

Bath and North East Somerset Council Draft Core Strategy

REPRESENTATIONS BY RESPONDENT

Bath and North East Somerset Council - Draft Core Strategy - Representations by Respondent (Numbers 101 to 200)

Respondent Number: 101 Respondent: Mr Robin Sales

RepresentationReference: 101\1

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation 2b says "enable the development of a new stadium for Bath RFC within the central area" Bath RFC are
(soundness): unwilling to build the stadium at Western Riverside or at Lambridge and want to demolish the leisure centre for their stadium. The leisure centre provides exercise for far more citizens, 7 days a week that the players participating in a number of home matches. A greatly enlarged stadium on the Rec would also bring congestion and parking problems.

Change sought to In 2b delete the words "in the central area"
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 101\2

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.44

Representation 2.44 supports the 54m major scheme of transport proposals. The scheme offers little benefit relative to
(soundness): its cost and should not be undertaken at a time when beneficial expenditure is being cut.

Change sought to The Core Strategy should simply state that the 54m transport proposals remains to be approved.
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 101\3

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.33

Representation 2.33 proposes that buildings can be in the georgian style only in exceptional circumstances. This will
(soundness): lead planning officers to reject, out of hand, planning applications that are well designed and appropriate.

Change sought to 2.33 "New buildings should not necessarily be in the Georgian style"
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 102 Respondent: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations

RepresentationReference: 102\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.07

Representation This presents a misleadingly positive picture. Most of B&NES is not well served from the M4/M5 or
(soundness): from Bristol airport. The rail link to London from Bath is good, but very expensive, thereby discouraging modal shift, and does not conveniently link to the rest of the country. Bristol airport may be rapidly

expanding for passengers but carries almost no freight, which has relevance to the region's economic growth ambitions.

Change sought to make sound: Soundness would be improved if there were better and more competitive transport links, eg (a) a direct bus link between Bath and the airport (which could run right through the length of the district) and (b) a rail link between Bath and a shuttle head for the airport in the Backwell area, which would avoid rush hour traffic congestion for the many who use the airport at peak hours. A study for such routes could be added to para 6.94.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\2

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.26

Representation (soundness): Lack of reference to public transport options and impact of off-street parking on residential streets in para 2.26 (RUH)

Change sought to make sound: Lay down requirements for public transport, and discourage staff and visitors from parking in nearby streets.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\3

Plan Reference: Policy CP4: District Heating

Representation (soundness): FoBRA believes it is neither legal nor sound to proceed with this policy at present. There has been no consultation or discussion on this issue, and the breezy comment about mitigating any negative impacts on vaults in central Bath in para 6.24 is quite inadequate.

Change sought to make sound: Promote discussion and hold consultation on this issue.

Representation (legal compliance): FoBRA believes it is neither legal nor sound to proceed with this policy at present. There has been no consultation or discussion on this issue, and the breezy comment about mitigating any negative impacts on vaults in central Bath in para 6.24 is quite inadequate.

Change sought to make legally compliant: Promote discussion and hold consultation on this issue.

RepresentationReference: 102\4

Plan Reference: Policy CP13: Infrastructure Provision

Representation (soundness): There is a glaring omission here, and indeed in the Core Strategy generally, that transport matters are delegated sideways to the JLTP3.

Change sought to make sound: Major developments should only be permitted in conjunction with suitable public transport infrastructure.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\5

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.44

Representation None of the 'Key strategies and plans' cited here include plans actually to reduce existing traffic
(soundness): volumes.

A master plan for traffic in Bath is required. While the Public Realm and Movement Programme (PRMP) does include measures to reduce traffic in the commercial centre of Bath, it does not cover the bulk of Georgian Bath.

Change sought to make sound: (a) Task the Transport Commission for Bath to negotiate a Master Plan for Traffic, including measures to reduce its volume, and
(b) extend the PRMP to the whole of the central area between the Holburne Museum and Royal Crescent..

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\6

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.48

Representation The quoted figure (345,000 m3) is equivalent to a staggering 96 football pitches or 3 Royal Victoria
(soundness): Parks at an average water depth of 0.5 m, and correspondingly more if the water was shallower.

Change sought to make sound: Refuse permission for any development until matching storage area is identified and made ready for use.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\7

Plan Reference: Bath: Strategic Issues

Representation Issue 10. Reference needed to the need for a Master Plan to tackle congestion and pollution in Bath.
(soundness):

Change sought to make sound: Alternative wording might be: "Bath suffers from high levels of congestion and air pollution throughout the main road network, including such iconic spaces as Queen Square and The Circus. A traffic Master Plan is required to address the problem. The spatial strategy should make the most of existing public transport infrastructure and planned investment so as to enable people to travel to and around the city with less environmental impact and greater efficiency". (See FoBRA comment on Objective 2)

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\8

Plan Reference: Policy B5: Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities

Representation The Core Strategy Paper (para.2.38) refers to Information Paper 3 which states (at para.4.3) that
(soundness): current student numbers at Bath's two Universities account for the demand for approximately 2,150 Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) across the city, i.e. in excess of university-managed accommodation on-campus and elsewhere. This represents one HMO for every 19 residential properties across the entire city (para.4.3).

Further, at para 2.1, the Information Paper states that the historical average annual growth rate in student numbers at the University of Bath has been 4.82% over the past 15 years. Table 3, however, shows the total University of Bath student population to have increased by 5.9% (from 12,970 to 13,738) between 2008/9 and 2009/10 (the latest actual figures available). Para.2.10 of the Information

Paper states that the emerging Masterplan for the University of Bath campus assumes a future student growth rate of up to 3% per annum.

The Information Paper goes on to argue (para.2.12) that only if the future average increase in student numbers at The University of Bath reduces to 2% per annum, and the University builds 2,358 new campus study bedrooms by 2020, will the existing demand for HMOs from University of Bath students (1,196 from Table 3) be likely to remain at current levels.

Para.2.13 of the Information Paper claims that calculations are presented at Appendix X to show the effects of a 3% and a 1% p.a. increase in University of Bath student numbers. These calculations cannot be found. However, my own calculations show that these two scenarios would result in a demand for approximately 300 more and 200 less HMOs respectively, relative to the 2008/9 level (Table 3). Hence it can be seen that the potential demand for HMOs is highly sensitive to small percentage changes in the student growth rate.

Para.4.8 of the Information Paper shows the effect on demand for HMOs of three scenarios for future student growth. These assume zero growth at Bath Spa University combined with zero, 1% and 2% growth at the University of Bath respectively. No figures are provided for a scenario with the University of Bath expanding at 3% per annum - which would be consistent with its draft Masterplan and significantly less than historical levels. Such a scenario would result in the need for 125 more HMOs than the current estimated total number of 2,150, even allowing for a reduction in demand of 175 from Bath Spa University students.

The estimates provided in Information Paper 3 and hence the draft Core Strategy Paper itself assume that the University of Bath will build 2,358 additional campus bedrooms by 2020/21 at a rate of approximately 240 per annum starting next year (2011/12). Yet no mechanism appears to be in place to link future student numbers to any actual building programme. Table 3 shows the number of University of Bath campus bedrooms to have remained static over the last three years while student numbers have increased by approximately 1,000. If this state of affairs is allowed to continue the Core Strategy aspiration that the 2010 level of HMOs (approximately 2,150 from para.4.3) "will represent the high watermark within the city" will be seriously at risk.

- Change sought to make sound:**
1. Core Strategy Policy B5 (Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities) should include a control mechanism to limit student recruitment to that which is sustainable taking account of the actual quantity of University-managed student bedrooms available at that time combined with a defined acceptable level of HMOs. The Core Strategy Paper should define clearly what that level is. Universities' aspirations to provide large numbers of student bedrooms in future years should not be relied on.
 2. The table at para.4.8 of Information Paper 3 should include the scenario in which there is zero growth in student numbers at Bath Spa University and 3% p.a. growth at The University of Bath, in line with the Universities' Masterplans.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\9

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Section 8 should include leisure, and the provision of a new Leisure Centre (whether or not a new rugby stadium goes ahead).

Change sought to make sound: Section 8 should include leisure, and the provision of a new Leisure Centre (whether or not a new rugby stadium goes ahead).

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\10

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation it is noted that a new stadium is to be accommodated in the Central Area (para 3f). While it might be possible to justify extension of the central area to include a new rugby stadium and related facilities on the Rec, this should not be allowed to mean that the Rec is generally 'open' for development.

Change sought to make sound: Make clear that any development of a new rugby stadium and related facilities on the Rec would be a 'one-off', because the club is already there, and that there is no intention to apply the land-swap concept to other developments.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\11

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.16

Representation It appears that the central area has been extended north as far as Alfred Street (from a present limit of George Street?) and East as far as Johnstone Street (from a present limit of Pulteney Bridge?). This might have the benefit of preventing the conversion of retail premises to pubs and bars. However, the document's vision for 2026 (diagram 8, p42) shows the Central Area expanding to include (for example) the whole of the Rec. More information is needed on the implications of this, because, if rezoned from residential/green-open-space to city centre/commercial in terms of planning and licensing of any new buildings along the river, residents could thereby lose rights to question these developments.

Change sought to make sound: More information required.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\12

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.32

Representation Mention of the recently endorsed WHS Management Plan is strangely absent, as is the funding of it. Commitment to preserving, enhancing, celebrating and exploiting Bath's WHS status is weak, and conflicts with major developments (e.g. Western Riverside building heights) are not addressed, nor ensuring excellence in contemporary architecture (e.g. Western Riverside block design) or using WHS as part of the economic development plan. Further, FoBRA took part in the committee to draft the Building heights strategy and hence welcomes it, but the SPD should be framed now, and the Strategy should also apply to Bath Western Riverside.

Change sought to make sound: Strengthen commitment to and financing of the WHS, and frame the WHS SPD now (para 2.35).

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\13

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Para 1.26 (p19), 2.28 and Policy B1(1d) (Scale and location of growth)
(soundness): FoBRA welcomes the priority for growth to be steered towards brownfield land and away from use of green spaces in Bath (ie towards preferential preservation of green spaces, particularly playing fields, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance 17: "Planning for open space, sport and recreation").

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\14

Plan Reference: Strategic Objective 3: Encourage economic development, diversification and prosperity.

Representation Para 1.27, Objective 3 (p16) and Strategic Issues (3) (p29) (Growth in Bath)

(soundness): FoBRA is pleased that the existing in-commuting imbalance has been addressed but the document is weak on detail and an understanding of the need to raise economic prosperity on a per-resident basis, not simply to 'grow the economy'. More sectoral details needed.

Change sought to The Core Strategy is the ideal opportunity to establish 'priority sectors' for economic development.

make sound: Examples could be:

- higher education as an economic sector in itself;
- technology/engineering-based employers of our local graduates;
- the arts as an economic sector in itself;
- perhaps a regional public/private medical centre of excellence;
- perhaps regional professional business services;
- tourism (of course), and
- retailing (of course).]

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\15

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Policy B1(8) (p35)(Bath Spatial Strategy) and Policy B2(4) (p40)(Central Area Strategic Policy)

(soundness): FoBRA supports "a new cultural/performance/arts venue within the Central Area". However, if we are looking to expand the creative arts and software industries in the city then a substantial conference centre with associated accommodation would be an excellent additional magnet, as the international reputation of Bath makes it potentially a highly desirable conference venue, and conference delegates would provide valuable high-end business to the local hotel, restaurant and entertainment industries even at relatively unpopular times of the year.

Change sought to This part of the plan needs to be expanded and elaborated.

make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\16

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation Policy B2 (p38)(Central area strategic policy)

(soundness): FoBRA agrees with most of this, though some would see point 3f as provocative (Leisure Centre and Recreation Ground identified as "Key Development Opportunities"), but we should particularly welcome point 2m under the Placemaking Principles ("lived-in feel"). This does not happen just because people happen to live there. It is because they actively care for their premises and make an effort to resist undesirable changes nearby. Visitors like to see a place well maintained. Further, in para 2h there is a missed opportunity for the Council to have a comprehensive plan for the riverside in Bath.

Coordinating a long term master plan for the riverside is a role the Council is uniquely able to play. It needs Council commitment and priority in this document.

Change sought to make sound: Solutions: (a) encourage city residents to maintain and invest in their properties, and (b) develop a comprehensive plan for the riverside in Bath.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\17

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.22

Representation Para 2.22 (p48)(MoD sites)

(soundness): FoBRA welcomes early redevelopment of Foxhill and Warminster Road. However,

- The entry talks only about housing (850 homes). Although suitable for housing, could these sites not be used for high tech industry offices too (no noise, lots of computers, close links to City Centre, good travel links) thereby helping to reduce commuting?
- This is one of the few mentions of the important SHLAA, which indicates where housing might be able to be built in B&NES.

Change sought to make sound: Solutions: (a) Change MoD sites to mixed development and (b) refer to the SHLAA wherever

make sound: appropriate – for example Objective 5, Policy DW1, Table 3(5) and Policy B1(3).

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\18

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.33

Representation Para 2.33 (p53)(WHS Architecture styles)

(soundness): FoBRA supports this wording on architecture styles, though there is a delicate balance to be struck to avoid sins evident in (for example) central Birmingham and Bristol. Most important is to get the scale right – height and massing. Exact but modern copies can be the right approach to infill existing set-pieces.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\19

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.44

Representation Para 2.44 (p56)(Transportation)

(soundness): Good, but commitment to addressing Bath's transport and congestion problem needs strengthening. This should be a fundamental priority as it profoundly impacts residents' quality of life, economic development, conservation, and the environment. As FoBRA policy states, this needs to be radical, comprehensive and urgent.

Change sought to make sound: The prevailing priority of the car over public transport, pedestrians and cyclists needs explicitly to be

make sound: removed before anything can change.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\20

Plan Reference: Policy CP9: Affordable Housing

Representation Policy CP9 (p123)(Affordable housing)

(soundness): The only difference between 'affordable housing' and other housing is a public rental subsidy, which can be applied to any housing and not only to that delivered in new developments. Planning gain can be extracted from developers in other forms and used generally for social housing subsidy. The reality is that Bath, as a preferred place to live, will always attract people who do not depend upon local employment, keeping house prices high in relation to local employment earnings. Adding to the housing supply will only marginally affect this imbalance.

Change sought to make sound: The emphasis should be on a long term higher value economic mix (as planned in the Core Strategy) and on promoting a cultural acceptance of house renting rather than ownership (Bath rental costs are much more cost effective and in line with local employment incomes than is home ownership).

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\21 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP12: Centres and Retailing

Representation Policy CP12 (p128)(Centres and retailing), also Paras 2.23, 6.89 and Table 4

(soundness): FoBRA supports this policy, though it is entirely reactive, and should be made sharper:

- Para 6.89 is correct that some centres hardly cater for everyday (eg Lansdown Road).
- In many cases, shops have been replaced by take-aways, either licensed or unlicensed, which arguably create vitality, but can become a focus for antisocial behaviour in the evening, and yet such a change of use would be consistent with the policy.
- Local centres have declined because people shop elsewhere (in the London Road one would inevitably shop in Morrisons).
- The 'use them or lose them' principle also applies to pubs, which don't seem to be covered by the Core Strategy.
- Once the Rossiter Road scheme is implemented in Widcombe, vacant premises are expected quickly to be let and rental levels to rise due to increased demand

Secondly, although concerns in this area are real, they are not easily addressed by the town and country planning system, since changes between various kinds of retail outlet are not "material changes of use" and this problem is exacerbated by the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order. However, B&NES might instead use its landlord powers in Bath city centre, where it has a controlling interest in a high proportion of the stores, to encourage the spread and retention of specialist shops, particularly of high-value and luxury goods, thus reinforcing the magic which attracts shoppers.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 102\22 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.94

Representation Core Policies 6f (p129)(Well connected)

(soundness): FoBRA supports this policy, and particularly welcomes the following:

Para 6.94 (Transport and Movement): the Council recognises the need for a study to assess an A46/A36 link and it points out the problem of excessive traffic in Bath though this should also be carried through to a commitment to do something about it via a master plan

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 103 Respondent: Ms Evelyn Cox

RepresentationReference: 103\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I believe that those who have expressed environmental concerns and who are also in a strong financial position, such as the Prince of Wales, should be encouraged to invest in the re-development of Bath's most derelict and ugly sites such as Snow Hill and other modern buildings. It is nonsensical to argue that every Duchy developments must be financially profitable. With a portfolio of investments that include shops and an international food franchise and a huge buffer of assets, the Prince can afford a few altruistic developments that actually support his environmental stance. Therefore, to rephrase the Duchy letter sent in answer to a plea from the group for the scheme at Newton St Lowe to be abandoned – "If Bath has to grow, the Duchy's site is NOT the obvious choice."

I strongly support the Bath Council in defending our natural assets against greedy developers, including those in sheep's clothing.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 104 Respondent: Professor Donald Thomas

RepresentationReference: 104\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): There has been no further evidence that the school wishes to sell the land for development. Instead, the demand for land to be used as playing fields seems to have increased.

It would be foolish to deny that closing Greenway Lane to through traffic would have significant local support. The council first proposed this in 2005, when it attracted some 40% in favour as the best traffic solution, in a well-supported questionnaire. Even those favouring it knew that they would face some personal inconvenience as a result. Their support for the proposal therefore shows how desperate they were to get something done about the traffic problem. So far, existing traffic-calming is felt to be too little too late. The promise in the the SHLAA that something more in the way of traffic reduction might accompany development, followed by an immediate assurance that there can be no guarantee of this, makes the development proposal a stone-cold loser in public opinion.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 105 Respondent: Mrs Merril Nunn

RepresentationReference: 105\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Lower Field, Beechen Cliff School - Lyn 1

I wish to object to the possibility of the above area being sold and developed as has been proposed in the SHLAA. There are many reasons for this, but in particular I would like to make the following points:

1. The value of the lower field as a playing field and open space. The use of this area for sport and general play is immensely important to a school that is now short of outdoor space (I gather the number of pupils is increasing). My son attended Beechen Cliff School and was very involved in the sport, so we know this from experience. Living opposite the playing field we have seen the large number of boys who use this area for sport or leisure as do many local residents.
2. It would appear that little attention has been spent to the fact that the Council has spent considerable time and money recently on making the area next to the substation safer where the road is very narrow. This work has improved and made safer the access to the playing field which many pupils use as their main route to school.
3. It seems extraordinary that developers have been given so much say (through the SHLAA) in the Core Strategy. I had assumed that this is the work of the Planning Department, not private individuals or firms who are bound to have a vested interest. Powerful arguments were put forward in 2007 for a similar development to be turned down and were successful. How can it be that these arguments are apparently no longer relevant only 3 years later, especially as the amount of housing needed in Bath has been reduced considerably?

For the above reasons and those raised when the previous proposal was rejected, I would ask that the area referenced as Lyn 6 be removed from the SHLAA, and that the Council once and for all reject any proposal that this will be developed.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 106 Respondent: Pro Planning

RepresentationReference: 106\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.65

Representation (soundness): The issue of minerals is considered to be both inadequately and inaccurately addressed in the five paragraphs 6.65 to 6.69 of the Core Strategy. It is a major issue for consideration through the Core Strategy and therefore merits, at the very least, a policy in its own right. PPS 12 requires Core Strategies to consider the minerals "contribution to national, regional and local needs at acceptable social, environmental and economic costs". BANES Core Strategy is considered to be inadequate in these regards. The Core Strategy seeks to rely upon national minerals planning policy and safeguarded minerals policies in the BANES Local Plan, until reviewed through the Placemaking Plan. For soundness however, the Local Plan policies should at least be reviewed through the Core Strategy preparation process, to provide the strategic context for the Placemaking Plans. Para 6.66 refers to there being currently two active sites, at Combe Down and Limpley Stoke. It omits to mention the outstanding minerals extraction consent at Stowey Quarry, Bishop Sutton, which is valid until November 2012 and is being actively reworked. Although this consent expires relatively early in

the life of the Core Strategy, the interrelationship of that consent, with the adjacent safeguarded mineral reserves and the current use of the quarry for waste recycling, surely merits its inclusion in paragraph 6.66 to inform the need for a subsequent Placemaking Plan relating to it.

Change sought to make sound: Amend para 6.66 to read:

“There are currently three active sites – two surface workings and one underground mine. Upper Lawn Quarry at Combe Down in Bath, Stowey Quarry at Bishop Sutton and Hays Wood mine near Limpley Stoke. The two near Bath produce high quality Bath Stone for building and renovation projects and Stowey Quarry produces white lias and blue lias limestones for use as building and walling stone and also for aggregate purposes.”

A new Policy CPX: Minerals should be written to provide the context for the site specific Placemaking Minerals Plan.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 106\2

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.36

Representation (soundness): Paragraph 5.36 of the Core Strategy describes suitable circumstances for farm diversification and the implications for conversion or replacement of currently underused agricultural buildings. The Policy introduced a test that the change of use should only take place:

“If it can be demonstrated that these buildings are not required for local food production purposes.”

The need to demonstrate redundancy of agricultural barns is a new test compared with the BANES Local Plan. Yet paragraph 5.41 states that proposals for the reuse of rural buildings will be considered against Local Plan Policy ET.9. Policy ET.9 does not however, include this test of redundancy. There is therefore an inconsistency between the draft Core Strategy and the Local Plan policy from which it purports to be derived. Furthermore, the test is not just to demonstrate redundancy within the agricultural unit concerned, but more generally in the local area. This is a very onerous test and is not considered to derive from government Policy PPS7 for sustainable development in the countryside either. The newly introduced requirement makes no allowance for the fact that many traditional agricultural buildings are unsuited for modern agricultural practices so that even with an existing farm unit, new agricultural buildings can be required, whilst traditional buildings are redundant. This new restriction on barn conversion policies for reuse proposals of benefit to the local economy is considered to be counterproductive to the objectives of the Local Plan to support the local economy of rural areas.

Change sought to make sound:

- Delete the reference in paragraph 5.36: “Therefore, conversion or replacement of currently underused agricultural buildings should only take place if it can be demonstrated that these buildings are not required for local good production purposes.”
- Paragraph 5.38 delete: “(where they are not needed for agriculture)”
- Delete any other references in the Core Strategy which would have the same undue restrictive policy effect.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 106\3

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation (soundness): Core Strategy Policy CP8 is ineffective in that it fails to make adequate provision to meet Objective 2 to make: “optimum use of brownfield opportunities in meeting housing and economic development

needs.”

There are existing brownfield employment sites within the Green Belt in BANES which are capable of contributing towards local economic growth within the rural areas. The Core Strategy seeks to secure 500 jobs within the rural areas over the plan period. Given that much of the area is covered by Green Belt, Green Belt policies should allow for appropriate forms of development consistent with both national and local Green Belt policies regarding their openness. The Core Strategy is considered to be inconsistent with national policy on Green Belts in PPG2 in that it does not provide for the designation of Major Developed Sites (MDS) in the Green Belt. A number have already been designated in BANES, but not all those which might be deemed to be suitable have been designated, and Green Belt Policy CP8 should recognise this.

Change sought to Insert additional paragraph 6.65 at page 120 as follows:

make sound: “Sites already designated as Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt have and are continuing to make a valuable contribution towards economic growth and the prosperity of the rural areas. Other brownfield sites which meet national policy tests for the designation of MDS’s as set out in PPG2 paragraph C1, will be considered for designation through the Placemaking Plan. The objective is to make best use of brownfield sites in rural areas and to increase the opportunities for job creation in the rural areas consistent with both Green Belt policy and the Core Strategy target level for growth in jobs in the rural areas.”

Amend Policy CP8 to include:

“The detailed boundaries and criteria for development within existing, and where appropriate, new Major Developed Sites will be defined in the Placemaking Plan.”

