

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET - CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

HEARING – STRATEGIC ALLOCATIONS, BATH (continued).

PART 3 - APRIL 2 (PM) - POSSIBLE ADDITIONAL/ALTERNATIVE GREEN BELT SITES

INSPECTOR'S AGENDA

Hearing will not start before 2pm, but it may be later.

The overall issue for this hearing is: are the strategic allocations in the Green Belt at Bath justified in principle and are the detailed requirements of the policies appropriate and effective? The hearing is in 3 parts to cover respectively: Odd Down, Weston and (more briefly) any alternative sites. This hearing covers any alternatives sites in the Green Belt in the context set out below

The focus of the Examination is now whether the changes the Council has proposed, including the strategic housing allocations, would make the Core Strategy sound. Hence this overall hearing focuses on the soundness of the proposed allocations themselves. Criticisms of the justification for those allocations should be made in parts 1 and 2 of the hearing. However, to avoid those sessions being made more complex or prolonged with material that really relates to other sites, this hearing session provides a brief opportunity for those who want to be heard on other sites.

In relation to the alternative promoted on behalf of the Duchy of Cornwall at Twerton, I do not intend this session to repeat matters covered in the previous hearings in January 2012.

I would remind all parties that I could not recommend in my report any such alternative site unless it had been the subject of appropriate public consultation and it would be inevitable that a further hearing would also be required if any alternative were proposed to be included in the Core Strategy. Hence it is inappropriate and unnecessary to examine in this session any possible alternatives in the same degree of detail as those currently proposed by the Council. Such detailed scrutiny would take place if they needed to be pursued further.

The identified potential participants need to confirm with Programme Officer whether they wish to participate.

For each possible alternative location the Council should briefly explain how the merits of any such alternative has been assessed in the overall plan process (or why not assessed) and the reasons they are considered inappropriate or less suitable than the chosen approach. The promoter of the alternative should then summarise the reasons for the acceptability of the development, why the plan is considered unsound in the absence of the change sought and should make clear whether the site is being suggested as a replacement for any of the allocations at Bath now proposed by the Council or as an addition. The Council can make a final comment in each case if necessary.

No further representations/evidence is required or will be accepted for this hearing session. Participants should refer to the relevant parts of representations already made where necessary.

Participants/Sites

1. Land west of Twerton (Duchy of Cornwall; Rep 222)
 - Does the further evidence provided by the promoter since January 2012 change the Council's previous assessment of the merits of this site?
2. Land at Minster Way, Bathwick (Wadderton Park Ltd, Rep 185)
3. Land south of Warminster Road, Bathampton (Green and Faulkner, Rep 5161, SCG BNES/53W)
4. Land at Old Fosse Road, Odd Down, Bath (Glen Jones and others) (SCG BNES/53R; have relevant representations been made?)
 - *The SCG states that it is agreed that further work is needed in relation to the impact on the WHS, land stability and archaeology before the site could be considered suitable. Accordingly, I cannot see that there would be any basis for me to suggest that it is a creditable alternative at this stage.*
5. Land south of Cranleigh (off B3110) South Stoke (Roger Harrison) (SCG BNES/53S; have relevant representations been made?)

Simon Emerson
Inspector
March 2014