporating active frontages, where appropriate, (and perhaps linked to with associated uses) can be shaped via the application of Local Plan Policy D.2 and its supporting text.