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 106\4

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

Representation Core Strategy Policy SV1 Part 3 is considered to be inconsistent with national policy as contained within **(soundness):** PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth. Paragraph 4 of PPS4 defines “Economic Development” as development within the “B Use Classes, public and community uses and main town centre uses.” This is expanded in paragraph 7 to include retail development, leisure and entertainment facilities, offices and art, culture and tourism. Policy SV1, Part 3 on economic development in the Somer Valley neither makes reference to PPS4, nor reflects this definition of economic development. Part 3a refers solely to jobs, but 3b and 3c refer only to “business use” with the implication that business is referring to Class B employment uses. This apparent inconsistency between PPS4 and Policy SV1 is neither explained nor justified in the Core Strategy text. Moreover in the case of some of the business parks listed and Bath Business Park in particular, some of the developments already fall outside Class B employment uses, developments which have brought clear benefits to the local economy. Given that these benefits and absence of harm are now recognised in national policy in PPS4, the Core Strategy has in effect built in obsolescence by failing to incorporate this Government policy which was published in 2009.

Funding Support and Location of Business Parks

In relation to effectiveness, although there are regeneration provisions for the town centres of Midsomer Norton and Radstock, not all the designated employment sites lie in or adjacent to these town centres. Again Bath Business Park at Peasedown St John is an example. In addition, as with many other employment designated sites in the Somer Valley, Bath Business Park has struggled to attract Class B developments and occupiers in the ten years during which it has had planning permission. That remains the case, even where speculative developments have been carried out, but have not been fully let. If funds are to be made available to regenerate and support economic developments within

Midsomer Norton and Radstock, the Core Strategy should make equal provision for support for all of the designated employment sites.

The Core Strategy's ignoring of the current economic recession, its impact on those parts of the area which were already struggling economically such as Somer Valley and the need for extraordinary measures, all contribute to its ineffectiveness. It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy is to look to the future and is to be enduring, whereas the recession is, hopefully, a current phase which will pass. Nevertheless its depth and impact have been so severe that to ignore it completely must be deemed to undermine the Strategy's effectiveness. Again citing the example of Bath Business Park, any interest that there has been in either the remaining development land or the vacant speculative units, has been shelved for 12 months or more. Conversely there is ongoing dialogue with different types of non-Class B occupiers for the development land.

Consistency with PPS4

Policy EC2 of PPS4 is the plan making policy for sustainable economic growth. EC 2.1.h. states:

"Existing site allocations should not be carried forward from one version of the development plan to the next without evidence of the need and reasonable prospect of their take-up during the plan period."

It continues that if there is no reasonable prospect it should not be retained and either wider economic uses or alternative uses should be considered. It does not appear that this government advice has been followed in relation to those employment sites which have not been brought forward during either the BANES Local Plan or indeed the previous Wansdyke Local Plan periods.

Change sought to Amend Policy SV1 Part 3a as follows:

make sound: "Enable the delivery of around 1000 net additional jobs (as defined as economic development in PPS4 paras 4 and 7) between 2006 and 2026."

Amend Policy SV1 Part 3b to read:

"Encourage the retention and expansion of local companies and the growth of new employment opportunities by making provision for...."

Replace Policy SV1 Part 3c as follows:

"Review existing employment sites through the Placemaking Plan. Where allocations have not been brought forward, or vacant sites redeveloped, allow economic development uses as defined by PPS4, or support alternative uses."

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 106\5

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

Representation Economic Development

(soundness): 1. There is considered to be an inconsistency under the heading of Economic Development Parts 3b and 3c. Part 3b allows for a planned reduction in industrial\warehouse floor space from about 110,000 square metres in 2006 to about 100,000 square metres in 2026. It is difficult to see how this can be achieved whilst complying with the requirement in Part 3c that all land in existing business use is to be protected and alternative uses only allowed where there is employment benefit, or which contribute to improvements to the town centre or does not lead to an unacceptable loss of employment land. For sites which are not in town centres how can a reduction in industrial floor space be achieved if employment land is to be so protected?

2. Similarly there is considered to be an inconsistency between Part 2a of Policy SV1 and Part 3c for similar reasons. Part 2a encourages the redevelopment of vacant and underused industrial land and factories, whereas Part 3c protects land in existing business use which includes vacant and underused premises.

Housing Development Boundaries

3. There is no reference to or provision for reviewing the Housing Development Boundary for either Radstock or Midsomer Norton through the Core Strategy and subsequent Placemaking Plan. This is in stark contrast to the provision in para 5.21 for rural villages which allows:

“The Housing Development Boundaries shown in the Proposals Map (saved from the existing Local Plan) will also be reviewed as part of the Placemaking Plan.”

If such a review is justified for villages where limited growth and development is to take place, it is imperative that it should also be allowed at major settlements such as Radstock and Midsomer Norton where growth and regeneration are critical issues. Furthermore, it is not thought that any review of the Housing Development Boundary was carried out for the Core Strategy preparation and it must therefore be both timely and ongoing. This is particularly the case in the Coomb End area of Radstock which links Radstock with Clandown. It is an area of mixed use employment premises and housing, subject to severe traffic constraints. Its regeneration is important to both settlements and, at present, the Core Strategy makes no provision for this as part of the Placemaking Plan process. There are currently vacant brownfield sites lying outside the Housing Development Boundary which, under Policy SV1 should not be redeveloped for industrial employment use, cannot be delivered for office use because of the location outside the HDB and traffic and access constraints and, notwithstanding their proximity to both the centres of Radstock and Clandown, are precluded from housing development by the current structure of the policies for Radstock.

A further justification for making provision to review the Housing Development Boundary arises because at present the Conservation Area for Radstock extends outside the Housing Development Boundary and yet embraces derelict and redundant industrial sites. It is difficult to achieve enhancement of these employment sites within the Conservation Area against this currently constrained policy context.

Housing Growth

4. Part 4b of Policy SV1 in effect precludes any new housing above the existing commitment of 2,200 dwellings. It is understood that these commitments are carried forward from the BANES Local Plan, approved in 2007 and with an end date of 2011. Where however, Local Plan policies have not been implemented during the Local Plan period, they should not simply be carried forward into the Core Strategy without careful scrutiny and justification. There are therefore a number of concerns regarding the Core Strategy for Radstock if it is to be dependent solely on existing allocations which to date have not been brought forward, and with virtually no opportunity to consider alternative sites for the duration of the Core Strategy period to 2026. For a town urgently in need of regeneration, such constraints on new house building will be counterproductive.

The argument for constraining housing growth in Radstock is to seek to reduce out-commuting to Bath and other employment centres. The Core Strategy recognises the differential house prices between Bath and Radstock and, whilst purchasing ability will improve if and when higher order jobs are introduced in the Somer Valley, this measure alone is unlikely wholly to address that price differential. It is considered that the Core Strategy needs to take a more realistic approach by accepting that significant out-commuting will continue from Radstock, and put in place measures to ensure that commuting can be carried out by as sustainable means of transport as possible i.e. primarily by bus. This reflects the approach taken in Keynsham where significant investment is to be made into the commuter rail network linking Keynsham with both Bath and Bristol, partly in recognition of the continuing high levels of out-commuting from Keynsham. It is acknowledged that funds are identified to improve bus links between Bath and Radstock, but the strategy in relation to out-commuting is not.

Change sought to Amend Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy as follows:

make sound: • Delete Part 3c or replace by:

“Review existing employment sites through the Placemaking Plan. Where allocations have not been brought forward, or vacant sites redeveloped, allow economic development uses as defined by PPS4, or support alternative uses.”

• Include a new proviso 4c:

"Re-visit both the Town Centre and Housing Development Boundary for Midsomer Norton and Radstock as part of the Placemaking Plan process."

• Amend 4b to read:

"Review the viability of the existing 2,200 committed dwellings within the Housing Development Boundary and, where either not currently viable, or where they have not been brought forward within 5 years of identification, delete from the committed list and seek alternative housing sites within or adjacent to the urban area as appropriate."

• Introduce a new proviso 3X:

"Where industrial sites lie in or adjacent to the urban area and its loss would contribute towards the planned reduction of industrial sites, give support for re-use including for housing development."

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 107 Respondent: Emma Cox

RepresentationReference: 107\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation I believe that those who have expressed environmental concerns and who are also in a strong financial position, such as the Prince of Wales, should be encouraged to invest in the re-development of Bath's most derelict and ugly sites such as Snow Hill and other modern buildings. It is nonsensical to argue that every Duchy developments must be financially profitable. With a portfolio of investments that include shops and an international food franchise and a huge buffer of assets, the Prince can afford a few altruistic developments that actually support his environmental stance. Therefore, to rephrase the Duchy letter sent in answer to a plea from the group for the scheme at Newton St Lowe to be abandoned – "If Bath has to grow, the Duchy's site is NOT the obvious choice."

I strongly support the Bath Council in defending our natural assets against greedy developers, including those in sheep's clothing.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 108 Respondent: Ms Deborah Cox

RepresentationReference: 108\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation It is not economically viable in the long term to exploit natural resources for the benefit of a small number of people.

I believe that those who have expressed environmental concerns and who are also in a strong financial position, such as the Prince of Wales, should be encouraged to invest in the re-development of Bath's most derelict and ugly sites. It is nonsensical to argue that every Duchy developments must be financially profitable. With a portfolio of investments that include shops and an international food franchise and a huge buffer of assets, the Prince can afford a few altruistic developments that actually support his environmental stance. Therefore, to rephrase the Duchy letter sent in answer to a plea from the group for the scheme at Newton St Lowe to be abandoned – "If Bath has to grow, the Duchy's site is NOT the obvious choice."

I strongly support the Bath Council in defending our natural assets against the purely financial

motivations of a few developers.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 109 Respondent: Mr David Cohen

RepresentationReference: 109\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I write as a former teacher at Beechen Cliff and at a number of other secondary schools in our local area. Compared to those other schools Beechen Cliff is not now especially well endowed with playing fields. To reduce the extent of its field would be a seriously retrograde step. Despite being smaller than other schools' fields I am sure that the amount of use made by that very sporting school is probably far more intensive than at other establishments.

For both formal and informal play activities the open spaces in front of the main school buildings were always extensively used while I was working at the school. With rising intake numbers that use must now be even greater. Inside, the school is cramped and, in my experience, claustrophobic. The need for the greatest amount of open play space is obvious.

Please don't proceed with any proposal that seeks to reduce the field space at Beechen Cliff as it would have a deleterious effect on the schooling of the children and students.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 111 Respondent: Traveller Law Reform Project

RepresentationReference: 111\1

Plan Reference: Policy CP11: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Representation (soundness): 1. para 6.81 and 6.82

These paragraphs fail to mention the Regional Spatial Strategy which in view of the recent Cala Homes judgement still stands and hence the policy is unsound because it is not conformable with regional policy. The panel report of the EiP into the Gypsy and Traveller Policy GT1 stated in relation to BANES:

Bath and North East Somerset

4.39 The panel also asked at the Examination why Bath and North East Somerset Council was now proposing a nil transit provision for its District despite Revised Table 4.3 indicating 20 transit pitches for this local authority area. We do not accept the Council's argument that since the GTAA indicated a primary need for residential pitches it would be premature to estimate transit needs before residential ones and this supposition has no foundation in Circular 01/2006. We conclude therefore that in the absence of any evidence to support the suggested nil provision, the figure of 20 pitches for transit provision in Bath and North East Somerset should be retained.

It went on to state in Table 4.3 that there was a need for 19 residential pitches in addition to the 20

transit pitches for the period 2006-11. Future needs are recommended to be assessed on a 3% compound growth rate to take account of future family formation.

Para 6.82 is unclear as to when and how pitches will be allocated in a DPD. To be consistent with Circular 1/2006 which states in para 33 that criteria must not be used as an alternative to site allocations. As it stands the core strategy seems to be unsound because it does not reflect this aspect of 1/2006.

2. Criteria in Policy CP11

In our view several of the criteria are ineffective because they are so tightly drawn that there will be little chance of suitable and affordable sites being available. Criterion a) requires site to be accessible by foot, cycle or public transport. Circular 1/2006 is clear that for rural locations, which are acceptable in principle, local authorities should be realistic about alternatives to the car (para 54). Gypsies and Travellers are unlikely to be able to find affordable sites in line with the proposed criterion because they will be in competition with housing developers for land. Hence they will have no other option than to seek land outside of development envelopes.

Criteria d, f and g require that sites shall not harm character and appearance, have no harmful impact on amenities of neighbouring properties and have no adverse impact on protected habitats and species, nationally recognised designations and natural resources.

All of these criteria are capable of being interpreted so as to rule out almost any potential site because of perceived harm. They go further than the advice contained in circular 1/2006 intends.

Almost any site could be held to cause harm or have an adverse impact. It opens the door to NIMBY objections. As with all planning issues there is a balance to be struck between harm and utility and planning authorities should balance the level of impact against needs for sites. These criteria taken together will in our view be ineffective and are not justified.

Change sought to make sound: 1. Para 6.81/2 should refer to the RSS and indicate the identified level of need (19 residential pitches and 20 transit pitches to 2011 with an annual increase of 3% compound for residential pitches thereafter). This will ensure conformity with the RSS and the requirements of Circular 1/2006. In our view these paragraphs should also include a commitment by the council to allocate pitches to meet these needs in a specified DPD. This will ensure conformity with para 33 of Circular 1/2006.

2. Policy CP11

Criterion a) - replace with 'local community services and facilities are reasonably accessible.' This will ensure that this criterion is effective in helping to deliver needed sites.

Criterion d) - insert the word 'unacceptably' before the word harm. This will help make this criterion effective in helping deliver sites in suitable and affordable locations.

Criterion f) - insert the word 'unacceptably' before the word 'adverse'

These changes will help ensure that the policy is sound, effective and justified.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 112 Respondent: Miss Elise Halford

Representation Reference: 112\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness): Clutton should remain as R2 category village since there is limited provision of and accessibility to local facilities, service and employment

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 113 Respondent: Miss Linda Clark

RepresentationReference: 113\1 S

Plan Reference: Whole Document

Representation I support the new draft strategy because it has taken on board the concerns the public have raised in (soundness): the previous strategy and decided not to build on green belt land and meet housing needs on brownfield and unused empty buildings in Bath (as I raised in my previous objection). I approve the acraping of unrealistic housing targets

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 114 Respondent: Society of Merchant Venturers c/o Carter Jonas LLP

RepresentationReference: 114\1

Plan Reference: Policy KE2: Keynsham Town Centre/Somerdale Strategic Policy

Representation We consider that Policy KE2 does not include sufficient flexibility should brownfield sites within the (soundness): urban area, including the Somerdal Factory site, not be deliverable. The policy is therefore inadequate and may prove to be ineffective.

In the current economic climate, the viability of developing a former factory site may be called into question due to potential contamination and the mitigation that may be required to ensure the site is developable. The Council is relying heavily on this site to deliver the amount of housing required in Keynsham.

We therefore consider that the Council should allocate a reserve site on greenfield land adjacent to the built up area that could be delivered quickly. Such a site could then be developed if land supply monitoring showed that the Council was unable to demonstrate a five-year supply in accordance with Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3: Housing.

As previously stated, land to the south of Keynsham, to the east of Wellsway, is immediately deliverable as it is a greenfield site in a single ownership. This site would be an appropriate reserve site should the Somerdale Factory site not come forward for development.

Change sought to make sound: We propose the following wording be added to Policy KE2:

"In the event that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land in accordance with PPS2, the Council will seek development on land south of Keynsham, east of Wellsway, to meet the shortfall."

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 115 Respondent: Mr Nigel Robson

RepresentationReference: 115\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation Policy RA.1 supports appropriately-scaled residential and employment development in and
(soundness): adjoining the District's larger villages where a suitable range of community facilities are present. The policy is supported by clear evidence showing that the larger villages (as listed at paragraph 5.18) have the capacity to deliver the quantum of housing development envisaged in the rural areas under the district-wide spatial strategy, notably those sites identified as suitable in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. It is clear that villages such as Bishop Sutton offer deliverable sites for sustainable development contributing to the District's housing and employment needs. The criteria set out in the policy are an effective means of bringing forward appropriately-scaled development in a manner consistent with national planning policy and with the support of local communities. Overall, the policy meets the test of soundness.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 116 **Respondent:** June and Alfred Leonard

RepresentationReference: 116\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation we did not agree with the original building plan designated for this area (including Whitchurch). It was
(soundness): definitely not a viable proposition for the excessive amount of houses planned. We were therefore very pleased when the change of government stopped these plans and put forward a more sensible plan

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 117 **Respondent:** Priston Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 117\1

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation District Wide Strategy:
(soundness):

1.11 We greatly welcome the initiative of Combe Hay, Englishcombe and Newton St Loe to undertake discussions with Natural England regarding extending the boundaries of the Cotswold ANOB to ensure that it surrounds the city of Bath and hope that this is achieved.

1.23 Underpinning much of the strategy is the section on Development Need where it is stated that the main drivers for development need are changes in demography in terms of population change: i.e. increased life expectancy, and inward migration, as well as lifestyle changes, but it includes no figures for the period up to 2026. Are the figures available for the basis of which development need has been assessed? If not, how has the whole strategy been developed? Further, as these figures have to be

predictions, what measures, such as updating of information and review of consequences, are to be incorporated into the Core Strategy so that it remains realistic?

1.33 As B&NES currently has an actual housing shortfall regarding past targets, whilst it is stated that delivery has to significantly increase to achieve current expectations can this realistically be achieved?

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 117\2 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.27

Representation 1.27 We greatly welcome the fact that no changes are proposed to the general extent of the Green Belt
(soundness): around Bath.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 117\3

Plan Reference: Policy RA4: Rural Exception Sites

Representation Rural Exceptions Sites. It is essential that any exceptions must only result
(soundness): 5.34 from an exhaustive housing needs survey and that occupancy is only available to individuals with very local connections. We do not consider market housing to be appropriate under these circumstances.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 117\4

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.38

Representation As it is acknowledged that broadband infrastructure is generally of unacceptably low quality it is
(soundness): essential that B&NES robustly exerts pressure on service providers and continues to do so until wide ranging improvements are made. Small businesses and the self-employed will not flourish until this is achieved.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 118 **Respondent:** Mrs J. Tinworth

RepresentationReference: 118\1 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.27

Representation (soundness): Protection of the Green belt surrounding Bath and therefore the protection of the World Heritage Site

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 118\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Prioritisation of previously developed land for new housing e.g. MoD sites and Western Riverside.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 118\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness): Existing Villages, etc. small scale infilling with new homes

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 118\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Housing numbers needed - these must be reduced to sensible and affordable levels

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 118\5 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.38

Representation (soundness): In view of expectant food shortages in a few years, no reduction in areas of farmland already in use for food production

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 118\6 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP6: Environmental Quality

Representation (soundness): Importance in view of possible climate change to protect wildlife habitats

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 118\7 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.94

Representation (soundness): Increase in traffic - protect area from pollution from fumes. Also roads will not support more traffic

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 119 **Respondent:** Jill Gray

RepresentationReference: 119\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): With the numbers of pupils at Beechen Cliff School ever increasing, the field is used constantly for school sports activities and for local community leisure. There is a real need for this land, zoned in March 2007 as open space, to be kept exactly as that.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 120 **Respondent:** Mr William Gaskell

RepresentationReference: 120\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness):

Change sought to make sound: You would need to draw up plans for a large community for people like me. For example the Newton St Loe development could be a 200 house development rather than a 2000 house development as I

think that is what is needed to grow Bath.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 121 Respondent: Mrs Ann Dolan

RepresentationReference: 121\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation This is an important recreational area for the pupils of Beechen Cliff school, who are increasing in
(soundness): number, and who already have less playing field area than would normally be expected for a school of this size. The boys use the lower playing field for running about and informal games almost daily in term time, which is good to see in these days when there is such concern about children not getting enough fresh air and exercise. It also provides a relaxing and safe fresh air walk to school for many of the pupils. The Government has further stressed the importance of playing fields and open air recreation, since the previous consideration was given to the preservation of this site.

The site is a greenfield site in a conservation area. It provides a recreational space for local residents in a well-populated area, not only immediately adjacent in Poets' Corner and Greenway Lane, but from Wellsway, Englishcombe Lane, Entry Hill, Oldfield Park and Holloway and Lyncombe Hill areas. It is a good place to walk, jog, and exercise children and dogs without having to resort to the use of the car. It provides an open traffic-free route from Alexandra Park through the lyncombe valley wildlife preservation areas within walking distance of town will be even more important. Residents there may well find it their nearest access to the countryside.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 122 Respondent: Martin and Teresa Broadbent

RepresentationReference: 122\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation a) Beechen Cliff School needs this space for recreation. If Culverhay is closed then the demands on
(soundness): Beechen Cliff will only be greater, and the school does not have enough playing fields for its size at present
b) This field is used a lot by the local community
c) The decision to put this site in the SHLAA overrules decisions made by Councillors, all of whom seem to be opposed to development on the site, regardless of political affiliation.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 123 Respondent: Mr John Amos

RepresentationReference: 123\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Ours sons attend the school and I have some knowledge of the school's need for this playing field area.
(soundness):

I am also a member of Greenway and I often walk along Greenway Lane. I note that it is narrow and winding and subject to through traffic. It already has numbers of cars parked there and is dangerous for pedestrians.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 124 Respondent: Ms Lucy Amos

RepresentationReference: 124\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Our children need more open space, not less, and this field (already part of the school grounds) is
(soundness): important not only for the health of the boys but also for the general public who can walk there freely, away from the ever-increasing traffic.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 125 Respondent: Mr Roger Nunn

RepresentationReference: 125\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation The playing field is still needed by the SCHOOL, mainly for informal games; since 2003 pupil numbers
(soundness): have risen; on any day up to 50 pupils can be seen playing on this area of the playing fields; and it is contrary to the governments plans to sell off any more playing fields. To sell off the field is contrary to the school's own wish, expressed by the headmaster and governors.

The lower field is extensively used by dog-walkers, local people for informal games with children, people walking across to Alexandra Park often with children, and for many other purposes. It is a valuable wild-life corridor.

The SHLAA has given insufficient attention to the TRAFFIC ISSUES raised, suggesting that the road might need to be closed in the centre. This would I believe be quite unacceptable to local residents, particularly in the light of recent spells of severe weather, when snow on Lyncombe Hill meant that vehicle access for people in the area of the east of Greenway Lane could only be possible westbound along the whole of Greenway Lane. If the latter road was cut in the middle to accommodate the housing development, these people would effectively be cut off.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 126 Respondent: D.M. Phillips

RepresentationReference: 126\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation In particular I support and find sound:

- (soundness):**
- a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
 - b)the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
 - c) the development of the MOD sites
 - d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
 - e)reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and growth in the region
 - f)the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
 - g)the development of Western Riverside

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 126\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing

(soundness): neighbourhoods.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 126\3 S

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation In particular I support and find sound: support of local farming and food production.

(soundness):

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 126\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

(soundness):

I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 127 **Respondent:** Lady Rosemary Thompson

RepresentationReference: 127\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation In particular I support and find sound:

- (soundness):**
- a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
 - b) the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
 - c) the development of the MOD sites
 - d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
 - e) reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and growth in the region
 - f) the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
 - g) the development of Western Riverside

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 127\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing

(soundness): neighbourhoods.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 127\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

(soundness):

I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 128 Respondent: Ms Margaret Dunn

RepresentationReference: 128\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation In particular I support and find sound:

- (soundness):**
- a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
 - b)the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
 - c) the development of the MOD sites
 - d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
 - e)reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and growth in the region
 - f)the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
 - g)the development of Western Riverside

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 128\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing

(soundness): neighbourhoods.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 128\3 S

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation In particular I support and find sound: support of local farming and food production.

(soundness):

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 128\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

(soundness):

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 129 Respondent:

RepresentationReference: 129\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am pleased that the greenbelt areas around Bath are to be retained and that the plans for an Urban Extension have been dropped. However I am concerned that the Duchy of Cornwall still favours the land near Newton St Loe for housing development and plan to appeal against the Core Strategy. I hope that the Council remains strong in protecting the greenbelt and urge them to consider the countryside near Newton St Loe to be made an Area of Outstanding Beauty.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 129\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I would like to comment on the new Core Strategy. I am pleased that the greenbelt areas around Bath are to be retained and that the plans for an urban extension have been dropped. However, I am concerned that the Duchy of Cornwall still favours the land near Newton St Loe for housing development and plan to appeal against the Core Strategy. I hope that the Council remains strong in protecting the greenbelt and urge them to consider the countryside near Newton St Loe to be made an area of outstanding natural beauty.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 130 Respondent: South Stoke Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 130\1

Plan Reference: Diagram 4: Bath and North East Somerset - The Key Diagram

Representation (soundness): It is unsound because it is not consistent with national Green Belt policy. Policy CP8 states "The general extent of the Green Belt is set out on the Core Strategy Key Diagram".

The Core Strategy Key Diagram appears as Diagram 4 on page 21. This Diagram is incorrect and needs to be changed along with diagram 3 on page 12, diagram 14 on page 77, diagram 18 on page 95, and diagram 20 on page 119.

The village of South Stoke is situated entirely within the Green Belt and (with the minor exception of some post war housing on Midford Road) is entirely located within the AONB. The Key Diagram 4 is incorrect as it shows South Stoke to be a suburban part of Bath (which it is not) and does not show it over-washed by Green Belt and AONB, as it should, and as is consistent with the current Local Plan. We are sure this is nothing more than a mistake that needs rectification. The mistake is then perpetrated on Diagrams 3, 14, 18, and 20, which all show South Stoke as a part of suburban Bath when clearly it is not.

- Change sought to make sound:**
1. Change Diagram 4 (the Key Diagram) so as to show that South Stoke is not part of urban Bath, but is instead colour-washed over by Green Belt and AONB designations.
 2. Change diagram 3 on page 12 so that South Stoke is not shown as part of suburban Bath. We suggest it is marked by a black dot on this diagram in the same way that Wellow and Corston are marked.
 3. Continue this change through to diagrams 14, 18, and 20 all of which are incorrect.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 130\2 S

Plan Reference: Whole Document

Representation (soundness): Congratulations on an impressive document. The Parish Council has asked me to confirm its support, which I am happy to do. Other than for this technicality the draft has our full support. Once again our congratulations for the production of a brave and inspiring document. You will appreciate that we must reserve the right to appear at the hearings in the eventuality of challenge there by others.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 131 **Respondent:** Mr G. Fear

RepresentationReference: 131\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy KE2: Keynsham Town Centre/Somerdale Strategic Policy

Representation (soundness): Any new development in and around the centre of the town must be suitable to reinstate the character and heritage of the town which has been sadly lost since the 1960's. The road infrastructure improvements should be carried out to enable the High Street to be safely used and free from traffic with improved air quality. Market traders' space can be provided to the widened High Street where the round-about is presently situated.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 131\2

Plan Reference: Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): It is presently stated that K2A and K2B are still retained in the Draft Core Strategy report. However, this land was only removed from the Green Belt because a Government Inspector came to a conclusion that the evidence put forward by the BANES highways department that an access road could be provided from Park Road to K2B was achievable. Abbots wood remains in the Greenbelt. The K2B site was visited and recently considered by BANES very own Councillors on the Planning Development Committee. They came to a decision that agreed with the many residents and communities that objected. The application was refused on unsuitable access and other planning conditions that were not met by the developer. Common sense prevailed. The removal of this land from the Greenbelt has been authorised under false pretences, as no suitable access to this site is practical or safely possible.

It has been recently mentioned that a road may be possible through the Abbots Wood to provide a link road to Charlton Rd. Charlton Rd and St Ladoc Rd. has long standing weight restriction limits applied to them. With both K2A and K2B, the possibility of up to 700 homes which has been mentioned (1400 cars + industrial + deliveries + possible public transport etc). Charlton Rd./St Ladoc Rd. would not cope with this traffic which will pass two schools. Placing a road through the middle of woodland would totally destroy the woodlands value to both wild life and the local community and as such would be very controversial. The purpose of the wood, which the local community planted, would be brought into disrepute and open to abuse by having a road built through it. It was planted as a quiet recreational and nature reserve area. It would be a terrible shame if this was damaged, as so many people have given their free time to achieve it. Wild life would not be able to cross such a busy road safely and would not have free access to the countryside. Woodlands should be noise free without the illumination from street lights. People would not walk along such a road or pathway in the dark winter afternoons for safety reasons. The Land should be reinstated to the Greenbelt. As additional employment facilities are planned over a mile away from K2 at Somerdale which is, adjacent the Railway Station it only seems logical that any housing for local people should be included here. It is easily accessible by buses, unlike K2B and access on to the Bypass and ring road can be provided.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 132 Respondent: The Southgate Limited Partnership

RepresentationReference: 132\1 S

Plan Reference: Bath: The Vision

Representation The overall spatial vision for Bath is supported. There is an acceptable balance between preserving the
(soundness): distinctive character of Bath with the need to ensure economic growth and strengthen Bath's role as an important regional centre in the South West. Although the key stated objectives are supported, they do not take account of recent developments and improvements in Bath, such as SouthGate which have provided an enhanced and more attractive centre and enhanced Bath's status by providing opportunities for sustainable city centre living, the provision of major new quality retail space and significant public transport improvements.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 132\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Our Client supports the principle of proposed policy B1 and encourages the emerging Shopping
(soundness): Strategy, particularly in respect of the following statement: "Ensure that the primary shopping area successfully absorbs Southgate into the trading patterns and character of the city centre by not making provision for a further large scale comparison retail project."

Our Client supports the inclusion of SouthGate within the primary shopping area, as identified in Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy. SouthGate has been successful but still needs to establish itself within Bath City Centre, and our Client therefore strongly supports no further provision for additional large scale comparison retail space in Bath. Any smaller scale retail development in the City must integrate

into the existing area and not threaten the viability and vitality of the existing City Centre, including SouthGate.

Our client does not support edge of centre or out of centre retail developments if they have the potential to weaken the function and viability of the primary shopping areas. The strategy for shopping should ensure that the vitality and viability of the City Centre and key established centres are protected. We consider that policy B1 should make explicit reference to edge or out of centre comparison retail developments not being supported by the Council where this could have a detrimental impact upon the primary shopping areas.

Change sought to make sound: We consider that policy B1 should make explicit reference to edge or out of centre comparison retail developments not being supported by the Council where this could have a detrimental impact upon the primary shopping areas.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 132\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation (soundness): Our client supports strategic policy B2 for the central area that seeks to ensure the central area is an attractive centre for shopping, leisure and recreation. SouthGate has contributed significantly towards this aim being modern, attractive, accessible, sustainable as well as sensitive to the historic qualities of Bath's World Heritage Site status, and as such acts as a benchmark for future development to aspire to. The identified Placemaking principle which notes the compactness and continuity of the primary shopping area, the high representation of independent, specialist and multiple retailers and high incidence of historic shop fronts as key strengths is supported. The policy proposes further retail space within the centre to address overtrading and this is supported in principle, and at an appropriate scale, as it will further enhance the central shopping areas and avoid the need for edge or out of centre retail development.

Further development within the City Centre including new housing, office space, public realm improvements and hotel bedrooms is supported which will further strengthen Bath as a sustainable City and reduce the need to travel.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 132\4

Plan Reference: Policy CP12: Centres and Retailing

Representation (soundness): Our Client supports the identified importance of centres, with Bath City Centre being supported as the top of the hierarchy and the focus for development. The policy encourages uses which contribute to maintaining the vitality, viability and diversity of centres, which is supported by our Client, however it does not provide clear guidance as to the scale of development that each centre can or should support as it is informed by an out of date retail study which has not taken into account the new retail space provided at SouthGate. A policy without clear guidance has the potential to allow development that will unacceptably impact on the vitality and viability of other centres and in particular threaten the primary shopping areas in the City Centre. We would welcome the opportunity to comment further when the new retail study is completed and this policy is refined.

In the interim, we would suggest policy CP12 contains a further clause 'c' as follows: "Retail

development within the centres listed within the hierarchy and defined on the Proposals Map will be permitted where it is:

- a Of a scale and type consistent with the existing retail function and character of the centre; and
- b Well integrated into the existing pattern of the centre; and.

C Does not threaten the vitality and viability of other existing established centres Any additional comparison retail provision within Bath should be provided to serve identified local needs and be of an appropriate scale, consistent with the requirements of national guidance in PPS4 policy EC1.4, which requires LPA's to assess the qualitative and quantitative retail needs of an area before permitting retail developments.

The function of SouthGate needs to be established and Bath's status as a regional retail destination secured. This must not be threaten by further comparison retail proposals being permitted in inappropriate and unjustified locations.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 132\5 S

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation In summary, The SLP is largely supportive of the objectives and policies within the emerging Core
(soundness): Strategy, particularly the Council's statement that further large scale comparison retail development will not be permitted in the plan period. The opportunities and improvements that SouthGate has provided for Bath are recognised by the Council and the scheme has been a major success for the City which has significantly strengthened its role as a major shopping destination. As the development is completed and further established, emerging policies within the Core Strategy should be carefully worded to ensure it can build on this success and is protected from development which may harm its viability and that of the wider city centre.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 133 **Respondent:**

RepresentationReference: 133\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation I understand that the number of pupils at the school has grown since the last application and, given the
(soundness): rise in child obesity, it would be a great mistake to deprive future generations of this very precious facility in such close proximity to the school. I also understand that Government policy on playing fields is now tighter than it was when the previous application was made. Bath is a World Heritage Site and is unique in having green spaces within the city. These are the lungs of the city and provide havens for wildlife.

People in authority have a grave responsibility to preserve these important spaces for generations to come. They are part of what makes Bath an exceptional place and, once they are built on, they are gone forever. So much damage was done to Bath in the 1960s - we must not make the same mistakes again.

Please, in future, concentrate on giving permission to build on brownfield sites and preserve our valuable green spaces. Finally I feel that local residents views should be condiered above all others. They are the ones who would be affected by the change of use or this green space, which at present they are able to enjoy and use for informal recreation. They should take priority over developers.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 134 **Respondent:** Mr and Mrs May

RepresentationReference: 134\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation In particular I support and find sound:

- (soundness):**
- a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
 - b)the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
 - c) the development of the MOD sites
 - d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
 - e)reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and growth in the region
 - f)the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
 - g)the development of Western Riverside

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 134\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing neighbourhoods

(soundness):

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 134\3 S

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation In particular I support and find sound: support of local farming and food production

(soundness):

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 134\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 134\5 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 135 **Respondent:** John and Sheila Deuch

RepresentationReference: 135\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound:

- a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
- b) the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
- c) the development of the MOD sites
- d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
- e) reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and growth in the region
- f) the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
- g) the development of Western Riverside

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 135\2

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing neighbourhoods

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 135\3 S

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: support of local farming and food production

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 135\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 135\5 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 136 **Respondent:** Mrs B. Hobbs

RepresentationReference: 136\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound:
a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
b) the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
c) the development of the MOD sites
d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
e) reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and

growth in the region
f)the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
g)the development of Western Riverside

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 136\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing neighbourhoods

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 136\3 S

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: support of local farming and food production

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 136\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 136\5 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 137 Respondent: I.G.C. Stratton

RepresentationReference: 137\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

- Representation (soundness):**
1. The SHLAA is a subjective and one sided document supported by developers without proper consultation with other interested parties.
 2. The SHLAA was published just prior to Christmas and responses have to be lodged by the 3rd February 2011. Accordingly there is totally insufficient time for proper consideration and preparation of responses to this document.
 3. The SHLAA is ill thought out, too cursory and ignores the powerful arguments against the proposal stated by the council in its decision of 2007.
 4. Throughout the United Kingdom local authorities are selling off land of one sort or another not for the benefit of the community but to raise money to pay for years of incompetent management. Is the proposed development yet another example of this policy?
 5. The SHLAA is totally contrary to the recently expressed views of councillors
 6. Government policy on playing fields has now been revised due to the overselling of these amenities to the detriment of the sporting activities of all children. As a result government policy now demands that school playing fields be preserved rather than sold off.
 7. With specific reference to Beechen Cliff there is an increased demand for playing fields as the number of pupils has increased since 2003 and the present headmaster strongly supports the retention of the land in question for its present use as playing fields.
 8. There has been a reduction in the councils housing land targets since 2007 which is even less. Furthermore the local plan published in 2007 zoned the land open space.
 9. Bath is a World Heritage City and accordingly there is an important need to protect "green infrastructure" and its landscape setting. In addition the land in question is clearly open space and a habitat for wildlife
 10. The SHLAA completely fails to deal with and ignores the extremely dangerous traffic problems in Greenway Lane. During the rush hour Greenway Lane ceases to be a "lane" and becomes a "rat run" and main artery for traffic into the centre of the city resulting in traffic jams. Even at quiet times cars speed along Greenway Lane at speeds in excess of 50mph. Consequently there have been a number of serious accidents which have taken place in this road. Any development of the playing fields would increase the amount of traffic and exacerbate these problems and dangers. There would also be an increased danger to the pupils of Beechen Cliff School as they have ingress and access to the school.
 11. Personally as the author of a legal textbook entitled "Building Land and Estates: Their Acquisition and Development" I can see no legal or other need for this land to be developed for housing or any other purpose,

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 138 Respondent: Mr Christopher Isaac

RepresentationReference: 138\1

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

- Representation (soundness):** While the proposed Core Strategy generally appears to move in the right direction, one has to be concerned (as indicated in the BA 2008 meeting) as to its implementation. Effectively BathNES will

have to act in a very corporate way, particularly with respect to providing appropriate employment fabric, the provision of affordable housing and with respect to a proposed cultural / performance arts centre. It will also need to make sure that the Universities invest in a higher percentage of student housing than previously, the lack of which has been to critically reduce the availability (and pricing) of family housing in areas such a Oldfield Park.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 138\2 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.93

Representation With respect to transport, the Council needs to support those initiatives that can make the car less
(soundness): attractive and public transport, cycling and walking more attractive.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 138\3

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Finally, at a more local level, I think it very unfortunate that the Council should appear to be accepting
(soundness): Beechen Cliff School's proposal to redevelop an area of their playing field alongside Greenway Lane for housing. Not only is this area important as a local amenity, but, with school numbers growing, informal play outdoors is an essential element of children's school life.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 138\4

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation The Core Strategy rightly recognises the need to address the physical and social problems / needs
(soundness): related to the small towns and villages to the south of Bath. There should be detail local plans produced involving the local communities, which get down to the level of place making, specification of local services, etc. More generally, there needs to be an education / employment strategy which, having studied the essential under-employment / unemployment problems related to lower income households, sets out packages of proposals to encourage employment growth and improve local access into the job market.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 139 Respondent: London Road and Snow Hill Partnership

RepresentationReference: 139\1 S

Plan Reference: Strategic Objective 4: Invest in our city, town and local centres.

Representation The Partnership notes the council's desire to promote "healthy and attractive urban centres" and the
(soundness): desire of the council, as expressed in the document to encourage "high quality environment in which to reside, locate and grow business, visit and invest. The Partnership looks forward to the policy being implemented in the London Road area. Objective 4 only notes the need to introduce more commercial space as part of new mixed use developments on underperforming sites

Change sought to There needs to be mention of under-used buildings as well as sites, with note advocating policies to
make sound: promote the commercial use of commercial buildings that are under used.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 139\2

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.90

Representation I believe the Core Strategy takes too narrow a view of the problems faced in the London Road area. In
(soundness): 6.90 London Road is mentioned in the context of retailing where the document notes that London Road is a "declining area". It could be argued that the area declined some forty years ago, and has not been given to opportunity to revive. Planning and economic policy have allowed shops to be turned into flats that are no longer desirable or even viable. Council owned properties in the area have been allowed to fall derelict, adding to the air of decline.

The core Strategy recommends "consolidating and strengthening the retail role..." This is too narrow a view of what is needed.

6.91 refers to the protection of shops within the area, whilst 6.92 seems to attempt some connexion between the Southgate development and the demand for retailing space in other parts of the city. Let's start by accepting that an entrepreneur does not ask: "Shall we open in Southgate or on the London Road.....?"

Change sought to May I suggest that we stop talking about retail as though it is the only possible or viable activity on the
make sound: London Road, or anywhere else for that matter. The Strategy Document needs to take a wider view of creating employment in the suburbs and in what you call local Shopping Centres. Perhaps we could free ourselves of the trap if we call these centres: Areas of Employment or areas of economic activity.....of which retailing will be one, perhaps important, aspect.

The Document does refer to "supporting business development" So why not use this concept more broadly? There is a recognised shortage of space for new and micro business other than retailing. Why not allow underused premises on the London road to be used for employment other than retailing?

To give a recent example. A vet applied for planning permission to open a surgery on London Road. The application was blocked because the surgery was not a "Shop" as defined. After support from elected representatives and the local community, planning permission was given, and more that 400 customers registered at the new business in the first three months!

The Core strategy should contain more about honing policies congruent to local needs as expressed by the community.

The London Road is an ideal location for the establishment of a Local Development Area.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 140 Respondent: Ms Irene Macias

RepresentationReference: 140\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): As a regular user of the field, where I have the pleasure to walk my dog every day, I feel very strongly that building on this wonderful site would be very detrimental to the school, the community as a whole, and the beautiful landscape and wildlife that so many of us so cherish. I feel that Bath is very built up already and that there are not enough green open spaces like this one. I see families with children, people doing sports, other dog walkers, and in general, people who enjoy the outdoors. I don't think the site is big enough to build much on it, anyway.

These fields are a wonderful asset not just to those who live adjacent to them, but also to the neighbouring community as a whole. I would ask you to consider very carefully any plans for this site, as it would have a very wide impact for many of us.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 141 Respondent: Mr Keith Bates

RepresentationReference: 141\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness):

Change sought to make sound: None

Representation (legal compliance): Legally Compliant - I support the Core Strategy and the proposal to give Clutton RA2 status within it. I do not consider that Clutton offers sufficient local facilities or infrastructure to support extensive further housing development.

As an RA2 site, Clutton remains a potential site for future identified social housing requirements which can be met through the use of small brown field site developments within the existing housing development boundary and that would be of a suitable scale and character

Change sought to make legally compliant: None

Respondent Number: 142 Respondent: Diana and Nicolas Francis

RepresentationReference: 142\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Others will have expressed cogent reasons for opposing any plan to develop this area for housing; it suffices to say that the retention of open space in Bath at the present time is vital to quality of life of residents, and scholars at Beechen Cliff School (where numbers are expected to rise substantially over the next couple of years).

The issue of how to cope with increased traffic is also a serious matter along a narrow and congested road.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 143 **Respondent:** Bathampton Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 143\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.06

Representation While the text is an accurate portrait of each sub-area inside the LPA's boundaries it could also set out
(soundness): the difficulty in devising planning policy for such an area – the close proximity of the World Heritage Site comprising much of the city and the areas of cherished landscape which immediately border it. The text should recognise the distinctive character of the Avon Valley east of Bath as a separate sub-region within the District and neighbouring Wiltshire. Development may involve difficult conflicts of interest and indeed conflict between CS policies which will require resolution, something which the CS should acknowledge.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\2

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation Policy DW1's overarching statement is unexceptionable. However, on account of a successful legal
(soundness): challenge to the Secretary of State's use of his powers the figures previously under consideration have been withdrawn. There is a serious national problem in the discrepancy between new homes required and the number of sites which either have planning permission or are allocated in development plans. How this situation may be resolved is unknown. The Secretary of State's notion that the national need can be met by the aggregation of 'bottom up' proposals coming from local communities seems unlikely to happen. Consequently, the possibility that B&NES may not be required to provide for a portion of that demand is uncertain. In the event of the problem remaining unsolved by the time of the CS's public examination it would be preferable for the text to recognise the potential problem on a 'what if?' basis.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\3

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation The reliance on a criterion-based policy with its operation as explained in paragraph 2.32 is
(soundness): unsatisfactory. In our view there is an over-riding need to preserve the character of the setting of the World Heritage Site. This is particularly so where it is in immediate proximity to open land of high quality in planning terms, notably east of Bath where the open undeveloped Avon valley bottom affords outstanding visual contrast and is largely in the Green Belt and/or Cotswold AONB. The unique visual characteristics of this area, both in its own right as a cherished landscape of high quality and in

its function as part of the setting of the WHS merits geographical designation as a buffer zone which should extend from the edge of the built-up area to the arc of ridge lines at the summits of the rising land surrounding Bath on three sides. Such geographical expression, in diagrammatic form in Diagrams 4 and 5 and eventually in the WHS management Plan as an SPD, is essential and would acknowledge that the WHS and its open buffer are together an integral part of the local landscape.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation (soundness): We support the categorisation of villages.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\5

Plan Reference: Diagram 5: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Indeed, the maintenance as open countryside in the Green Belt of the River Avon valley bottom land immediately east of the WHS should be declared in the CS as an immutable principle and clearly expressed in geographical terms on Diagram 5 (page 33).

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\6

Plan Reference: Whole Document

Representation (soundness): We welcome the requirement to provide 17.7% of AH on for small sites of 5 to 9 dwellings or 0.25 to 0.49 ha. However, such a requirement may well work against the intention of the policy by stimulating applications for permission to build 4 dwellings. For that reason, we consider the CS should explicitly encourage the LPA to routinely seek some provision of AH on development sites of less than 5 dwellings in the rural settlements

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\7 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation We welcome the CS's support for the protection of the Green Belt. We note its observation that there
(soundness): are places where small adjustments in the boundaries could logically be made. As no action was taken on this in the Local Plan inquiry we consider the issue should now be addressed and support the commentary in the CS.

PPS1 as revised gives primacy to proposals for renewable energy generation over the long-established strong presumption against development in the Green Belt. The CS text should acknowledge that there may arise circumstances in which there could be a conflict between Policy CP3 Renewable Energy and Policy CP8 Green Belt.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\8

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.95

Representation This policy refers to the JLTP3 which incorporates the BTP. One element of the BTP is the Bathampton
(soundness): Meadows Park and Ride site proposal. Bathampton Parish Council continues to oppose this proposal for the following reasons:

1. B&NES's own consultants admit the development would have no significant effect on traffic congestion or traffic-generated air pollution;
2. It would offer no contribution to relief from the damaging effects of heavy goods vehicle traffic passing through Bath;
3. Traffic currently diverting to other routes as a result of delays in London Road, Bath would return;
4. The existing bus lane in London Road is served by bus services with 9 journeys in off-peak hours with 2 stopping places in the reserved lane;
5. It would encroach on the Green Belt and be widely visible from viewpoints in the neighbouring Cotswold AONB in a location which should form part of a geographically-defined open green buffer zone around the City of Bath World Heritage site. The WHS and the valley together form an important component of an outstanding local landscape;
6. The planned provision of 1400 spaces falls short of the B&NES Council's estimate of the 1800 spaces needed, yet the physical constraints at the site would prevent any future expansion, and it is therefore not sustainable
7. The scheme is an integral part of the Bath Transport package, the business case for which is based on unsupportable assumptions.
8. The claimed public support for the scheme does not truly reflect the results of such public consultation as was carried out.

If the Bathampton Meadows Park-and-Ride site is rejected the problem of provision of an alternative location east of Bath may only be possible in the area of another LPA. However, the latest estimates produced by the LPA show a greater proportion of traffic entering Bath from the north (A46) than from the east (A4). This alone clearly indicates the need for a review of possible sites, including the deletion of the Bathampton Meadows site.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\9 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP9: Affordable Housing

Representation We welcome the requirement to provide 17.5% of AH on small sites of 5-9 dwellings or 0.25 to 0.49 ha.
(soundness): However, such a mandatory requirement may work well against the intention of the policy by stimulating applications for permissions to build 4 dwellings. For that reason, we consider the CS should explicitly encourage the LPA to routinely seek some provision of AH on development sites of less than 5 dwellings, including the subdivision of existing premises, in the rural settlements.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\10

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.06

Representation A problem of the statutory planning regime is that an LPA treats its area as an island. That is
(soundness): unrealistic; for example the River Avon east of Bath forms an administrative boundary yet there are planning interests common to both sides of the valley. There are similar problems of the need for cross-boundary co-operation as in the case of business development in Wiltshire only accessible to heavy goods traffic on a minor road through Batheaston. A further example is the failure to consider whether a suitable park-and-ride site east of Bath might be possible beyond the LPA boundary. The CS should acknowledge the existence of cross-boundary problems.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 143\11

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.94

Representation Paragraph 6.94 expresses the need for studies assessing development of an A36/A46 link yet no such
(soundness): development is proposed in the LDF period to 2026 and reference to such a connection should be deleted.

Change sought to make sound: Delete reference to the A36/A46 link from the Core Strategy.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 144 **Respondent:** Ms Liz Dodgson

RepresentationReference: 144\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation The playing field is extensively used both by the school and local community; indeed the revised
(soundness): inclusion of this area is even more astonishing bearing in mind that Government guidance has become more emphatic on the preservation of school playing fields since the election of the Coalition last May.

This playing field forms part of a Conservation area and is an important green, open space on the south

side of Bath. In an age where we have a far greater understanding of the value of preserving our green spaces we need to protect rather than threaten this area from ANY risk of future development. This area provides the setting both for Lyncombe Vale and, critically, the listed properties that form its backdrop; development would destroy this forever. Surely, our experiences of previous planning decisions in the 70s and 80s have taught us to value rather destroy this wonderful heritage city, which, after all we are only custodians of.

It is critical that this well used and appreciated green space is not eliminated for the sake of a few houses that will make little impact on Bath's housing requirement. Therefore, I believe that there are indisputable grounds for LYN 6 to be removed from the SHLAA.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 145 Respondent: Mrs Saskia Jackson

RepresentationReference: 145\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness): I believe that the information as set out in the draft core strategy shows consideration and understanding of local circumstances.

My comment refers in particular to the classification of Clutton Village.

I believe that the village is unsuitable for significant housing development due to the existing infrastructure (eg sewerage) , facilities (school, amenities) and traffic / transport (traffic volume, lack of footpaths, lack of public transport links)

Where moderate development is being proposed within the village boundaries this should take place on brownfield sites

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 146 Respondent: Ms Alison Evans

RepresentationReference: 146\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am pleased that this Core Strategy has agreed to maintain the greenbelt around Bath and that the number of houses to be built has been agreed to a more sensible number following the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy.

I agree that the housing development should be on brownfield sites and that this will include the redundant MOD sites.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 146\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy B5: Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities

Representation I also agree that student accomodation should be created on university sites and that this will stop the
(soundness): loss of family homes being used for multiple occupation in areas such as Oldfield Park.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 146\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation My particular interest is in the countryside close to Newton St Loe and I am pleased that the idea of an
(soundness): Urban Extension to Bath has been firmly dropped from the new Core Strategy.
I feel that the village of Newton St Loe has a unique identiy which must be retained. Its rural setting is very important. I am aware that the landowners - the Duchy of Cornwall - are still in favour on building on the fields near Newton St Loe and that they are to appeal against the Core Strategy. It is suggested that making this area an Area of Oustanding Natural Beauty would help to protect it and I ask that you support this idea.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 146\4

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation I agree with the statement that the strategy must support local food production, and the statement
(soundness): that the openness of the countryside must be maintained. (This is especially important in regards to Bath and its setting as a World Heritage Site).

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 147 **Respondent:** Bath Green Party

RepresentationReference: 147\1

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: The Spatial Vision

Representation The vision is critically flawed in that it does not identify a sustainable future. In the current times of
(soundness): potentially catastrophic climate change, the document needs to address the principle of providing for the needs of the area from within the area.

The issue of sustainability needs to be addressed in a way that it is not at the moment.

In 2005 Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1 defines "The Government's Objectives for the Planning System" and says

"Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning. At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. A widely used definition was drawn up by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987: "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

The 2006 Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) must conform with the PPS, and addresses the issue in section 1.

1 A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE FOR THE SOUTH WEST

1.6 Sustainability Principles and Policies to Guide the Spatial Strategy

A 'One Planet Economy': Sustainable Consumption and Production

1.6.2 There is a tension which the Draft RSS must help resolve, between further population and economic growth and the imperative to reduce resource consumption and, most importantly, the decoupling of growth and CO2 emissions. Consumption of natural resources or 'ecological footprint' has a global impact. Growing demands for built development, infrastructure, food, fresh water, natural materials and energy, seriously risk the erosion of the life systems on which we all depend.

The South West's ecological footprint is unsustainable as it stands. If everyone on the planet consumed such a quantity of natural resources and energy as an average South West resident, three planets would be needed to support life on Earth. Consequently, a shift is needed towards 'one planet', lower consumption, with lifestyles which are more resource efficient. This should include a move towards locally produced, replaceable natural resources, more efficient usage of energy, better waste re-use/recycling and more efficient use of scarce natural resources such as minerals.

The "Sustainability Appraisal" for the RSS starts:

What is the purpose of Sustainability Appraisal?

1. The preparation of the South West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is required by law to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA) incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment, with the aim of achieving the goal of sustainable development.

"The goal of sustainable development is to enable all people throughout the world to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life, without compromising the quality of life of future generations.

This message is not new - but has been lost in this version of the Core Strategy. If the September 2009 Environ "Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report" is meant to "ensure that the Core Strategy is in accord with the objectives of sustainable development", it fails. Expectations of economic and population growth have superseded expectation of sustainability, and this must be reversed.

This clear definition of sustainability needs to be re-stated and be the main pillar of planning policy.

RA7

The options do not comment on the sustainability of the areas, which needs to be the first element to consider

.K4

The options do not comment on the sustainability of the area, which needs to be the first element to consider

Change sought to make sound: So to answer question DW1 – We do not agree with the spatial vision because it does not define a sustainable future. The top line vision should read “By 2026 the lives and lifestyles of people in B&NES will be sustainable”
The whole Core Strategy needs to be revised to meet this objective.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\2

Plan Reference: Strategic Objective 1: Cross cutting objective - Pursue a low carbon and sustainable future in a changing climate.

Representation Peak oil

(soundness): The Core Strategy looks to the long term and in the long term we will live in a world where oil is scarce and very expensive. Concern about declining supplies of oil and an increasing demand for oil has been increasing, as evidenced by numerous reports since the 2006 RSS and 2007 PPS1.

See:

From 2008 “Preparing for Peak Oil - Local Authorities and the Energy Crisis” at http://www.odac-info.org/sites/default/files/Preparing_for_Peak_Oil_0.pdf

“The Oil Crunch - Securing the UK’s energy future.” UK Industry Taskforce on Peak Oil & Energy Security (ITPOES) <http://peakoiltaskforce.net/>

In 2009 – “Building a positive future for Bristol after Peak Oil” http://www.bristol.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=32277111

Change sought to make sound: BANES must publish its analysis of the risks around Peak Oil and include solutions to mitigate the risks
make sound: in the Core Strategy.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\3

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: The Spatial Vision

Representation Food security

(soundness): On 5th January 2010, during a speech at the Oxford Farming Conference, the Right Honourable Hilary Benn said :

“... it’s only in the last few decades that we have felt able to take food supply for granted, but the truth is now apparent. We cannot take it for granted any more. Food security is as important to this country’s future well-being – and that of the world’s – as energy security. Securing both must be our priority.

... .. We need to do three things. First, we need to produce more food. Second, we need to do it sustainably. And third we need to make sure that the food we eat safeguards our health.

... .. we also know that the consequences of the way we produce and consume much of our food are unsustainable. To our planet and to ourselves. Ours is a world where a billion people go to bed hungry each night because they are too poor to have enough to eat, while the same number of people in rich countries are overweight or obese because they eat too much. A world where 3 billion people live on less than £1.30 a day while British households throw out nearly £33 million worth of food a day. A world where a lot of food production depends on oil and water to such an extent that we will be very vulnerable when they become either too expensive or too scarce.
Is all this sustainable? No, it isn’t.

Is it just? Of course it isn't.

Is it going to be helped by governments abdicating responsibility or by leaving it just to the market to sort out? Clearly not."

There are already millions of people who do not get enough food; as changes in the climate disrupts the patterns of food production, more will go hungry. In the UK, we are largely dependent on the availability of cheap energy to grow and transport our food – as oil becomes scarcer our food supply chain will be disrupted. We must become more self-reliant in growing our own food .We must grow more food locally and organically. See:

<http://www.soilassociation.org/Whyorganic/Climatefriendlyfoodandfarming/Soilcarbon/tabid/574/Default.aspx> for a selection of links.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy must ensure the provision of sufficient land for growing food close to the urban areas.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\4

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.19

Representation (soundness): PPS1 must be the primary driver "KEY PLANNING OBJECTIVES . To deliver sustainable development, and in doing so a full and appropriate response on climate change" and this overrides the earlier RSS. More and every effort must be made to fill empty properties before building more. Innovative ways must be found to maximise occupancy in existing housing to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. Specific policies for student housing have not been included and need to be.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\5

Plan Reference: Policy CP3: Renewable Energy

Representation (soundness): B&NES is to be praised for commissioning the CAMCO report and for being prepared to lead the way in developing renewables. However, in defining the Target levels for renewable energy, the CAMCO report fails to acknowledge the need for the type of fundamental change demanded by PPS1. The CAMCO target recommendations are not far-reaching enough and do not respond to "climate change is the greatest long-term challenge facing the world today".

It is imperative that we aim for as near the technical potential as possible. This is what PPS1, the Government and current evidence demands. Additionally, there must be scope for increasing targets as new technologies evolve. We must at least meet the UK national targets for 2020 (32% electricity, 14% heat). Concerning energy from biomass - this will be limited by the supply of biomass; we cannot rely on imports because surrounding areas will need their biomass to meet their own needs.

There must be a fundamental shift in the planning process for the installation of renewable energy supplies. Planners should comply with PPS1 to achieve the greatest renewable supply and to encourage and facilitate construction of renewable supplies. Renewable energy sites should be situated where their potential is maximised. Community groups should be encouraged, supported and facilitated, as projects initiated and backed by the community will prosper - as they do in the Scandinavian countries.

DW9 : Do you agree with the targets (for on-site renewable energy generation) suggested by research?
No.

There is a great urgency to this matter. There must be a fundamental shift in planning policy to meet PPS1 "KEY PLANNING OBJECTIVES . To deliver sustainable development, and in doing so a full and appropriate response on climate change secure the highest viable resource and energy efficiency and reduction in emissions; " Given that any new developments will be around for many years to come, they should be developed such that their energy needs are met without emitting GHGs. Given that we are going to struggle reducing emissions to meet the needs of existing housing/businesses, let's not make life harder for ourselves – all new developments must be able to meet their needs without GHG emissions.

However, the location of the source of the energy should be one that allows the most efficient production of the energy – it is pointless putting up wind turbines on-site if there is not sufficient wind, but the developer can put up a turbine in another area where there is sufficient wind.

Change sought to B&NES must set targets approaching the technical potential to achieve that which is demanded by the
make sound: Key Planning Objective in PPS1 "To deliver sustainable development and in doing so a full and appropriate response on climate change."

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\6 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP1: Retrofitting Existing Buildings

Representation DW8 : Do you think a local policy should be developed to support retro-fitting?
(soundness): Yes, given that existing properties will otherwise be emitting most of the GHGs.

Change sought to
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\7

Plan Reference: Policy CP2: Sustainable Contruction

Representation DW10 : Do you agree with the threshold (10 dwellings, above which developers should have to apply
(soundness): the on site renewable energy generation targets)?
No. There is a great urgency to this matter.

11 :Do you agree that major development should meet higher targets than national standard?
Yes, and we think that all developments should meet CSH 6 from now on.

DW12: Do you agree with the threshold or should it be lower?
It should be lower.

Change sought to Developers must provide ALL new dwellings with sources of renewable energy
make sound:

All developments should now meet CSH 6.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\8

Plan Reference: Policy CP2: Sustainable Construction

Representation DW13:Should the Checklist be required as part of planning applications?

(soundness): Yes

DW21: Does the proposed core policy for high quality urban design include all the necessary elements? Developments must be built to be long-lasting and very resilient, as once oil availability begins to decline it will become extremely expensive to repair/rebuild. So longevity needs to be designed into the developments from the outset.

Minimum space standards for private housing (Page 53)
We recommend all options.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\9

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation Climate change

(soundness): In 2007 a supplement to PPS1 was issued. While the RSS has not been updated to take account of the increased emphasis on preventing further climate change, this Core Strategy must adhere to the PPS1 climate change supplement. This will require a fundamental change to planning – a change which is not currently envisaged by the Core Strategy. The supplement to PPS1 says :

“The Government believes that climate change is the greatest long-term challenge facing the world today. Addressing climate change is therefore the Government’s principal concern for sustainable development.

KEY PLANNING OBJECTIVES . To deliver sustainable development, and in doing so a full and appropriate response on climate change secure the highest viable resource and energy efficiency and reduction in emissions; climate change considerations should be integrated into all spatial planning concerns; planning authorities should provide a framework that promotes and encourages renewable and low carbon energy generation. Policies should be designed to promote and not restrict renewable and low-carbon energy and supporting infrastructure.”

Since 2007 there has been more and more evidence of the urgent need to reduce emissions of GHGs and the consequences of climate change on people now and in the future. All the evidence strengthens the need to take action that is practicable to prevent further climate change.

We live in extraordinary times. We must take urgent action to prevent further climate change. We must adapt to the inevitable changes in climate, both locally (eg flooding) and also around the world (eg food shortages). We must plan for sustainable lifestyles after Peak Oil. “Business as usual” will not provide solutions to these problems. Fundamental change is needed. B&NES must be enthusiastic in planning solutions to these issues, to be at the forefront, in order to ensure the safety, security and sustainability of its residents. The Core Strategy must be part of these plans for a genuinely sustainable future.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\10

Plan Reference: Policy CP13: Infrastructure Provision

Representation DW16 : Does the proposed core policy for infrastructure provision include all the necessary elements?

(soundness): No, it also needs to include:

- Community space, meeting places/rooms, youth centres and play areas - and community involvement in developing these.
- Allotments and food growing space to meet demand
- Clear and dominant walking and cycling routes

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\11

Plan Reference: Policy CP7: Green Infrastructure

Representation The description of what constitutes the Green Infrastructure is not clear. We would like to be involved

(soundness): in defining it (reference to Core Strategy Options document)

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\12

Plan Reference: Policy CP12: Centres and Retailing

Representation A prosperous economy must be a sustainable one. The basis of a resilient and sustainable local

(soundness): economy must be a diverse economy that produces as full a range possible of local goods for local use and provides services for them. It must also become zero-carbon, and in the short term the economy should be strongly involved in the move to becoming zero carbon. PPS1 applies to this section, as it does to all sections ""KEY PLANNING OBJECTIVES . To deliver sustainable development, and in doing so a full and appropriate response on climate change". We agree with "Well-integrated mixed use would actively assist in creating self contained (resilient) sustainable communities and the provision of LOCAL services is key". An important part of a sustainable local economy is farming and the local production of food for local use.

Missing from this section is any mention of out of town shopping centres. These should be prohibited, as well as ribbon development of large-scale retail stores. We agree that developments should be in and around community centres. Manufacturing sites must be made available in urban areas for the local economy as described above. All of this will work towards removing the need for reliance on private motor cars.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\13

Plan Reference: Policy CP6: Environmental Quality

Representation DW23: Does the proposed core policy for landscape include all the necessary elements?

(soundness): As well as country lanes, the list of our sensitive landscapes should also include all public rights of way, which should be protected.

DW24: Does the proposed core policy for historic environment include all the necessary elements?

The historic environment should only ever be compromised in efforts to build sustainability (as defined by our response), e.g. in preventing further climate change, not to build car parks. Protecting our future is more important than protecting our past.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\14

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation B1: Do you consider this to be a fair portrait of the city?

(soundness): Not completely. The portrait doesn't comment on the sustainability of the city, which needs to be the first element to consider.

B2: Are any elements missing or wrongly presented?

Yes.

A) The transport infrastructure section does not recognise the value of the current size and compactness of the city, which makes it eminently suitable for many of its journeys to be made by walking and cycling, nor of its hilliness, which means that it is particularly important to have a well-integrated and affordable public transport system.

B) Although para 3.18 mentions air pollution, there is no mention within the transport infrastructure section of the role that transport currently plays in CO2 emissions.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\15

Plan Reference: Bath: Strategic Issues

Representation B3: Do you consider this list to be a reasonable summary of the key issues identified in the portrait?

(soundness): No.

a) We disagree with the second bullet point which identifies the need for growth. It should instead say "Make Bath a sustainable city with a diverse and resilient local economy which includes the production of the goods its needs and the provision of the services to maintain it. The city's economy should be built around the over-riding need to reduce CO2 emissions."

b) The fourth bullet point (about the river corridor) should include giving priority to creating public open space which includes safe walking and cycling routes into the city centre

c) The eighth bullet point (about tourism) should include taking the opportunity to make Bath an

exemplar of 'green tourism' based on the reduction of CO2 emissions from this sector of the economy
d) We disagree with the need for continual development of the universities within the city, as this will create further pressure on the city's housing market. The geography of the city and the already identified need for housing development makes further development of the universities impossible to attain within the city. Any further development should take place in areas where there is less pressure on the housing market and a greater need for diversifying the economy with these types of jobs.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\16

Plan Reference: Bath: The Vision

Representation B4: Does the vision capture the themes and ideas that should guide the future development of the city?
(soundness): No, it does not recognise the over-riding need for reducing CO2 emissions. Comments under B1-3 also apply here.

B5: Do the objectives successfully break down the vision into a series of specific goals against which to evaluate a strategy for Bath?

No, it specifically needs to also include points about:

- a) Local food production
- b) A local energy policy with the development of renewable energy production within B&NES
- c) A local waste management system so that we are not reliant on 'exporting' waste to be disposed of elsewhere.

Point 8 also needs to affirm the priority which needs to be given to walking and cycling within the city.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\17 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation We disagree with the concept of developing a new neighbourhood on the edge of Bath. The priority in
(soundness): providing for additional housing needs to be done through:
a) Tackling the legacy of empty housing, both publically and privately owned
b) Finding innovative ways of making better use of the existing housing stock to provide for more people than it currently holds
c) Ensuring all new development of housing is done within existing built-up areas or as small extensions where these will improve the sustainability of a community.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\18 S

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation We agree with the rationale for a river corridor concept, but it needs to give greater priority to public
(soundness): open space including safe walking and cycling routes to the city centre.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\19

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation B11: What are your views on options 1a and 1b and 2a and 2b?

(soundness): There is a need for some retail space to be provided away from the city centre, as envisaged by 1b and 2b, but only as small local shops, not large-scale stores, supermarkets or bulky goods as listed in 1b and 2b. Office space needs to be accessible to major public transport and safe walking and cycling routes. This will largely mean city centre provision, but small-scale provision elsewhere in the city is also important where it meets this criteria.

B12: To what extent should the Core Strategy seek to accommodate office space and comparison within the central area?

These should both be located where accessible to the largest number of residents by foot, cycle and public transport. To that extent, the city centre should have the bulk of the provision, but not exclusively.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\20

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

Representation The options do not comment on the sustainability of the area, which needs to be the first element to
(soundness): consider. There is a lack of ambition to provide jobs to more closely match the population. The opportunity to bring rail back in use should be considered as part of the transport plan.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 147\21

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.93

Representation As with other sections, the priority for this section should be the urgent reduction of CO2 emissions.
(soundness): This must include giving priority to ensuring all areas are safe and accessible by foot and developing safe cycling routes, and should include a specific policy on changing the urban speed limit to a maximum of 20mph, with slower speeds where necessary.

We oppose expanding the number of Park and Ride sites or their size and we also oppose the building of the South Bristol Ring Road, as both these measures will encourage greater car use and facilitate longer journeys. Parking provision and management policies must have REDUCING car use as their main objective. This policy also needs to recognise that B&NES should join a regional integrated transport authority.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 148 Respondent: Bath Chamber of Commerce

RepresentationReference: 148\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am writing on behalf of Bath Chamber of Commerce to express our broad support for the latest Core Strategy Document. We have been appreciative of being fully informed of developments and grateful than many of our original observations on the original have been incorporated into the new version.

However, there are six points that I need to raise on behalf of our members, who form a significant part of the business community.

1. We believe that economic development must come first and foremost in every strategy since it is the foundation from which all funding is generated which can thereafter meet the needs of the welfare of both people and heritage.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 148\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am writing on behalf of Bath Chamber of Commerce to express our broad support for the latest Core Strategy Document. We have been appreciative of being fully informed of developments and grateful than many of our original observations on the original have been incorporated into the new version.

However, there are six points that I need to raise on behalf of our members, who form a significant part of the business community.

2. We note the reduction in the proposed numbers of jobs and houses compared to previous estimates and despite them being unambitious, we consider them acceptable as an absolute minimum. Ideally, they will be surpassed, but on no account should we fall short of delivering them and there must be no allowance for resting on laurels once 60% or 70% is achieved.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 148\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am writing on behalf of Bath Chamber of Commerce to express our broad support for the latest Core Strategy Document. We have been appreciative of being fully informed of developments and grateful than many of our original observations on the original have been incorporated into the new version.

However, there are six points that I need to raise on behalf of our members, who form a significant part of the business community.

3. We believe there is adequate land in Bath to produce the number of high value jobs that are so necessary. In fact there may be an argument for some employment land coming out of the market in order to create a demand which would allow developers the opportunity to create modern office space.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 148\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation (soundness): I am writing on behalf of Bath Chamber of Commerce to express our broad support for the latest Core Strategy Document. We have been appreciative of being fully informed of developments and grateful than many of our original observations on the original have been incorporated into the new version.

However, there are six points that I need to raise on behalf of our members, who form a significant part of the business community.

4. That said, we believe there should be a flexible approach to the Green Belt. Of course we do not seek its total destruction, far from it, but we do believe that beneficial development should not be restricted by an overly tight interpretation.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 148\5 S

Plan Reference: Whole Document

Representation (soundness): I am writing on behalf of Bath Chamber of Commerce to express our broad support for the latest Core Strategy Document. We have been appreciative of being fully informed of developments and grateful than many of our original observations on the original have been incorporated into the new version.

However, there are six points that I need to raise on behalf of our members, who form a significant part of the business community.

5. We would like to note our impression that there have been occasions in the past when some Council Departments have seemed to be at odds with others. We very much hope that the Core Strategy is shared by the entire local authority.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 148\6 S

Plan Reference: Whole Document

Representation I am writing on behalf of Bath Chamber of Commerce to express our broad support for the latest Core
(soundness): Strategy Document. We have been appreciative of being fully informed of developments and grateful
than many of our original observations on the original have been incorporated into the new version.

However, there are six points that I need to raise on behalf of our members, who form a significant part
of the business community.

6. Finally, we would like to see even greater efforts put into encouraging more inward investment. The
business community is more than willing to play its part. We could circulate material to contacts and
even act as ambassadors when the opportunity arose if there was suitable literature available to
distribute. I would be happy to discuss this with appropriate officers.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 149 **Respondent:** Jean

RepresentationReference: 149\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation In particular I support and find sound:

- (soundness):**
- a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
 - b) the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
 - c) the development of the MOD sites
 - d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
 - e) reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and
growth in the region
 - f) the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
 - g) the development of Western Riverside

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 149\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing neighbourhoods
(soundness):

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 149\3 S

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: support of local farming and food production

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 149\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 149\5 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 150 **Respondent:** Mr and Mrs Awebb

RepresentationReference: 150\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound:
a) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath
b) the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development
c) the development of the MOD sites
d) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats
e) reducing the housing numbers to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and

growth in the region
f)the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
g)the development of Western Riverside

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 150\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: small scale infilling of new houses within existing neighbourhoods

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 150\3 S

Plan Reference: Rural Areas: The Vision

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: support of local farming and food production

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 150\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation (soundness): In particular I support and find sound: The protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 150\5 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 151 Respondent: Dunkerton Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 151\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.45

Representation While Dunkerton Parish Council believes the Core Strategy to be legally compliant and sound we have **(soundness):** some comments on the Rural Areas section of the Strategy. In considering the factors that will drive growth in the rural economy, Dunkerton Parish Council believes that the draft significantly overplays the potential of employment in renewables (biomass, hydro etc). We see little evidence of, or scope for, such expansion in the Cam Valley and particularly in our Parish. Conversely, we believe that the significance of extant, relatively poor rural broadband coverage is underplayed. We feel it is unadventurous and cautious that the draft simply "recognise" that rural coverage is patchy. In developing the strategy, B&NES takes a properly energetic and proactive line in the way it proposes engagements with public transport providers; a similarly focused strategic line needs to be developed to engage with broadband providers, to enable homeworkers and small rural businesses to market their services and products.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 152 Respondent: Corston Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 152\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation From discussions held with Parish Council colleagues at Newton St. Loe, we understand that the Duchy **(soundness):** of Cornwall intend to make representation later this year to the Examination in Public of this draft Core Strategy with the intention of attempting to reintroduce the excluded Urban Extension of Bath at Newton St. Loe (Known as Option 3A in the previous Core Strategy Spatial Options).

Should this transpire, Corston Parish Council would make the point that the Urban Extension at Newton St. Loe was thoroughly addressed during the earlier consultation and was overwhelmingly rejected by an exceptionally large number of Unitary Authority residents. So much so, that understandably, the Urban Extension was removed from the current draft Core Strategy. To reintroduce this discredited proposal could be seen as an attempt to undermine a democratically established conclusion that reflects the wishes the people, including Unitary Authority Councillors; Parish Councils and environmental protection groups, All of the above did not wish to see building development on valuable agricultural land or any areas within the Green Belt. Corston Parish Council wishes to be presented at the Examination in Public of this current Core Strategy.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 152\2 S

Plan Reference: Strategic Objective 1: Cross cutting objective - Pursue a low carbon and sustainable future in a changing climate.

Representation (soundness): Corston Parish Council fully supports Objective 1 and 2 as proposed.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 152\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Objective 3. We feel the council should concentrate on the development of brown field sites such as Cadbury at Keynsham, Riverside in Bath, and as they become available, ex.Ministry of Defence sites throughout the area. Additionally, we consider that in the past planning decisions for major development projects have taken too long to reach a conclusion and in future the process needs to be significantly shortened.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 152\4

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.45

Representation (soundness): 1E Infrastructure. We are concerned that there is no comment on the provision and improvement to deliver an acceptable level of Broad Band IT services, particularly in rural areas This is an important matter and should be added to the Draft Core Strategy.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 152\5

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation (soundness): Urgent consideration should be given to permanently increase pedestrian areas in Bath city centre. Milsom Street and Stall Street are considered to be prime candidates.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 152\6

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.58

Representation We understand that the Strategic Nature Area shown in diagram 20. Section 6.58 is about to be
(soundness): extended from Kelston to Englishcombe on the South West side of Bath. This important change of designation should be reflected in the Core Strategy document.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 153 Respondent: Claverton Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 153\1

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: Vision and District-wide Strategy

Representation (a). The City of Bath WHS (UK's only complete city to be designated a WHS) and its high quality (Green Belt and Cotswolds AONB) landscape combine to make Bath unique. However, this „very special relationship“ is not expressed effectively within the Spatial Portrait of the district. Recognition of this inextricable link is paramount, especially because of the difficulties which may arise when any proposed developments involve conflicts of interest between Core Strategy Policies.
(b). Paragraph 1.11 does not highlight that the Avon and Limpley Stoke Valley to the east of Bath, which lies within the Cotswolds AONB, is a distinctive cross boundary area within B&NES and Wiltshire.
(c). Diagram 2 (Sub-regional context) illustrates effectively that B&NES is not an „island“, but surrounded by a number of neighbouring authorities, including, not only the other West of England local authorities, but also those of Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire.
The Parish Council recognises that the Core Strategy does acknowledge, e.g. at 1.25 and 6.59, that strategies and programmes in neighbouring authorities have to be taken into account and that the West of England JLTP3 also acknowledges, at 2.5, the need to identify cross boundary transport issues. However, the Spatial Portrait and Key Strategic Issues fail to highlight these issues.

Change sought to make sound: (1). Paragraph 1.06 should highlight the unique nature of the City of Bath WHS and its landscape setting, along the lines described above. It should also highlight that conflict may arise between Core Strategy Policies when considering future development proposals.
(2). Paragraph 1.11 should highlight the Avon and Limpley Stoke Valley area as a distinctive cross boundary area within B&NES and neighbouring Wiltshire.
(3). A summary discussion of Cross Boundary Issues should be highlighted at the beginning of the Core Strategy under Key Strategic Issues (1.12) and include not only considerations related to the West of England area but also those associated with development in and traffic movements from, Bath's eastern neighbour - Wiltshire.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 153\1

Plan Reference: Policy CP7: Green Infrastructure

Representation The evidence base regarding considerations related to the Kennet and Avon Canal is totally inadequate
(soundness): and the Core Strategy is silent regarding planning, delivery and coherence with the strategies of neighbouring Wiltshire Council. The Kennet and Avon Canal is a unique and significant heritage feature, with a large section located within The City of Bath World Heritage Site landscape setting, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and neighbouring County of Wiltshire. There are a number of important considerations related to the canal, including - social, housing, environment, planning, heritage, leisure and tourism. However, the Core Strategy only contains two very short references to the canal - Policy B1 (Natural and Built Environment - page 34) and 5a (Setting the

Agenda) - paragraph 5.04, page 92, the latter simply being a brief description of its geographic location. In addition, Diagram 20 fails to identify the canal as part of Green Infrastructure Network (page 119).

This poor representation or profiling of the many considerations related to the canal also does not reflect previous Claverton and Bathampton Parish Council representations on the Core Strategy Spatial Options, the activity of the British Waterways Mooring Strategy Steering Group (MSSG) or other parallel canal initiatives, e.g. the fundamental change of British Waterways to charitable status and the re-energisation of the Kennet and Avon Partnership Board of which B&NES is a member. It is also noted that the Core Strategy Spatial Options Document - Consultation Report has disregarded the comments and recommendations made by Claverton and Bathampton Parish Councils.

The Core Strategy contains no policy statements about the canal. The 2007 B&NES Local Plan contains only one Policy - HG.14a (Permanent residential moorings). The need to profile adequately the Kennet and Avon Canal has also been articulated in the recently approved Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan (2011-2016). This key document makes the following statement - "There is a need to promote understanding that the River Avon and Kennet and Avon Canal are integral to the Site's landscape setting and a need to ensure they are managed appropriately"

Change sought to make sound: We recommend the following two changes to the Core Strategy in order to make it sound -
make sound: 1. The following three paragraphs should be added to Policy CP7 as section 6.61 on page 119. We recognise, given that key considerations regarding the canal cut across a number of Core Strategy Policy areas, it is difficult to identify exactly where to insert an amendment. However, we consider that CP7 is an appropriate location, given the natural fit with paragraph 6.60 (the canal is an important cross-boundary G1 issue) and our second recommendation regarding the Green Infrastructure Network.

"6.61

Management of the Kennet & Avon Canal is a significant B&NES/Wiltshire cross-boundary G1 issue. The canal is a unique and important heritage feature; with a large section located within The City of Bath World Heritage Site and its landscape setting, including that part which is designated as Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

As a founding member of the Kennet & Avon Canal Partnership, B&NES recognises that, since the adoption of the 2000 Conservation Plan, there has been a significant increase in the number of boats using the western end of the canal and a step change in the recreational use of the waterside path and environs. It also accepts that a small section of the boating community will continue to choose to live on the canal.

B&NES accepts the MSSG Vision of the Kennet and Avon Canal and will play an active role in the re-energised Partnership Board to ensure that (a) British Waterways fulfils its statutory responsibilities for managing the canal and protecting the attractive waterside and landscape environs and (b) all canal users comply with planning policy and environmental health legislation.

2. The Kennet and Avon Canal should be identified as part of the Green Infrastructure Network (page 119 - Diagram 20) and the accompanying text amended appropriately.

We consider that inclusion of the above two amendments will make the Core Strategy sound by:

- (a). ensuring that the evidence base is more robust
- (b). local community/cross-boundary stakeholders are identified
- (c). key canal issues are better profiled
- (d) B&NES commitment to management of the many issues related to the canal is better described.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 153\2

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation The Parish Council welcomes the Policy B4 statement that “Proposals which would harm the

(soundness): Outstanding Universal Values of the City of Bath World Heritage Site, including its authenticity and integrity, or which would harm the setting of the World Heritage Site will be refused”

However, the Parish Council does not consider that Policy B4 and its operation, as set out in paragraph 2.32, will protect the landscape setting of the World Heritage Site (WHS) against inappropriate development. The Parish Council considers that the Policy needs to be strengthened and has the following comments.

(a). Paragraph 2.31 (page 52) identifies “the green setting of the City in a hollow in the hills” as being part of the OUV of the Bath WHS and paragraph 2.32 goes on to state that “The setting of the WHS, beyond its designated boundary, is also important as inappropriate development here can impact upon the site itself”

“The green setting of the City in a hollow in the hills” does not just relate to those hills which look down on the city centre but to the whole landscape which surrounds the WHS. The Parish Council considers that this aspect is frequently misrepresented or misunderstood and the Policy should be amended accordingly.

(b). The evidence base for proposing Policy B4 as the preferred option for protecting the landscape setting is incomplete and misleading.

1. The Core Strategy Spatial Options Document - Consultation Report states only that there was “A large body of support for the preferred policy approach for protection of the WHS setting heralding it as a far more pragmatic and workable policy and more in line with the emerging national policy approach”. The report omits the many comments and recommendations from Claverton Parish Council and a number of other parish councils and organisations, e.g. Bath Preservation Trust, that disagreed with B&NES’s preferred criterion-based policy approach (Option 2) and recommended a buffer zone (Option 1).

Bath and North East Somerset’s Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form
6b continued

2. There is no mention of the recently endorsed Bath WHS Management Plan (2011-2016). This important document also identifies the buffer zone and landscape setting as a key priority (closely matching a recommendation from the 2008 UNESCO Bath Report) and the need to continue to explore ways to preserve the setting of the Site.

In the WHS Management Plan, under the objective - “Ensure that landscape & natural elements of the Site & its setting, including heritage sites & their associated remains, are protected, acknowledged, understood & managed alongside the Site” the action - “Continue to monitor the effectiveness of existing setting protection & consider the necessity of applying a formal buffer zone” - has been identified.

There is, therefore, no consistency between the Core Strategy and the WHS Management Plan regarding a buffer zone and protection of the WHS landscape setting.

(c). The description of the landscape setting of the WHS, as set out on page 52 paragraph 2.32, is inadequate. It fails to highlight the fact that the WHS is surrounded by Green Belt and the Cotswolds AONB on its north, east and southern boundaries. Bath is unique in being the UK’s only complete city to be designated a WHS but its landscape setting is also exceptional and key to the city’s inscription as a WHS.

An additional concern is that, while the title of section 2e (pages 52 & 53) is “The World Heritage Site and its setting”, there is no depiction of the juxtaposition of the two, only an illustration of the cityscape. Recognition of the inextricable link between the WHS and its landscape setting needs to be enhanced.

(d). Page 52, paragraph 2.32 states that “The WHS Setting Study provides the background information needed to assess any potential impacts and provides an impact assessment framework to form the basis for assessing the potential impact of a development on the OUVs. The Setting Study will be used to guide decision making affecting the WHS setting and may form the basis of a future Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)”.

The Parish Council considers that the capacity of the WHS Setting Study to guide decision making

affecting the WHS setting is overstated.

It is also concerned that, not only was this study published by B&NES without being put out for public consultation, but is now being considered as the basis of a future Supplementary Planning Document.

(e). WHS landscape setting considerations have also been brought into sharp focus in the June 2008 UNESCO Bath report and the July 2009 DCLG Circular on protection of World Heritage Sites.

The UNESCO report states that - "With regard to the protection of the property, the mission recommends that the State Party act on the reinforced protection of the surrounding landscape to prevent any future developments which could have adverse and cumulative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property".

The DCLG Circular highlights that WHS landscape setting considerations are a "key material consideration" and the impact of a development should be afforded significant weight. It states - "The UNESCO Operational Guidelines (paragraph 104) suggest the designation of a buffer zone around the World Heritage Site wherever this may be necessary for its conservation. A buffer zone is defined in the guidelines as an area surrounding the World Heritage Site which has complementary legal restriction placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the World Heritage Site..." The message is clear; additional measures are required to reinforce protection of the WHS landscape setting. However, there is nothing in Policy B4 to address this concern.

Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form
6b continued

(f). It is unclear why Policy B4 highlights PPS5 Policy HE1 (Heritage Assets and Climate Change) when it is evident that all PPS5 Policies are relevant to the WHS and its setting, e.g. Policy HE10, and are material considerations which must be taken into account in all development management decisions.

It is clear that these policy guidelines are open to a high degree of interpretation. Recognising that the City of Bath WHS and its high quality landscape setting is a unique heritage asset it is, therefore, imperative that Policy B4 attempt to remove any ambiguity in interpretation of PPS5 or other relevant guiding policies.

The Parish Council considers that a geographically defined buffer zone would alleviate this ambiguity and provide the higher level of protection which is needed to prevent inappropriate development in the landscape setting of the Bath WHS.

Change sought to The following changes are recommended, in order to make Policy B4 sound –

- make sound:**
1. Paragraph 2.31 should be explicit and clarify the phrase - "the green setting of the City in a hollow in the hills" - along the lines described in 6b (a).
 2. The Core Strategy Spatial Options Document - Consultation Report should be amended to provide a balanced summary of the consultation representations regarding the two options for protecting the setting of the World Heritage Site.
 3. Reference should be made to the Bath WHS Management Plan (2011-2016) and, in line with the action identified in this Plan; a statement should be added, setting out B&NES' commitment to studies which will assess the designation of a formal buffer zone around the WHS.
 4. Reference should be made to the fact that all PPS5 Policies are (a) relevant to the WHS and its setting and (b) material considerations which must be taken into account in all development management decisions.
 5. Paragraph 2.32, or a new paragraph, should be explicit about the important characteristics of the WHS landscape setting, i.e. Green Belt, Cotswolds AONB, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens
 6. Page 52 should include an illustration which depicts the extent of both the WHS and its Green Belt/AONB landscape setting.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 153\3

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.31

Representation (a). Paragraph 2.31 (page 52) identifies “the green setting of the City in a hollow in the hills” as being
(soundness): part of the OUV of the Bath WHS and paragraph 2.32 goes on to state that “The setting of the WHS, beyond its designated boundary, is also important as inappropriate development here can impact upon the site itself”

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 153\4

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.32

Representation ©. The description of the landscape setting of the WHS, as set out on page 52 paragraph 2.32, is
(soundness): inadequate. It fails to highlight the fact that the WHS is surrounded by Green Belt and the Cotswolds AONB on its north, east and southern boundaries. Bath is unique in being the UK’s only complete city to be designated a WHS but its landscape setting is also exceptional and key to the city’s inscription as a WHS.

(d). Page 52, paragraph 2.32 states that “The WHS Setting Study provides the background information needed to assess any potential impacts and provides an impact assessment framework to form the basis for assessing the potential impact of a development on the OUVs. The Setting Study will be used to guide decision making affecting the WHS setting and may form the basis of a future Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)”.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 153\5

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.94

Representation The statement in Policy 6f, paragraph 6.95 that - “The Councilrecognises the need for studies to
(soundness): assessan A46/A36 link” is alarming. This, superficially, innocuous statement has significant implications, in direct conflict with many other policies within the Core Strategy. It is not based on robust evidence and does not reflect long standing and valid environmental concerns expressed by both the local Bath and wider community and at a previous public inquiry into such a scheme. For many years an A36/A46 link road has been suggested as a possible above ground eastern by-pass to the City of Bath. However, it is universally accepted that such a scheme would have a devastating impact on the Cotswolds AONB, City of Bath World Heritage Site landscape setting and amenity of the area east of Bath. This highly controversial scheme is unsustainable. It is not the answer to traffic congestion and air pollution problems in the City of Bath.

Further key considerations:

- (a). The Core Strategy Spatial Options Document - Consultation Report omits, e.g. on pages 61-63, any reference to the detailed concerns expressed in Claverton Parish Council’s representation about an A36/A46 link road. Similar concerns are known to have been expressed in representations by other organisations and Parish Councils.
- (b). For the convenience of the Inspector, the following comments summarise the Claverton Parish Council representation and further underpin why the Parish Council considers inclusion of the link road in the Core Strategy to be unsound.

Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form 6b continued

(i). It has been firmly established that bypasses attract extra traffic. Rather than building an extremely expensive link road, thereby encouraging traffic to the Bath area, lower cost measures should be employed to discourage through-city traffic in the first place. The number of through-HGVs which would be removed by a link road is too small to justify the undisputed and permanent damage to the Avon & Limpley Stoke Valley and City of Bath World Heritage Site landscape setting. The damaging impact of HGVs on the city can be tackled by measures which would remove more HGVs (through N-S, E-W & local) than a link road. These measures, which are outlined in the B&NES draft Air Quality Action Plan, include the relatively low cost HGV ban on Cleveland Bridge or the A36 Warminster Road, as originally proposed by the Council in 2005. Such a ban is the only acceptable option to protect both the City of Bath WHS and its landscape setting. The Parish Council understands that B&NES Cabinet strongly supports such a scheme. It is also relevant to note that future use of the recently approved Deep Sea Marine Terminal at Avonmouth should significantly reduce the volume of HGV traffic between south coast ports, via the Bath A36/A46 corridor, and the M4/M5 interchange area.

(ii). The wider harm and disbenefits which a link road would bring, outweigh any presumed benefits. A link road would not solve Bath's traffic congestion problems because traffic is predominantly local, as highlighted by B&NES: "In the Bath urban area, Government figures suggest that fewer than 1 in 20 cars represent through traffic during the morning rush hour, so a bypass would not tackle the thousands of cars whose destination is Bath"

(iii). The many statements made in the Bath WHS Management Plan, West of England Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP3) and other key policies in the Core Strategy make it clear that protection of both the WHS and its landscape setting constitutes, in planning parlance, "a very special circumstance". This has been brought into sharp focus by the 2009 Government Circular on protection of WHSs, the 2009 B&NES "Bath WHS Setting Study" and the 2008 City of Bath UNESCO report. In particular, the UNESCO report highlights the need to reinforce protection of both the surrounding landscape and the views to and from the City of Bath. The considerations outlined in these reports reinforce previously expressed concerns about the dramatic impact which an A36/A46 link road would have on the Cotswolds AONB and WHS landscape setting, in particular those expressed at the 1990 public inquiry which rejected comprehensively a proposal for an A36/A46 link road as being "...intolerable in its landscape impact and devastating to recreational amenity" - unambiguous words which remain wholly relevant.

(iv). Against a background of the vision, objectives, strategies and policy statements in the draft Core Strategy, and these recent international, national and local reports on the WHS and its landscape setting, it is very clear that no case can be made to justify the continued presence of an A36/A46 link road in B&NES/West of England transport planning.

(v). An A36/A46 link road and the, now planned, 1400 space Park and Ride on Bathampton Meadows would combine to have a catastrophic impact on the landscape and amenity of the whole area east of Bath. Set against the vision, objectives, strategies and policy statements in the draft Core Strategy, this must never be allowed to happen

(vi). The absence of the A36/A46 link road from the West of England JLTP3 transport Vision to 2026 is welcomed. Looking towards 2026 and beyond, B&NES must relinquish, once and for all, any aspirations for an A36/A46 link road through the WHS landscape setting and Cotswolds AONB. To do otherwise would be to undermine the credibility of the Core Strategy and signal B&NES intention to abandon the WHS landscape setting rather than protect it.

Change sought to The reference to the A36/A46 link road on page 129, paragraph 6.94 of Policy 6f should be removed
make sound: and no other references to a link road should be inserted.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 153\6

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.44

Representation Paragraph 2.44, page 56 refers to a proposal for a new Park and Ride to the east of the City. This **(soundness):** proposal scheme is located on the ancient water meadows of Bathampton.

This highly contentious proposal is not founded on a robust evidence base, will not meet its stated objectives, is not sustainable and does not reflect long standing and valid environmental objections expressed by the local Bath/wider community and in number of government and B&NES reports. It is also in direct conflict with many local and national policies. Rigorous evaluation of all potential Park and Ride options has not been carried out.

Further detailed comments:

(a). B&NES' own papers show that the Park & Ride would have little or no impact on traffic congestion or air pollution levels (NO₂ and PM₁₀) and therefore fails to achieve stated primary objectives. Along London Road, west of the A4/A46 roundabout, NO₂ levels would remain well above the objective level and congestion would not be alleviated.

The B&NES papers also show that the whole Bath Transportation Package (of which the Park and Ride is a key element) would have little or no impact on traffic related air pollution across Bath.

(b). The proposed Park and Ride would be the largest in Bath and would not be sustainable. The planned provision of 1400 spaces falls short of B&NES' estimate of the need for 1800 spaces. However, the site is not capable of extension because it immediately abuts the River Avon flood plain.

This lack of expansion capability is contrary to specific advice from the Department of the Environment that, sites should preferably be "surrounded by sufficient adjacent land to allow expansion should levels of demand warrant this.

Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form
6b continued

(c). The proposed Park and Ride site lies in an extremely sensitive valley floor location, in Green Belt and surrounded by the Cotswolds AONB and within 200 metres of the City of Bath World Heritage Site. It fails to satisfy the requisite tests in PPG2 (by the council's own admission).

The site, which would be floodlit for many hours during the winter months, would be widely visible from viewpoints in neighbouring communities, including the eastern area of the WHS, the closely-neighbouring Cotswolds AONB and scheduled ancient monuments. It is in a location which would clearly form part of any geographically-defined green buffer zone around the City of Bath World Heritage Site.

(d). The Park & Ride would do irreversible environmental damage and seriously degrade the character, openness and visual amenity of the WHS Green Belt/Cotswolds AONB landscape setting, and "green valley approach" to the City of Bath.

(e). Public consultation on the Park and Ride was untimely and perfunctory. B&NES evaluation of the scheme was carried out in secrecy and it was presented as a "fait accompli" on 31st July 2008. The only public opportunity to comment on the Park and Ride was at a B&NES exhibition of the four main Bath Transportation Package proposals on 6th/8th November 2008. Claims of public support for the scheme are misleading and do not truly reflect the fact that, following the November exhibition/consultation, the Park and Ride had a 78% rejection rate and following the submission of the planning application some 550 objection letters were submitted while less than 20 supporting letters were received. (f).

B&NES carried out perfunctory evaluations of other Park and Ride options and did not consider any in Wiltshire, where a considerable percentage of the estimated Park and Ride patronage is generated. A related concern is that B&NES' current figures show that the highest percentage (46%) of predicted Park & Ride demand is from the north via the A46. This provides a significantly different perspective on the location of the proposed Park and Ride, when compared to the 34% figure originally indicated by B&NES. This revised demand figure alone indicates the need for a review of Park and Ride options.

(g). A number of government and B&NES reports, over the preceding decade, consistently and explicitly rejected use of the site for Park and Ride and associated development, on the grounds of serious adverse environmental impact.

These previous rejections, coupled with the many planning policy conflicts and widespread community concern, are evidence of a well documented and almost universal objection to the use of the proposed Bathampton Meadows site for Park and Ride development.

Change sought to The Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride should be removed from the Bath Transportation Package **make sound:** and all references to it in the Core Strategy, particularly those on pages 33 - Diagram 5; 56 - paragraph

2.44 and 57 - Table 5, should be deleted.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 154 Respondent: British Waterways

RepresentationReference: 154\1

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: The Spatial Vision

Representation The spatial strategy map does not indicate the location of the Kennet & Avon Canal although it is
(soundness): mentioned as an asset in the text.

Change sought to Annotate the route of the Canal to indicate that it is separate from the river although part of the green
make sound: corridor.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 154\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Representation We are pleased to note that the Policy advocates making better use of the existing green and blue
(soundness): infrastructure running through and surrounding the town.

Change sought to
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 154\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy B3: Twerton and Newbridge Riverside Strategic Policy

Representation We welcome the acknowledgement that the river I underutilised in the past and that it can provide an
(soundness): improved connectivity for walkers and cyclists into the town centre via the river corridor.

Change sought to
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 154\4

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.01

Representation The context section does not mention the Kennet & Avon canal as an important feature in the rural
(soundness): landscape and only considers it as an historic transport corridor. Waterways for Tomorrow and the TCPA guidance note make it clear that waterways should be considered as contributing a wide range of roles; As a catalyst for regeneration and diversification, water supply and transfer, flood management, tourism, leisure and recreational resource, a heritage landscape, open space and ecological resource and a sustainable transport route. All of these are relevant to the rural areas around Bath and as such they document should be amended to give greater recognition to the role the canal should play in the area.

Change sought to make sound: The Kennet & Avon Canal runs through the rural area to the north and East of Bath, linking many settlements along its route. The Canal is a multi – functional resource, serving a variety of roles including, rural regeneration and diversification, flood management and drainage, a tourism Leisure and recreational resource, heritage landscape, ecological resource, valuable open space an sustainable transport corridor.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 154\5 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP7: Green Infrastructure

Representation (soundness): We are pleased to note that a comprehensive list of direct and in direct benefits of GI is listed and that the core Strategy recognises the need for GI policies to be cross boundary as many of the assets such as the river and canal ass through more than one Local Authority area. British Waterways believe that the Introduction to the Green Infrastructure Policy could be improved in that it uses the definition used in PPS12 and it is not immediately clear that this definition encompasses ‘blue infrastructure and blue spaces’ such as waterways.

Later on the text makes it clear that Bathnes considers waterways as important GI assets but this could however be made clearer at the outset and in the glossary where the term Green infrastructure is further defined.

Change sought to make sound: Highlight ‘ blue infrastructure’ in the definition in the same way as used in Policy KE1.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 155 **Respondent:** Mr Nicholas Press

RepresentationReference: 155\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): support strategy

Change sought to make sound: none

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant: none

RepresentationReference: 155\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA2: Development in the Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria

Representation (soundness): I wish to support this policy and the limit of development for RA2 village to those areas within the existing housing development boundary. Coincident with this I support the existing local plan map for CLUTTON and the retention along the current boundaries of the Housing Development Boundary.

Change sought to make sound: None –Support Strategy

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 155\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation I wish to support the list of villages given RA1 status and support the EXCLUSION of CLUTTON from this
(soundness): list. Clutton doesn't meet the criteria of an RA1 village it doesn't have the convenience shop and the existing school and infrastructure wouldn't support further developments of a RA1 village. The school is currently and for a number of future years is over subscribed and its location will not allow further expansion. Any extra pupils would require attendance at more remote schools. This would either walking along roads with no pavements or street lights or transport by Car which would be contrary to Green transport policies in Core policy 6f.

Change sought to make sound: None- support strategy

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 156 **Respondent:** Pulteney Estates Residents Association

RepresentationReference: 156\1

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation PERA are concerned that Diagram 8, page 42, appears to propose that the current Central area be
(soundness): extended, by 2026, to include the Recreation Ground from the present limit of Argyle Street. PERA are concerned at the implications of this rezoning from residential/public open space to city centre commercial with regard to planning consents and licensing applications for any new buildings in this area. This rezoning pre-empts the decision on use of the Recreation Ground by the Charity Commissioners and could be prejudicial to existing covenants on the Recreation Ground.

Change sought to make sound: Central Area zoning to remain as currently delineated.

Representation (legal compliance): BANES Council have sought to regard the Rec and certain residential streets within the PERA area as "commercial" in the latest version of its Core Strategy, thereby giving further credence to the development of commercial activities on the Rec, and in neighbouring residential areas.

As you know it is the 1956 conveyance that appears to govern how the Trust should be run. This conveyance refers to the Conveyance dated April 1922 which imposes on the parties to the 1956 conveyance an obligation "to observe and perform the covenants and conditions contained in the April 1922 conveyance"

The April 1922 conveyance contains a covenant binding on ANY future owner of these specific premises (the current Rec land) that "there will be no buildings for the purposes of trade or business which may be a nuisance, annoyance or disturbance or otherwise prejudicially affect the adjoining premises or neighbourhood." This seems to be clear that whoever owns the land, and regardless of any land-swap, that these conditions should be upheld.

Change sought to make legally compliant: Compliance with existing covenants pursuant to the Recreation Ground.

Respondent Number: 157 **Respondent:** Chew Stoke Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 157\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.43

Representation Our concern is about the effectiveness of the strategy for rural areas in terms of infrastructure and
(soundness): delivery.

The Core Strategy states that it aims to improve the rural economy and maintain and enhance community facilities in rural areas (Policy RA3).

However, the Core Strategy document also identifies poor access to public transport as a major issue in rural areas. Section 5C talks grandly about key transport infrastructure improvements and the need for people and villages to be well connected. However, there is no real detail or even a solid statement of intent that public transport serving the rural areas is even being looked at beyond the Greater Bristol Bus Network Improvements (which will do very little to help most rural areas). The reality for rural areas over the last 10 years has been an ever-reducing bus service making it impossible to make most “normal” journeys without using a car. This lack of public transport creates barriers to getting access to services and facilities – and, as ever, those who suffer most are the young people, the elderly and those who cannot afford their own car. The document talks about better links to Bristol and Bath from the rural “hub” villages but, even if this does happen, this seems to have the potential to leave the rest of the rural areas even more isolated. Ad hoc community travel arrangements do not give the assurance of a regular service to those in rural areas and this means that they are not used as fully as they might be and the isolation continues – a public bus service is the only correct and fair answer for rural areas, even though it will have to be heavily subsidised. The rural areas deserve this as a minimum.

Section 5C also makes vague and weak comments about broadband in rural areas and partnership working to improve access to rural services. If rural areas are to thrive in terms of business use, fast broadband is essential and we are disappointed at the lack of progress here.

Generally, in the rural areas, there is a perception that those who make the decisions for B&NES in Bath take little note of the problems for rural areas and policies are very “Bath-centric”. It is felt that those in the built up areas love to visit the beautiful rural areas at weekends, but fail to understand the problems with lack of transport, lack of facilities and lack of investment in rural areas. With current cut-backs it would seem that the problems are only going to get worse.

Finally, with rural areas being so dependent on the car for access to services and facilities, it may be hard for the area to achieve some of the other strategic objectives, such as climate change targets and proposals to reduce reliance on car travel.

Change sought to make sound: We feel that, for rural areas at least, B&NES needs to have a clear intent to review the rural public transport infrastructure and to invest in it and also to have a clearer vision and intent in terms of technology such as faster broadband (although the delivery of improvements is reliant upon service providers, there is much that B&NES can do).

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 158 Respondent: Margarida Dolan

Representation Reference: 158\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I can see the Lower Field from my house so I can let you know that it is used by the school all the time for sports lessons. In addition, every day the school children use the Lower Field during their lunch break to play games, run around or sit down chatting. The Lower Field is also used everyday, all day long by different communities. As early as 6 am there are people walking their dogs, running or exercising. At the weekend, many families who do not live in the area go for long walks that include the Lower Field, the steep steps off Greenway lane, Lyncombe Vale, Perrymead and Rosemount. Families with children use the field to run around and play games, and it is also frequent to see university students who live in the area practicing sports. The field is unusual as it is easily accessible from a number of points, it is flat, it has open views and there is no charge to use it. Local residents, visitors,

school children and staff are all privileged to experience this amazing scenery and its wildlife. Building on the field would irreparably damage this beautiful, peaceful and unique area and its diverse communities. I believe the Council should focus on treasuring and preserving this open space, and ensuring that it is always here for the enjoyment of all.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 159 Respondent: Phil Turton

RepresentationReference: 159\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): The SHLAA's assessment is far too scant. It ignores completely the arguments against the development proposal as set out by BANES in its 2007 decisions. The views of the local community have not been sought. This has resulted in a clearly biased assessment which warrants revision. The SHLAA ignores the impact of the development proposal on the setting of the listed Devonshire Buildings. Although acknowledging the PRow crossing the site the SHLAA ignores the current extensive permissive use of the land for informal recreation by the local community. The SHLAA gives scant attention to traffic issues – assuming solutions will be forthcoming but without providing detail. Policy BH.15 on visually important open space (carried over from the local plan) is ignored together with the land's role as a green wedge and wildlife corridor. In addition to the above, I understand that the school's current headmaster has expressed the view that the site is needed as playing fields; pupil numbers having risen and daily use of the site by the school's pupils having intensified. Development of the site when housing land targets have been reduced since 2007 and Government policy on playing fields having been tightened would make for an Olympic legacy with which BANES would not wish to be associated.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 160 Respondent: Mr Peter Dolan

RepresentationReference: 160\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness):

- 1) Inclusion of the field in the SHLAA is contrary to the recent decision of the council not to designate this area for development.
- 2) The school needs the playing field. The ratio of playing field area to pupils was previously too low and school numbers have since increased. The area in question is regularly used.
- 3) The SHLAA ignores the extensive use of the field by local residents.
- 4) The SHLAA assumes the need to close Greenway Lane to through traffic. This would seriously inconvenience residents. During the recent spell of cold weather it was impossible to leave the lane to the east.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 161 Respondent: Greenway Residents forum

RepresentationReference: 161\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation The SHLAA is procedurally defective

(soundness): The procedure to be followed in the SHLAA is set down in the B&NES SHLAA Methodology and Call for Sites Consultation of July 2008. §5.58 of that document states "A site will be considered as available for development, when on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems. This means that it is controlled by a housing developer with an expressed intention to develop or a landowner with an expressed intention to sell." However, it appears to us that the Council's information on this is out of date. This land is not controlled by a housing developer (Beechcroft's option to purchase expired some years ago), and our information is that the school is no longer in favour of selling. Indeed, on 24 January 2011 the headmaster of the School wrote to the Council formally confirming that the current view of the Governors was that the land should not be disposed of. Hence the land fails the first and most basic test of eligibility for inclusion.

However, this finding of the SHLAA is defective in other ways as well. The SHLAA's documented assessment of the land in question as suitable for development relies entirely on the report of the Planning Inspector who examined the Local Plan in draft. On page 347 of her Report, the Inspector listed the representations she had taken into account in considering the future of this land as 2310/B4 (Beechcroft Developments) and 2310/B17 (Beechcroft Developments). She made no mention of the properly submitted representations by Greenway! (the Greenway Lane Area Residents' Forum), as well as by the Council itself, which specifically addressed the possibility of development of the Lower Field, and raised a series of issues, such as the key role of visually important open space, which were not mentioned in the Inspector's arguments. Both the range and the weight of the arguments in question were affected. This was a procedural flaw which vitiated her conclusions, as was, we believe, recognised by the Council in October 2006 when it rejected this part of her Report. The authors of the SHLAA have not only failed to obtain up to date information on the Council's fundamental ownership test. They have also uncritically rehearsed the Inspector's words and failed to appreciate that the Council's views, evidence to the Inquiry and final decisions were very different. They have failed to consult the local community on their work, and the fundamental planning principle of audi alteram partem has therefore been transgressed. The result is defective and, we think, Wednesday unreasonable. It must be set aside.

Remedial action required

This threat to the delivery of national and local policy can be met only one way. We call on the Council, before the Local Development Framework proceeds any further, to reaffirm its decisions of October 2006 and March 2007 on the Beechen Cliff School Lower Field, and to amend the SHLAA so as to delete site Lyn6 and to make very clear that development of the Beechen Cliff School Lower Field remains and will remain wholly unacceptable.

We note that this land was the only site recommended as an addition by the Inspector which the Council set aside, rejecting her recommendation. We therefore believe that the loss of 18 dwellings by the omission of this site from the SHLAA would not be a precedent indicating that other sites should be treated similarly, nor involve a material loss of sites from the SHLAA such as to cast into doubt the achievability of the housing target in the draft Core Strategy.

The strengthened case against development on the playing fields of Beechen Cliff School

The assessment of suitability for development is inconsistent with national policy on open space and greenfield development

Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation stipulates: "10. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements..."; this was acknowledged in the B&NES SHLAA Methodology and Call for Sites

Consultation of July 2008. The only such assessment is now obsolete. This was carried out by DFES in 2000-03. At that time local residents were able to set out in comprehensive detail, referring to a recent OFSTED inspection and independent research, how the proposals failed all three of the Secretary of State's then criteria, as a result of which the proposals were amended by the school in discussion with DFES officials and were apparently approved at the margin. Since then, however, circumstances have changed. The government's education policy on disposal tightened in 2004, and the Coalition's policy is now tighter still. Other government policies in health and the DCMS field increasingly call for the retention of recreational open space. In addition, the number of pupils at the school has significantly risen since 2003, and with it the need for playing fields, including space for informal outdoor recreation – as is demonstrated by the increasingly intensive use of the land in question by the school. The school would risk serious harm if this land were now to be developed. It is clear that the earlier assessment is now out of date and that national policy demands the retention of the allocation as playing fields and open space.

PPG17 goes on, "Developers will need to consult the local community and demonstrate that their proposals are widely supported by them. 11. Open space and sports and recreational facilities that are of high quality, or of particular value to a local community, should be recognised and given protection by local authorities through appropriate policies in plans. Areas of particular quality may include...small areas of open space in urban areas that provide an important local amenity and offer recreational and play opportunities". It is very clear that development of this land has no support in the local community, 70 of whom turned out to protest about this on the wet and windy night of 12 January 2011; and that the amenity and recreational value of this land is very high.

Moreover, Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing)(9 June 2010), at §36, requires that previously developed sites should be developed before greenfield sites. Beechen Cliff School playing fields are greenfield, as defined in that PPS (Annex B page 26). Therefore other sites, including Western Riverside, should be developed before they are considered. Even if it were acceptable to develop on the BCS Lower Field (which it is not), it would be wrong to aim to build on it within five years, as the SHLAA now declares to be practicable.

The SHLAA has ignored evidence which shows that there is a real need for the playing fields. The Secretary of State for Education and Skills gave consent on 17 September 2003 to disposal of the land. But:

- the previous OFSTED report stated that the playing field space was insufficient, and the decision took three years of renegotiation and resubmissions, so the Minister's decision must have been borderline;
- On 27 August 2004 the Minister's announced a change in his policy so that in future playing fields should only be disposed of as an "absolute last resort" (The Times, 28 August 2004);
- The new Coalition Government has a policy on the loss of playing fields which is even more restrictive;
- the land in question is still in daily use by the school's pupils, as local residents can testify;
- the number of pupils in the school has risen markedly since 2003, and with it the need for outdoor recreational space;
- the present headmaster of the school has indicated his view that the land is needed by pupils for recreation.

The 2003 consent does not enable the Council, in exercising its planning functions, to ignore the question of the need for recreational open space by the school. As evidence of need, the Minister's 2003 decision has now clearly been overtaken. All the evidence now points to the need for these playing fields continuing.

The SHLAA has ignored evidence which shows that there is still a real need for the open space for leisure and recreation

The SHLAA takes no account of the current extensive permissive use of the land for a full variety of informal recreation by local residents, and their need for it to continue, even though this was evidenced to the Local Plan inquiry by Greenway!

The SHLAA has ignored the impact of its proposals on the setting of a listed building. Following the inquiry into the draft Local Plan, the Inspector considered the impact of development on

views from the listed terrace of Devonshire Buildings. However, she failed to consider the impact of development on the setting of this important listed Georgian terrace, the extensive views of which from the south would be closed off by development of the Lower Field. Officers compiling the SHLAA appear to have ignored both matters, though the second in particular is of considerable importance in terms of listed building conservation in this World Heritage city.

The SHLAA has given insufficient attention to the Council's allocation of the land for visually important open space and its impact on the World Heritage Site
Then known as "Home Field", the land now in question was part of land on Beechen Cliff purchased by public subscription in 1869 "with a view of preserving it as an ornamental appendage to the City", and "to be held in trust in perpetuity". The school was developed on part of the larger holding in 1932, and as a public body took ownership of its playing fields in 1989. UNESCO's Statement of Significance for the Bath World Heritage Site remarks on how "Bath's urban and landscape spaces are created by the buildings that enclose them, providing a series of interlinked spaces that flow organically, and that visually (and at times physically) draw in the green surrounding countryside to create a distinctive garden city feel, looking forward to the principles of garden cities". In its recent report on the World Heritage Site, UNESCO highlighted the need to enhance the protection of the landscape surrounding the City, and the World Heritage Site Steering Group agreed that this should be one of the Group's four immediate priorities "; Though the land now under consideration is not as critical as the face of Beechen Cliff itself, it has great significance as part of the visually important open space highlighted by Local Plan Policy BH:15 and which plays a key role in the character of the World Heritage Site as described in the UNESCO report.

Referring to the importance of the site in delivering Policy BH:15 of the Local Plan, Council officers commented to the Inquiry on 16 January 2002, "Greenway Lane is a historic lane with a semi-rural character. Its character, with a long section of country-style hedging and open space, is a vestige of the rural setting of this part of Bath" and went on to remark that development would – partly because it also affects the open views from Devonshire Place and interrupts the visual break between the school complex and its foreground – harm the character of this part of the Conservation Area. In our view equally important are the position of the Lower Field as a green wedge linking the important hilltop of Beechen Cliff and Alexandra Park, on the one hand, with Lyncombe Vale and the Cotswold Hills AONB, on the other; and the green and verdant tone it gives to the view of the city from the Fosse Way and Bloomfield Road, and even from the Georgian terrace at Bloomfield Crescent.

The new draft Core Strategy is threaded through with references to the importance of green infrastructure. It remarks "A well-designed, managed and integrated network of green infrastructure provides a wide range of direct and indirect benefits to people and wildlife. This includes a greater sense of community, improved health and well being and ... conserving or enhancing landscape character, historical and cultural features". The strong emphasis on green infrastructure in the Core Strategy is entirely inconsistent with the assertion of the SHLAA that housing development would be "suitable" or "practicable" on the critically-sited greenfield land now in question.
The SHLAA has ignored wildlife issues

Although the Council did not in the Local Plan formally categorise the land in question as of wildlife importance, its role as a green wedge is significant here. Wildlife such as badgers and deer are often seen on Greenway Lane, and the reason is the link which the Beechen Cliff Lower Field provides between habitats in Beechen Cliff and Alexandra Park on the one hand, and in Lyncombe Vale and the Cotswold Hills AONB on the other. Development on this site would cut off an important wildlife corridor.

The SHLAA has given insufficient attention to the traffic issues
The SHLAA dismissed, on the grounds that they were soluble, the traffic issues raised by major development in Greenway Lane. Eighteen dwellings with visitors and tradesmen would generate a good deal of traffic, increasing the number of households in the Lane by around 30%. Traffic has increased markedly in recent years, as have its speeds, and this is currently the subject of study and

discussions between Greenway! and the Council, in the context of general road safety and in particular the safety of the children attending the three schools in the vicinity. Many, including relevant professionals, believe that the Lane has already exceeded its safe capacity for traffic. There are already frequent accidents, which only good fortune has to date prevented from being serious. The site is situated well above the level of the road, and the consequent steep access would enter the Lane at a straight and broad point where speeds are high: this would be markedly unsafe. It is unacceptable for the SHLAA to assume that difficulties of this sort can be resolved by traffic engineering or the use of planning conditions: they strike at the root of whether the site is developable, and there would need to be a clear understanding of their solution before an entry in the SHLAA ought to be made.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 161\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation We believe that an excellent job has been done on the Strategy itself, and particularly welcome the
(soundness): focus on green infrastructure which is properly threaded throughout the document, the attention paid to public transport, and the exclusion of the threatened urban extension which would have damaged Bath and the Cotswold AONB.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 162 **Respondent:** Batheaston Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 162\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.06

Representation While the text is an accurate portrait of each sub-area inside the LPA's boundaries it could more
(soundness): usefully also express the reason for the difficulty in devising planning policy for such an area – for example, the close proximity of the World Heritage Site comprising much of the major city and the areas of cherished landscape which immediately border it. We also consider the text should recognise the distinctive character of the Avon Valley east of Bath as a separate sub-region within the District and neighbouring Wiltshire. Development may often involve possibly difficult conflicts of interest and indeed conflict between CS policies which will require resolution, the CS should not be silent on this possibility.

Change sought to (i) In paragraph 1.06 insert 'The high quality of much of both the townscapes and landscapes of the
make sound: area will in some situations involve a conflict between policies. In such cases the LPA will have regard to the balance of advantage in the public interest when assigning appropriate weight to them'.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\2

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.11

Representation A problem of the statutory planning regime is that an LPA treats its area as an island. That is
(soundness): unrealistic; for example the River Avon east of Bath forms an administrative boundary yet there are planning interests common to both sides of the valley. There are similar problems of need for cross-boundary co-operation as in the case of business development in Wiltshire only accessible to heavy good traffic on a minor road through a built-up area of Batheaston. A yet further example is the failure to consider whether a suitable park-and-ride site east of Bath might be possible beyond the LPA boundary. The CS should acknowledge the existence of cross-boundary problems.

Change sought to (ii) In paragraph 1.11 insert reference to the location in the Green Belt and Cotswolds AONB of the
make sound: Avon valley immediately east of Bath.

In paragraph 1.11 add 'In the Rural Areas the Council will fully liaise with adjacent planning authorities when cross-border issues arise'.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\3

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.12

Representation The concepts of community and neighbourhood infuse the CS but it is not clear what these terms
(soundness): mean. Is it possible, for example, for a group of villages to represent itself as a community or neighbourhood? In this context we also consider the Vision document produced by the Valley Parishes Alliance for the Kennet and Avon Canal should be treated in the same way as a Parish Plan and should be so acknowledged in the CS text.

Change sought to Provide definitions of locality, community, and neighbourhood in the Glossary and cross-reference
make sound: them to Locality (1.12 para 5 p10).

Representation (legal compliance): The relevance of Parish Plans
The CS text does not touch on Parish Plans in Locality (page 10). The concept of them emanates from DEFRA but they are not statutory, nor do they relate to the Town and Country Planning Act. Paragraph 6.2 Of PPS12 nevertheless requires LPAs to pay close attention to their contents. In the light of that advice the text of the CS should clearly mention them and indicate what weight planning administration should accord these plans.
The c Concepts of community and neighbourhood infuse the CS but it is not clear what these terms mean. Is it possible, for example, for a group of villages to represent itself as a community or neighbourhood? In this context we also consider the Vision document produced by the Valley Parishes Alliance for the Kennet and Avon Canal should be treated in the same way as a Parish Plan and should be so acknowledged in the CS text.
3. Relevance of other Development Planning Documents
Together with the CS the DPDs constitute the portfolio of documents which form the Local Development Framework. Provided there is no conflict of policies it is possible for a DPD, which may cover a subject of comparatively narrow and specialised interest, to be adopted before the CS. This should be made clear in section 1a of the CS to avoid public misunderstanding. Immediately before the CS coming to its public examination an up-to-date Appendix consisting of a list of the adopted and the planned schedule of further Development Planning Documents should be added to give more explicit usefulness to paragraph 1.05 of the CS.
4. The regional background.
The euphoria attending the withdrawal of the Regional Strategic Statement is not justified. RSSs were withdrawn following a successful legal challenge to the Secretary of State's illegal use of power. A serious problem remains as to what the government proposes to do about the cloud of housing demand which hovers over the whole country. The question of what, if any, materiality may still attach to the withdrawn RSS figures is a matter of current professional debate. It is not unlikely that by the time the RSS comes to public examination the issue of reallocating regional housing demand may return. That would necessitate a revisit to and possible reassessment of housing demand. The concept of national demand being aggregated from local proposals is inconceivable. The CS may become prey to an unresolved national issue and should give warning of this.

Change sought to make legally compliant: Add reference to Parish Plans in Locality (1.12 para 5 p10).

RepresentationReference: 162\4

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation We find Policy DW1's overarching statement unexceptionable. However, on account of a successful **(soundness):** legal challenge to the Secretary of State's use of powers the figures previously under consideration stand withdrawn. However, there is a serious national problem in the discrepancy between new homes required and the number of sites which either have planning permission or are allocated in development plans. Where this cloud of demand may come to rest is an unresolved question. The SofS's notion that the national need can be met by the aggregation of 'bottom up' proposals coming from local communities seems hardly likely to happen. Consequently, the possibility that B&NES may not be required to provide for a portion of that demand cannot but be uncertain. In the event of the problem remaining unsolved by the time of the CS's public examination it would be preferable for the text to recognise the potential problem on a 'what if?' basis by stating in what way it would deal with any additional demand. While it is probably likely that this would be on a sequential basis relying on information already gathered on housing land availability such an outlook should form part of the CS text. That kind of issue is dealt with in only a limited way in paragraph 1.36. While the anatomy of the District's built and natural environment is expressed as separate items of infrastructure at DW1 1-13 in Table 2 and its physiology as strategic objectives 1-7, the text gives little recognition to the fact that in many instances these aspects will be found in conflict. That the quality of both cityscape and landscape requires particularly high planning standards against this background requires emphasis in the accompanying text.

Change sought to make sound: i) Insert in Policy DW1 after paragraph 2 'In the event of a regional demand for additional housing be imposed on the LPA a sequential examination of the site information which underlies the CS will be undertaken and any subsequent change in paragraph 2 figures will give rise to the amendment of Diagram 4.

(ii) Add to paragraph 1.35 'The potential conflict between strategic objectives will require resolution through very high and exacting standards of planning practice.'

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\5 S

Plan Reference: Diagram 5: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Bath Spatial Strategy Page 57 Diagram 5
(soundness): We strongly support the recognition of the River Avon corridor east of Bath as a key asset by its recognition on Diagram 5. However, we find the depiction of Bath Spa University and an east of Bath park-and-ride site at Bathampton Meadows in identical diagrammatic notation as confusing. For the reasons elucidated in our Representation 10 we oppose the latter and there recommend its diagrammatic representation be deleted.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\6

Plan Reference: Policy B4: The World heritage Site and its Setting

Representation We find the reliance on a criterion-based policy with its operation as explained in paragraph 2.32
(soundness): unsatisfactory. In our view there is a paramount need to preserve the character of the setting of the World Heritage Site. This is particularly so where it is in immediate proximity to open land of high

quality in planning terms, notably east of Bath where the open undeveloped Avon valley bottom affords outstanding visual contrast and is largely in the Green Belt and/or Cotswold AONB. We consider the unique visual characteristics of this area, both in its own right as a cherished landscape of high quality and in its function as part of the setting of the WHS merits geographical designation as a buffer zone which should extend from the edge of the built-up area in the Avon valley bottom to the arc of ridge lines at the summits of the rising land surrounding Bath on three sides. Such geographical expression, in diagrammatic form in Diagrams 4 and 5 and eventually in the WHS management Plan as a DPD, is essential and would acknowledge that the WHS and its open buffer are an together integral and visually striking part of the local scene.

Change sought to (i)On Diagram 5 and Diagram 20 diagrammatically show a Buffer Zone around the World Heritage Site.
make sound: (ii)In paragraph 2.32 and paragraph 6.58 add text references to a geographically-defined Buffer Zone around the World Heritage Site.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\7

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation With regard to community facilities and shops (RA3) we are strongly required by B&NES to relate
(soundness): replies to consultation on planning applications to Local Plan policies. In practice we have found that notwithstanding the LPA's Statement of Community Involvement its degree of adherence to policies in development control on these matters is remarkably and bewilderingly inconsistent. In our view it fails from time to time to take account of the local plan policies which should serve to provide and protect these functions, especially in such a village as Batheaston which has an operative Local Plan Inset Plan. While that difficulty applies to commercial land uses a similar problem arises in dealing with residential development when the LPA appears not to regard the clear requirements of Policy D4 of the adopted Local Plan. We would welcome the inclusion of a statement about the LPA's obligatory duty of development control to link its decisions to the rightful high-mindedness of Policy RA3 through observance of the policies of the the LDF documents and the retained policies of the adopted Local Plan.

Change sought to In Policy RA1 after 'policy DW1 ' add 'and the retained Policies of the adopted Local Plan'.
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\8 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA4: Rural Exception Sites

Representation While we welcome Policy RA4 it appears to us that that the physical nature of the surrounding terrain
(soundness): and landscape quality constraints may limit its applicability to Batheaston where there is unallocated land within the existing village housing development boundary

Change sought to
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\9

Plan Reference: Policy CP9: Affordable Housing

Representation We welcome the requirement to provide 17.7% of AH on for small sites of 5 to 9 dwellings or 0.25 to
(soundness): 0.49 ha. However, such a requirement may well work against the intention of the policy by stimulating applications for permission to build 4 dwellings. For that reason, we consider the CS should explicitly encourage the LPA to routinely seek some provision of AH on development sites of less than 5 dwellings in the rural

Change sought to Under Small Sites add ' On sites of fewer than 5 dwellings some provision of affordable housing will be
make sound: sought either on-site or by the provision of commuted resources for such development elsewhere'.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\10

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.94

Representation a). An A36/46 link road

(soundness): Paragraph 6.94 expresses the need for studies assessing development of an A36/46 link yet no such development is proposed in the LDF period to 2026 and reference to any such connection should be deleted from the CS text. Indeed, the maintenance as open countryside in the Green Belt of the River Avon valley bottom land immediately east of the WHS should be declared in the CS as an immutable principle and clearly expressed in geographical terms on Diagram 5 as part of a buffer zone surrounding the World Heritage City (page 33).

Change sought to (i) Delete "and an A46/36 link" from 6.94

make sound:

Representation (legal compliance): The claimed public support for the scheme does not truly reflect the results of such public participation as was carried out in the devising of it. From the abandonment of the proposal to establish a park-and-ride site at Lambridge, on land currently the training ground of Bath Rugby, the preparation of the Bathampton meadows scheme was pursued in secrecy until the publication of the completed planning application, when 2 presentation meetings, claimed as 'consultation' by the LPA, were held. We maintain this was wholly contrary to the LPA's adopted Statement of Community Involvement as the community was not consulted during the formulation of the proposal..

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 162\11

Plan Reference: Diagram 5: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (b). Bathampton Meadows Park-and-Ride site

(soundness): Batheaston Parish Council continues to oppose the Bathampton Meadows Park-and-Ride site proposal for the following broad physical planning reasons:

1. B&NES's own consultants admit the development would have no significant relief from traffic congestion or traffic-generated air pollution is claimed for the development by the LPA;
2. It would offer no contribution to relief from the manifold other deleterious effects of heavy goods vehicle traffic passing through Bath along London Road and through Cleveland Place and Bathwick;
3. Traffic currently diverting to minor residential routes as a result of delays in London Road Bath would return;
4. The existing bus lane in London Road is served by 5 frequent stage-carriage bus services with 2 stopping places in the reserved lane; it is also used by cycles, motorcycles, and taxis;
5. The necessary consequent loss of on-street parking in Walcot Street and London Road would have a deleterious effect on existing commercial frontages, particularly Walcot Street's 'Artisan Quarter' activities.
6. The development would encroach on the Green Belt and neighbour the Cotswold AONB in a location which should form part of a geographically-defined open green buffer zone around the City of Bath World Heritage site. These 2 elements together are an important integrated component of an

outstanding local scene;

7. The planned provision of 1400 spaces falls far short of the B&NES Council's estimate of the 1800 spaces needed, yet the physical constraints at the site would prevent any future expansion;

8. The scheme is one of four comprising the Bath Transport package which has been declared by the courts to be an integrated commitment; the business case for it does not take important issues into account.

9. The claim that the Package as a whole will save £700 millions over 80 years is inaccurate and covers too long a time span. Its forecast costs outweigh any benefits.

10. Within the last 10 years the use of the site for development has been rejected on several occasions either by the LPA itself or on appeal on the ground of its detriment to the environment.

If the Bathampton Meadows Park-and-Ride site be rejected the solution to the problem of the provision of an alternative location east of Bath may only be feasible in the area of another LPA. However, the latest estimates produced by the LPA show a greater proportion of traffic entering Bath from the north (A46) than from the east (A4). Though there would still be substantial traffic originating from the A4 this nevertheless indicates the need for a review of possible sites alternative to Bathampton Meadows, which should be deleted.

Change sought to make sound: (ii) On Diagram 5 delete 'East of Bath Park and Ride (NEW)' and show a diagrammatic representation of a Buffer Zone around the World Heritage Site.

Representation (legal compliance): The claimed public support for the scheme does not truly reflect the results of such public participation as was carried out in the devising of it. From the abandonment of the proposal to establish a park-and-ride site at Lambridge, on land currently the training ground of Bath Rugby, the preparation of the Bathampton meadows scheme was pursued in secrecy until the publication of the completed planning application, when 2 presentation meetings, claimed as 'consultation' by the LPA, were held. We maintain this was wholly contrary to the LPA's adopted Statement of Community Involvement as the community was not consulted during the formulation of the proposal..

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 162\12

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation (soundness): We welcome the CS's support for the protection of the Green Belt. We note its observation that there are places where small adjustments in the boundaries could logically be made. As no action was taken on this in the Local Plan inquiry we consider the issue should now be addressed and support the commentary in the CS.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance): PPS1 as revised, the government's overarching statement of planning policy, gives primacy to proposals for renewable energy generation over the long-established strong presumption against development in the Green Belt. In view of national policy the CS text should acknowledge that there may arise circumstances in which there could be a conflict between Policy CP3 Renewable Energy and Policy CP8 Green Belt.

Change sought to make legally compliant: Reference to possible conflict between Policy CP3 and Policy should be inserted after CS para 6.63 p120CP8

Respondent Number: 163 **Respondent:** The Theatres Trust

Representation Reference: 163\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation (soundness): It is with reluctance that we find the document to be Sound because it fails to provide any protection or enhancement to its existing cultural venues but unfortunately the provision of cultural services is not a statutory duty for local authorities. Nevertheless, the Council should value its performance spaces as

major contributors to the urban landscape of the city centre and to its evening economy. The city centre is the proper location for the area's main entertainment and tourist venues and there should therefore be either a separate item in Policy B2 to deal with the city's cultural offer particularly the protection and promotion of established cultural venues (as opposed to new developments).

The Vision says that Bath has 'a vivacious cultural scene' and Policy B2 says that Bath is 'an important cultural asset for the world' but the document doesn't explain why and there is no mention of existing cultural facilities, only new development. A new performance arts venue is mentioned on page 35 but there is no explanation in the text as to what deficiencies require this new cultural facility. Policy B2 should state that existing cultural assets will be protected and if necessary supported for adaptation to new challenges. Without a policy to protect such facilities it could become difficult to retain an essential community asset particularly where land values become higher for an alternative use.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 164 Respondent: Peter Marsden

RepresentationReference: 164\1

Plan Reference: Policy B5: Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities

Representation (soundness): Core Strategy para 2.34 acknowledges that the increase in the student population has had an adverse effect on the city's housing stock and, by inference, on the sense of community in several of the city's wards. This is seen as a result of a mismatch between student numbers and the provision of dedicated on-campus and in-city accommodation. It is implied that some reduction, however modest, in the number of student HMOs is desirable.

In para 2.35 the Core Strategy is expected to deliver a better balance between the Universities' aspirations and their interface with local communities and the wider city. Information Paper 3 sets the scene for this. Bath Spa University forecasts no increase in student numbers in the next 10 years, with no prediction beyond that. However, the University of Bath's draft Masterplan forecasts growth in the number of full-time students of between 1% and 3% in the period to 2020, and it has been slightly in excess of 3% in the two years since the preparation of the Masterplan. Only a full delivery of the Masterplan's 2358 bed spaces and growth at or below the lower end of forecast would see any reduction in the number of student HMOs. A mid-range increase in numbers would do no more than preserve the status quo. a situation which is seen by many, and by inference by the Council, as unacceptable. Therefore the Policy as currently drafted stands every chance of being ineffective.

Change sought to make sound: Policy B5 should be much clearer in its aims and more proactive in its intentions if it is to achieve the policy direction expressed in para 2.34. It should define an acceptable number of student HMOs, bearing in mind the need for affordable housing in the non-student market, and set out a framework agreed by all stakeholders, including local communities, to achieve this. To this end the number of student bedrooms to be developed on the Claverton Down campus ("about 2,000") should more accurately reflect the draft Masterplan's figure of 2,358. Policy GDS.1/B11 of the Local Plan should similarly be updated.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 165 Respondent: GVA

RepresentationReference: 165\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.13

Representation (soundness): As part of the Core strategy process we understand that the housing development boundaries (saved from the existing Local Plan) will be reviewed as part of the new plan making process. An arial photograph of the site is shown below, highlighted in red.

As background the SHLAA report identifies the quantum of housing that will need to be delivered within rural areas such as East Harptree if sufficient housing is to be provided within BANES over the Core Strategy Period (upto 2026). A target figure of 800 is set out for rural areas which would include the settlement of East Harptree. Currently there is a shortfall of 239 units against this target, in terms of identified sites.

Based on a development potential of 35 dwellings per hectare, and a theoretical site coverage of 80% the sire could yield about 45 dwellings. The SHLAA report notes that this amount of development would not be commensurate with the role and size of East Harptree.

The arial photograph as attached has been further annotated to highlight the northern section of the site in blue which based on a development coverage of 80% of the plot, the sire would yield approximately 20 dwellings. This level of new development for the site is considered more commensurate with the size and role of East Harptree. Furthermore the inclusion of the northern part of the site is perceived as falling within the natural housing envelope of the East Harptree settlement as indicated on the arial photograpg by the black line.

On this basis it is recommended that there is clear justification to include the northern part of the sire as part od the proposed housing development boundary for East harptree when the housing boundaries are reviewed.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number:	166	Respondent: Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
---------------------------	-----	---

RepresentationReference: 166\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation (soundness): The policy for the Central Area of Bath is considered sound. The extent of the Central Area has been correctly identified, along with neighbouring areas identified as key development opportunities. The scale and scope of development envisaged in and neighbouring the Central Area is considered appropriate, realistic, and capable of being delivered in accordance with the principles of PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Development.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 166\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP12: Centres and Retailing

Representation Policy CP12 seeks to direct retail development of an appropriate scale and type to the defined centres, **(soundness):** or where appropriate, adjoining the centres in the identified hierarchy. This policy is sound and in accordance with national policy set out in PPS4 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Development'. It is noted that the supporting text to the policy refers to PPS4 as a material consideration informing decisions on specific proposals. PPS4 will be an important material consideration in assessing proposals for out-of-centre retail development as such development falls outside the scope of Policy CP12.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 167 Respondent: Homebase Ltd

RepresentationReference: 167\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Our objections relate to the failure to identify any provision for existing retail businesses, and **(soundness):** specifically the Homebase, to include any allowance for accomodating 'larger' comparison units within this 'Area' or to provide for the future relocation of existing retail businesses outside of the 'Central Area'. My clients do not object to the 'legal compliance' of this DPD with national policy and guidance, but with its 'soundness'. In terms of the latter, Policies B1 and B2 are in our view 'unsound' for the following reason:

- a) They do not show a firm or coherent strategy for achieving or delivering the regeneration proposals for WRE (including the Homebase) within the timescales of this DPD
- b) They made no provision for the future of existing retail businesses (including the Homebase store) or the 'option' of accomodating the Homebase within a modern and innovative development
- c) They provide no reasoning or explanation as to why 'larger' comparsion retail development could not be accomodated (or retained) within the 'Central Area' to complement the City Centre
- d) There is no commercial or other 'evidence' to support or indicate that the regeneration of WRE can be delivered and who the Partners in delivering that development are likely to be
- e) There is no indication as to how and when the regeneration of WRE could happen or if it was not commercially viable or achievable what 'alternatives' have been considered

Overall, my clients consider that the mistakes and errors of earlier DPD's are being repeated and as the Inspector in relation to the Bath Local Plan also concluded, the future of existing businesses and how they will be accomodated or not within WRE is simply being ignored and overlooked. Whilst Policies B1 and B2 refer to the need to accommodate within the 'Central Area' a new rugby stadium, a new arts facility and to retain existing leisure facilities, there is no policy reference or guidance as to whether the Council will look to retain existing retail businesses within this 'Area' and if not to which other 'policy areas' or locations within Bath those bussnesses will be encouraged and assisted by the Council to relocate too.

Change sought to make sound: We would suggest the inclusion of the following wording within Policy B2 and at the end of Part 4:

" The retention and enhancement of existing retail businesses or their relocation to a suitable and viable site"

This change should also be refleacted in amendments to the wording of Policy B1 part 6 'Shopping' and sub-criterion 'b'

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 168 Respondent: Alison and Kjeld Jenson

RepresentationReference: 168\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation We strenuously object to building on the Beechen Cliff playing fields. Our two sons attend the school
(soundness): and need all the exercise they can get and to let off steam. The loss of an essential open space for the boys comes at a time when they are being encouraged in active participation in all sports by the Olympics next year. Furthermore, we live in Maple Grove and value the fields as an essential green space for walks.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 169 Respondent: Norton Radstock Town Council

RepresentationReference: 169\1

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

Representation There is an ineffective jobs – housing balance: 0.37:1 instead of the effective balance of 0.75 – 1.50 jobs
(soundness): per household (cervero, 1996a) which will lead to more commuting.

Change sought to Reduction in housing or increase in employment opportunities to have a more beneficial jobs : housing
make sound: ratio. Reduce the number of new homes for the Somer Valley.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 169\2

Plan Reference: Somer Valley: The Vision

Representation 4.17 does not consider the difficulties of commuting due to large freight traffic using the A37, A367 and
(soundness): A39 and does not consider all the alternatives such as re-opening of rail links.

Change sought to Consideration should be given to an integrated transport system.
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 169\3

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

Representation The Core Strategy currently states an increase in office space and reduction in industrial/warehouse
(soundness): floorspace, but does not show any overall growth in expanding the overall provision for economic development in the Somer Valley and in particular the town centres of Midsomer Norton and Radstock.

Change sought to A more thorough look at the Economic Development potential for the area and commitment to
make sound: encourage growth in employment floorspace, greater than currently shown.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 169\4

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

Representation The document does not mention biodiversity and the important areas of local ecology. The document
(soundness): does not allow for a renewable energy area.

Change sought to Thorough research and consideration of the ecology of the area and the biodiversity and renewable
make sound: energy opportunities.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 169\5

Plan Reference: Paragraph 4.14

Representation There is no explanation why only 50% of the potential jobs will likely come forward and therefore no
(soundness): defined way in which these jobs may be more deliverable. Given the imbalance in the jobs to housing
ratio it is essential job creation is supported.

Change sought to A greater understanding and explanation of the area's deliverable job capacity and ways in which the
make sound: growth of this can be supported by this plan.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 169\6

Plan Reference: Paragraph 4.28

Representation The DPD is not deliverable as it does not embrace sound infrastructure planning. The absence of a
(soundness): Master Plan for Radstock when Midsomer Norton and Keynsham have them, is not sound. No
consideration appears to have been made with regards to the movement of residents of the Somer
Valley for Social & Domestic activities.

Change sought to A Master Plan for Radstock and consideration of other infrastructure areas such as access to NHS
make sound: Services and Education in order that a sound infrastructure plan can be produced.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 170 **Respondent:** Robert Hitchins Limited

RepresentationReference: 170\1

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation The Core Strategy is not effective in that it does not respond to and meet CS Objective 5 namely
(soundness): meeting housing needs. The housing numbers proposed (550 dpa) are not founded upon a robust and
credible evidence base as evidenced by the inconsistency with Regional Spatial Strategy, the latest
household projections (including projections commissioned by Barton Willmore) and the Strategic
Housing Market Assessment. Furthermore it is not consistent with national policy (both existing and
emerging) in that it does not meet the objectives set out therein. I address each of these points below.

The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West proposed that 775 dpa be constructed within the District. The Proposed Modifications to the RSS proposed that 1,065 dwellings should be constructed annually within the District. The 2008 based projections for England and the Regions indicates that the number of households within B&NES will increase by some 16,000 in the period 2006 to 2026 (800 new households per annum) and the evidence of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment is that there is a need for 847 affordable dwellings annually.

Chelmer Projections undertaken by Cambridge Econometrics for Barton Willmore in Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form January 2011 show that the demographic change (based on a continuation of long-term average migration levels) will result in a further 15,100 households (755 new households per annum) in the period 2006 to 2026. The labour force increasing by 10,558 over the same period. See Appendix 1 Table 1 attached.

Dwelling-led projections have also been prepared to show the effect of the Core Strategy proposal to provide for just 11,000 dwellings (550 dpa) over the Plan period on the District's population and labour supply. In summary in the period 2021 - 2026 there will be migration out of the district (-1,563) and the labour supply will have grown by just 2,900 (2,891) between 2006 and 2026. See Appendix 1 Table 2 attached. In short by the end of the Plan period there will be a declining population and insufficient labour to meet the economic aspirations of the Plan.

Furthermore it is submitted that the Core Strategy has no regard to the need to accommodate growth arising in the neighbouring area; namely Bristol which cannot be met within the City's administrative area. I attach as Appendix 2 a copy of our representations in respect of its Core Strategy.

When taken together the evidence indicates that the Core Strategy should be planning to provide considerably more dwellings per annum than are currently proposed and that a proportion of these dwellings should be provided in locations around Bristol to meet its needs. In terms of assessing an appropriate level of growth it is our submission that an additional 16,000 homes will be needed within the District to meet indigenous needs (having regard to demographic changes, vacant and second homes) and at least a further 4,000 homes to meet part of Bristol's unmet need (which we assess to be 20,000 homes plus). B&NES should therefore be planning for a total of at least 20,000 homes to be constructed in the period 2006 to 2026 (1,000 new homes per annum).

Revised PPS3, (June 2010) seeks a "Step Change" in housing delivery, through a new, more responsive approach to land supply at the local level. Paragraph 32 of PPS3 states that: "The level of housing provision should be determined taking a strategic, evidence-based approach that takes into account relevant local, sub-regional, regional and national policies and strategies achieved through widespread collaboration with stakeholders."

Paragraph 33 of PPS3 advocates that in determining the local level of housing provision, LPAs should take into account the evidence of current and future levels of need and demand for housing and affordability levels based on a number of factors including; evidence within the SHMA, NHPAU, advice on affordability levels and Government household formation forecasts.

Guidance published on 6th July 2010 by the Chief Planner, Steve Quartermain at CLG states that: "Local authorities should continue to collect and use reliable information to justify their housing supply policies."

It is not considered that the B&NES Future Housing Growth Requirements to 2026 Stage 2 Report either meets the approach advocated in guidance or provides sufficient justification for deviating from what the evidence overwhelmingly indicates is required. Attention is also drawn to Economic Prediction and the Planning Process¹ which provides background to the use of SW Growth Scenarios (Oxford Economics June 2010) in assessing future housing requirements.

A failure to meet housing need renders the Core Strategy inconsistent with national policy as expressed in PPS3; namely the achievement of The Government's key housing policy goal which is "to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home,

Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form which they can afford, in a community where they want to live”.

Change sought to Amend sub paragraph 2 of Policy DW1 (District-Wide Strategy) to require that provision be made for a **make sound:** net increase of at least 20,000 homes between 2006 and 2026.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 170\2

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation URBAN EXTENSION
(soundness):

There are exceptional circumstances that require the review of the Bristol – Bath Green Belt; namely the need to accommodate development required in the period to 2026 in the most sustainable locations. See our representation above to Policy DW1 sub paragraph 2 which makes clear our view that the Core Strategy is unsound in that regard. In order to accommodate the scale of development required in the most appropriate locations it is necessary to examine whether there is a need to remove land from the Green Belt. This exercise was undertaken in the context of the preparation of the Regional Spatial Strategy and the further work resulting in the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy Spatial Options Consultation October 2009 and the area to the south east of Bristol at Whitchurch was identified by the Council for removal from the Green Belt in order to accommodate the scale of development required then.

The adopted Local Plan identifies 6 purposes of including land within the Bristol - Bath Green Belt. This is reproduced at Table 8 of the Draft Core Strategy. Land at Whitchurch is considered in the table below against each of these purposes:
(see email)

As noted in the October 2009 Spatial Options Consultation this area has:

“..the potential to be well integrated into the existing urban area of South East Bristol with access to a wide range of services and facilities supporting the needs of the new and existing communities. Development in this area would offer an opportunity to develop around Whitchurch village. The disused railway track bed is an opportunity to provide a green link from the Bristol urban area out to the new neighbourhood. There are opportunities to extend existing and planned public transport services from Bristol into the Whitchurch area.”

and thus would clearly be a sustainable location for future development.

The Concept Plan below shows an area that could be released from the Green Belt at Whitchurch to accommodate around 295 new homes whilst; retaining the distinctiveness of Whitchurch as a separate settlement (not disrupting green links and the visual separation of Whitchurch from other settlements) by means of significant areas of green infrastructure which link into existing green infrastructure extending into Bristol. Development in this location could take place without impact on the setting of the scheduled ancient monument Maes Knoll, or the Chew Valley skyline.

Change sought to Amend Criterion 4 of Policy DW1 to provide for the release of land at Whitchurch from the Green Belt **make sound:** and consequential amendments to the Key Diagram.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 171 **Respondent:** Sandra Blair

RepresentationReference: 171\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation I have read in almost all areas of the Core Strategy of the need for austerity measures in this "time of
(soundness): austerity" which is commendable and we must all learn to live with these measures. However, I have also read in the press that BANES is proposing to fund a new Leisure Centre in the centre of Bath to the tune of £10million. I am now not sure what the reasons are for the Core Strategy as I did not come across any mention of the Leisure Centre proposal anywhere in its pages. If £10million is to go on a ne project does that mean there will be more austerity measures in other areas? Doesn't make sense to me at all and seems rather unfair.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 172 **Respondent:** Jared Carmichael

RepresentationReference: 172\1

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation Agree that Clutton should not being classed as a RA1 village. Agree that as a RA2 village, residential
(soundness): development will only be permitted within the settlement boundary. Additional development in RA2 villages will lead to urban housing needs being met where employment opportunities are limited and create a dormitory settlement with unsustainable high levels of out commuting.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 173 **Respondent:** David Beasley

RepresentationReference: 173\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.94

Representation Para 6.94 reads:

(soundness): "The B&NES highway network remains heavily trafficked highlighting the need to undertake transport and access improvements and major capital infrastructure projects to facilitate growth in housing numbers and jobs, to minimise the adverse effect of traffic, and to enable environmental improvement to be made to existing centres. The Council will continue to safeguard routes for the Whitchurch bypass and Temple Cloud/Clutton bypass and recognises the need for studies to assess the Saltford bypass and an A46/A36 link."

Not Justified:

Para 6.94 asserts that there is a "need" for the highway network to have "transport and access improvements and major capital infrastructure projects". There is nothing in the Draft Core Strategy which demonstrates a "need" for building increased road capacity, nor is there anything which shows that this would contribute to the sustainability objectives.

This approach is not the most appropriate strategy for reducing road congestion and the harmful effects of high traffic volumes (see below). It is inconsistent with other parts of the Draft Core Strategy which make clear the need to reduce car use and encourage travel by other means (e.g. paras 1.12,

6.100, Objectives 1 and 7, and elsewhere). These alternative strategies are more appropriate and more sustainable.

Not Effective:

The strategy of building more roads as a means to reduce congestion was discredited by the Government's 1994 SACTRA report, which showed that adding road capacity stimulates growth in transport - which then leads to more congestion. The most effective way "to minimise the adverse effect of traffic" is to reduce the amount of traffic. This approach is consistent with other parts of the Draft Core Strategy and local and national policy.

Not Consistent with national policy

The Department of Transport acknowledge that increased road space leads to more traffic and emissions (<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmenvaud/981/981-i.pdf>, para 89, p54) Therefore, increasing road capacity is inconsistent with national targets on reducing carbon emissions.

Change sought to To make para 6.94 consistent with other parts of the Draft Core Strategy and with national targets and **make sound:** regional policies, it should be reworded as follows: (changed words are in capitals)

"The B&NES highway network remains heavily trafficked IN SOME PARTS, highlighting the need to REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF TRAFFIC. To facilitate growth in housing numbers and jobs, to minimise the adverse effect of traffic, and to enable environmental improvement to be made to existing centres, DEVELOPMENT WILL BE LOCATED WHERE THERE IS MINIMAL NEED TO TRAVEL BY CAR, AND SUPPORTED BY HIGH QUALITY TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE WHICH HELPS TO INCREASE THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING AND CYCLING. AS THE POLICIES IN THIS STRATEGY TAKE EFFECT, AND CAR USE REDUCES, CONGESTION IS EXPECTED DIMINISH, AND WITH THAT, THE IMPETUS FOR NEW ROAD CONSTRUCTION."

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 174 Respondent: Mrs Barbara Gordon

RepresentationReference: 174\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.94

Representation Para 6.94 reads:

(soundness): "The B&NES highway network remains heavily trafficked highlighting the need to undertake transport and access improvements and major capital infrastructure projects to facilitate growth in housing numbers and jobs, to minimise the adverse effect of traffic, and to enable environmental improvement to be made to existing centres. The Council will continue to safeguard routes for the Whitchurch bypass and Temple Cloud/Clutton bypass and recognises the need for studies to assess the Saltfort bypass and an A46/A36 link".

Not Justified:

Whilst there is a need as para 6.94 asserts for a highway network to have "transport and access improvements and major capital infrastructure projects" there is nothing in the Draft Core Strategy which demonstrates a "need" for building increased road capacity, nor is there anything which shows that this would contribute to the sustainability objectives. This approach is not the most appropriate strategy for reducing road congestion and the harmful effects of high traffic volumes. It is inconsistent with other parts of the Draft Core Strategy which make clear the need to reduce car use and encourage travel by other means (e.g. paras 1,12,6.100, Objectives 1 and 7, and elsewhere). These alternative strategies are more appropriate and more sustainable.

Not Effective:

The strategy of building more roads as a means of reducing congestion was discredited by the Government's 1994 SACTRA report, which showed that adding road capacity stimulates growth in transport – which then leads to more congestion. The most effective way “to minimise the adverse effect of traffic” is to reduce the amount of traffic. This approach is consistent with other parts of the Draft Core Strategy and local and national policy.

Not Consistent with National Policy:

The Department of Transport acknowledges that increased road space leads to more traffic and emissions (<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmenvaud/981/981-i.pdf>, para 89, p54). Therefore increasing road capacity is inconsistent with national targets on reducing carbon emissions.

Change sought to To make para 6.94 consistent with other parts of the Draft Core Strategy and with national targets and **make sound:** regional policies, it should be reworded as follows: (new wording in italics.)

“The B&NES highway network remains heavily trafficked in some parts, highlighting the need to reduce the amount of traffic. To facilitate growth in housing numbers and jobs, to minimise the adverse effect of traffic and to enable environmental improvement to be made to existing centres, development will be located where there is minimal need to travel by car and supported by high quality transport infrastructure designed to help increase the attractiveness of public transport, walking and cycling. As the policies in this strategy take effect and car use reduces, congestion is expected to diminish, and with that the impetus for new road construction.”

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 175 Respondent: Clutton Ward Councillor

RepresentationReference: 175\1

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation Policy RA1 does not address the housing needs of Clutton as evidenced in a survey undertaken Dec **(soundness):** 2010 - Jan 2011

Change sought to Designation of Clutton as an RA1 village to enable more housing to be built **make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 176 Respondent: Mr Clive Pugh

RepresentationReference: 176\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation These green spaces are inherent to Bath's character and status. I support fully the arguments of the **(soundness):** Greenway Lane association

Change sought to **make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 177 Respondent: Mr Derek Satow

RepresentationReference: 177\1

Plan Reference: Diagram 4: Bath and North East Somerset - The Key Diagram

Representation (soundness): The Key Diagram shows South Stoke as an inset in both the Green Belt and AONB. In the current B&NES Local Plan, South Stoke parish and village are washed over by the Green Belt (and have been since the Green Belt in this area was established in 1990 on adoption of the Wansdyke Environs of Bath Local Plan). South Stoke does not meet the criteria to be a Policy RA1 settlement and is not designated as such. Moreover to make it an inset would involve a major boundary change, contrary to the statement in para. 1.31.

With regard to the AONB, the whole of South Stoke parish is within the area designated as AONB by the 1990 variation order with the exception of a small area of housing on the Midford Road.

Change sought to make sound: On the Key Diagram (and other similar diagrams), South Stoke parish and village should be shown as washed over by both Green Belt and AONB. (the small area of housing on the Midford Road excluded from the AONB is probably too small to be significant at the scale of the Key Diagram, but the boundary of this small exclusion will no doubt be evident on the Proposals Map.)

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 177\2

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation (soundness): I consider this policy and its supporting text to be sound in all respects and wish to express my strong support for it. The retention of the existing boundary is fully justified by the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, in which respect the abandonment of the highly controversial and hugely damaging urban extension proposal is very welcome. I particularly welcome the fact that "to preserve the individual character, identity and setting of ... the villages and hamlets within the Green Belt" is recognized as a purpose of including land in the Green Belt, this being justified as a continuation of its recognition in the current adopted Structure and Local Plans.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 179 Respondent: Marius McKee

RepresentationReference: 179\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Dear Sirs 2 February 2011

I am writing to object to the inclusion of Beechen Cliff Playing fields as part of the SHLAA.

It is a very well used field by Beechen Cliff School pupils every day of the school term. It is used by local residents and walkers from further afield every day of the year.

I can vouch for this because I live opposite the gated entrance, at South Hill Villa, 18 Greenway Lane.

Please see attached a copy of a map from the early 1800s when a few houses were built in the area, most noticeably Devonshire Buildings. The field in question was in use then, had a public pathway across it (which still exists today), and presumably the ancient hedgerow that borders the field was in existence then.

I would therefore urge you to remove this area from the SHLAA, as not appropriate for development. Any development would not be in keeping with Bath's justified status as a World Heritage Site - which includes not just the buildings but also the historic spaces in between.

Yours

Marius McKee

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 180 Respondent: J S Bloor Ltd

Representation Reference: 180\1

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: The Spatial Vision

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is considered to be unsound as it is not justified, effective and consistent with national policy. There are questions about the evidence base relying on short term trends in the economy to reduce the ability in the long term of the Council to meet housing needs. The implications of reducing the housing provision have already been acknowledged by the Council in 2009 in the Spatial Options consultation paragraph 2.29 which was based on the housing figure of 15,500 dwellings for the plan period and not that dissimilar to the First Detailed Proposals that were submitted by the Council.

"If this level of housing is not provided then it will have serious implications, preventing some people having access to a decent home, making housing less affordable (to buy or rent) and in the longer term damaging the local economy by reducing labour supply and mobility." This was the argument used by the Secretary of State, and the Panel in producing their Panel Report following the Regional EIP, that there was a need to increase the housing requirement from that set out in the Draft RSS of 15,500 to 21,300 dwellings.

In determining the local level of housing provision, PPS 3 advises in paragraph 33 that the advice from the NHPAU should be taken into account. The West of England Housing Market Assessment (June 2009) states in paragraph 11.1.8 that "Regional analyses by NHPAU indicate that the South West region is one where greater housing supply will be needed to moderate affordability pressures and meet demographic demand." There is a high level of need for affordable housing which is not being met through existing policies and levels of delivery.

The spatial vision seeks to provide "...opportunities for all, whilst maintaining and enhancing the environmental attractiveness of the unique heritage." However, by reducing the housing provision the Council will not be providing opportunities for all – the implications for failing to meet housing supply are well known and have been set out above. Evidence of housing need from the West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (June 2009) is that approximately 850 dwellings per annum are required to meet those who need social rented and intermediate housing, ie those in housing need. The overwhelming message therefore is one of very high housing need, in relation both to household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Reducing the housing figure to 11,000 dwellings in the latest version of the Core Strategy ie 550 per annum will have a deleterious effect on the ability of people to access the housing market and moreover, on the quantum of affordable housing that it likely to be provided. The strategy emphasises the delivery of new housing on brownfield sites, however, this will fail to meet housing needs, as past experience during the Local Plan period has shown, only in four years of the Local Plan period were housing completions above that envisaged. This occurred in the early years of the plan in 1996/97, 1997/1998 and 1998/1999 and only once since in 2007/08. The shortfall in housing provision in BANES will increase commuting, as people working in parts of BANES will not be able to afford to live there. The economic strategy seems to be planning for a lower level of growth throughout the plan period rather than recognising that it should plan for more than one economic cycle. The role of the Core Strategy is to set out the long term spatial vision for BANES up to 2026 and the broad locations for new housing, jobs and other strategic development over the plan period.

The Roger Tym and Partners Report (Update June 2010) refers in the conclusions in paragraph 4.3 that if BANES Council choose to review its job growth target at this time, the report recommends that it should be done so jointly with the other local authorities in the West of England. However, what has happened in practice is that the individual Local Authorities, although aware that their neighbouring authorities are considering lower levels of growth, have not undertaken any analysis on a collective basis of the wider implications of lower levels of growth for the West of England. This is in conflict with the local authorities' collective approach set out in the Local Economic Partnership (LEP) which is based on contributing to 3.4% cumulative annual economic growth in total Gross Value Added (GVA) by 2020.

The Roger Tym work has stated that if each authority were to make its own forecasts and establish its own targets, at different times and using different approaches from its neighbours, it is very unlikely that the figures would add up to a reasonable future for the West of England as a whole. This will have implications for local economic growth and the aspirations of the LEP for the economy of the sub region.

The Strategy will be subject to plan, monitor manage so the level of development can be monitored. It is inappropriate to base the long term spatial vision on the current economic climate. If planning is based on a low growth scenario, high growth will create severe market distortions. There is a danger that the South West's historical under housing provision is exacerbated if planning figures are linked solely to a particular low "average" growth rate scenario. In turn, this tends to create higher carbon outcomes in terms of commuting and extended travel to work areas and negative social externalities related to housing affordability. Over the life of the Core Strategy it is inevitable that the economic climate will change, consequently the Core Strategy should be prepared so as to enable appropriate levels of housing provision to occur over the lifetime of the Plan and for it to be monitored accordingly.

The spatial vision does not refer to the need to support economic growth in the Bath TTWA by ensuring that sufficient housing is available in addition to that which is provided at Bath. Bath itself is constrained and relying on the redevelopment of brownfield sites which as referred to in representations on paragraphs 2.40 – 2.49. There are concerns about the deliverability given the amount of public sector investment required and that approximately 20% of the dwellings are within Flood Zones 2 and 3a.

The spatial vision for Keynsham is that it will continue to be a market town and service centre for the surrounding area. The Panel at the Regional EIP noted that as Bath was relatively constrained then Keynsham could meet the housing needs in a sustainable way. Development at Keynsham was promoted since Keynsham's location would allow for development to serve the wider needs of the conurbation. The Panel considered that Keynsham could provide a wide range of community services for the new development and that it would also be an attractive location for associated employment development (paragraph 4.1.65 of the Panel Report). Keynsham is well related to the A4 and the railway line to Bristol. The Panel considered that there was sufficient scope for development around Keynsham to allow for development to proceed without threatening the integrity of the separation of

Keynsham and Bristol by the Green Belt. The Panel proposed a total of 3,000 dwellings at this location. Para 4.1.65 of the Panel Report December 2007 out of 18,800 dwellings in total for BANES.

The Panel also concluded paragraph 4.0.32 that the scale of demand and the application of the principles of Sustainable Future for the South West as set out Policies SD 1- 4 provide the exceptional circumstances to justify alterations to the Green Belts within the region. The spatial vision for BANES should reflect the need to make provision for at least 18,500 dwellings in BANES during the plan period and also to accommodate development at Keynsham.

Change sought to 7b Change required to make the Core Strategy sound:

make sound: The spatial vision for BANES should be revised to reflect the need to provide for additional dwellings in accordance with the latest 2008 based household projections and evidence of housing need. The spatial vision for Keynsham in particular should be amended to include the opportunities for development at south west Keynsham.

Representation (legal compliance): 6a Why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant:

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009.

Change sought to make legally compliant: 7a Change required to make the Core Strategy legally compliant:

In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections and take into account evidence of housing need.

The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

RepresentationReference: 180\2

Plan Reference: Keynsham: The Vision

Representation

(soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as it does not meet housing needs. The Proposed Changes to the RSS identified the need to alter the general extent of the Green Belt at Keynsham in order to accommodate an urban extension to meet housing needs. The RSS considered that in order to make the necessary provision for new homes and to fulfil the role of the SSCTs in terms of their economic potential which could not be met in the existing urban areas, then the most sustainable solution is to provide for urban extensions to the SSCTs. This was debated at the Regional EIP and was a recommendation of the Panel. To address these exceptional circumstances, the RSS makes changes to the general extent of the Green Belt, removing the designation from the areas required to accommodate the proposed urban extensions.

The Panel considered that Keynsham was a suitable sustainable location for housing development in order to support economic growth in the Bath TTWA. Keynsham was considered as a suitable location as it would allow development to serve the wider needs of the conurbation. The Panel considered that Keynsham can provide a wide range of community services for new development and that it would be an attractive location for associated employment development. The combination of these factors makes Keynsham a sustainable location. The Panel considered that there was sufficient scope for development around Keynsham to allow development to proceed without threatening the integrity of the separation that the Green Belt ensured. This was endorsed by the Secretary of State in the Proposed Changes to the RSS. The Secretary of State agreed that Keynsham has a strong function relationship with Bristol and forms part of the Bristol

SSCT. It was considered that there were opportunities at Keynsham both for housing and employment to strengthen its role, so it could better serve its own population and that of the surrounding area.

The vision for Keynsham should, as part of the vision for BANES be in general conformity with the RSS (albeit that it is the Interim RSS i.e. the former RPG10 of September 2001 that is the RSS in the absence of the latest RSS being finally adopted). The need to critically review the Green Belt, to examine whether boundary alterations were needed to allow for long term sustainable needs was set out in the Interim RSS. The evidence base of the latest RSS is a material consideration. Clearly the vision is not in general conformity with the RSS, as the Core Strategy has not reviewed the Green Belt in the context of making provision for long term sustainable development needs for an urban extension to Keynsham for 3,000 dwellings. The latest 2008 based household projections also endorse the need for provision to be in sustainable locations.

The Economic Strategy for Bath and North East Somerset 2010 – 2026 states that the Green Belt around Keynsham has led to out commuting. In order to maintain Keynsham as a viable, sustainable market town there is an urgent need to build on its strategic location and transport links to expand and diversify the employment base. This would help to reduce out commuting and replace some of the jobs lost at Cadbury. The Economic Strategy states on page 41 that:

“The future use of the Somerdale site will be critical to the future of Keynsham and the action plan places emphasis on developing employment on this site. A targeted inward investment plan should be put together for Keynsham in order to raise its profile and as a future potential alternative office location to Bristol, as the area has good transport links and the strategic employment site of Somerdale.”

The Action Plan in the Economic Strategy sets out priorities for 2010 – 2013 and listed for Keynsham is: “Bring forward new employment space in Keynsham town centre and at Cadbury Somerdale”, the action was to bring forward a Regeneration Delivery Plan covering Keynsham Town Centre and Cadbury Somerdale, the output is listed as development of the centre which could deliver 10,000sqm of office space, 1,000sqm retail space, 2,000 sqm leisure and community space and up to 600 new and relocated jobs. Given Keynsham’s acknowledged suitability as a sustainable location for housing development in order to support economic growth in the Bath TTWA, it is not clear what the justification is for developing housing on part of the Somerdale employment site. This location is a suitable employment location and Keynsham in the Economic Strategy has been identified as an alternative location to Bristol for office development. The Somerdale site falls within Flood Zone 2 and yet is expected to accommodate 600 dwellings. The SFRA has also identified that part of the area is subject to increased risk from climate change. The loss of employment land at Somerdale will not support the self containment of Keynsham and will lead to a further imbalance between housing and employment provision. On this basis an objection is made to the use of the Cadbury Somerdale site for residential development. Given the above land at south west Keynsham is considered to be suitable, available and deliverable.

Development south west of Keynsham would not compromise the principles of the Green Belt. Keynsham as a market town should be the focal point for locally significant development including the provision of the bulk of district housing provision outside the Bath SSCT and also taking into account Bristol SSCT, thereby increasing its self containment. Bloor Homes consider that land to the south west of Keynsham provides the best opportunity to accommodate future housing needs. This area would not lead to the coalescence of Keynsham with Saltford. The area is not constrained by flood plain or conservation area, but is within the Landscape Character Area subject to Policy NC1, this is however a local designation. Bloor Homes consider that land to the south west of Keynsham is suitable for an urban extension to meet local needs. The Bloor land control extends to approximately 55.94 hectares which sits between Charlton Road and Parkhouse Lane to the north and Redlynch Lane to the south. The capacity of the site is approximately 1,000 dwellings assuming 60% is developed for residential use. (Representations including a Site Location Plan were submitted in response to the Spatial Options Consultation in January 2010.)

Change sought to 7b Change required to make the Core Strategy sound:

make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33 so that provision is made for in the order of 18,500 dwellings and the general extent of the Green Belt is redefined at Keynsham so that land south west of Keynsham is removed from the Green Belt and development needs can be accommodated sustainably in accordance with national guidance. Changes would need to be made to Policy DW01 to increase the housing provision for the plan period to at least 18,500 dwellings. Changes would need to be made to the spatial vision for Keynsham and also to Policy KE1 to reflect the strategic location and the need to make provision for 3,000 dwellings instead of 1,500 dwellings at Keynsham. Policy KE1 would also need to define the general extent of the Green Belt by removing land to the south west of Keynsham from the Green Belt. See proposed changes to Policy KE1

Representation (legal compliance): 6a Why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant:

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan as set out in PPS 12 paragraph 4.50 i.e. it should conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy, which in the South West is the Interim RSS i.e. the former RPG 10. The evidence base for the latest version of the RSS i.e. the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes should be considered as a material consideration.

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest Government guidance in terms of the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections. The Council's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: 7a Change required to make the Core Strategy legally compliant:

The Regional Spatial Strategy remains part of the development plan, despite the Coalition Government announcing that the RSS was to be abolished. The 6th July 2010 revocation of Regional Strategies was announced with immediate effect. The 6th July revocation decision was then subject to challenge in the Cala Homes (South) Ltd case. The effect of the Cala Homes decision was that the Regional Strategy as it stood on 5th July forms an ongoing part of the development plan. PINs Advice confirms that the RS is part of the development plan until legislation to formally repeal or revoke the RSS is implemented. The Core Strategy should be consistent with the development plan and the latest national advice, which now includes the DCLG 2008 based household projections. In the South West the Regional Strategy remains part of the development plan and in this case that is RPG10 September 2001 which became the Interim RSS in 2004. The Core Strategy does not conform to the Regional Spatial Strategy and no local justification is provided for the lack of conformity. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings.

Representation Reference: 180\3

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.18

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound, this paragraph refers to the abolition of the RSS which the Council has considered provided an opportunity to "move away from nationally imposed growth targets and establish its own requirements in response to local circumstances." The paragraph refers to analysis of new up-to-date evidence.

The RSS has not yet been abolished. Although the Coalition Government have now published the Localism Bill, it will be some time before the RSS is formally abolished. Until then the RSS is part of the statutory development plan and this has been set out in an Advice Note published by the Planning Inspectorate following the Cala Homes decision in November 2010. In the South West the most recent RS had reached an advanced stage and although not finalised the evidence base is considered to be a material consideration. The approved RSS is that of September 2001 i.e. RPG 10 which became the Interim RSS in 2004. It is this document that sets out the strategy based on sustainable development and that development should be located at sustainable locations. Policy SS 4 also refers to the need to review the Green Belt.

The strategy set out in the Interim RSS was taken forward in the emerging RSS which is consistent with national planning guidance. The housing figure for BANES in the RSS Secretary of State's Proposed

Changes was 21,300 dwellings for the plan period 2006 – 2026. The housing provision was based on the 2004 household projections. The justification for the overall housing provision was set out in the Schedule of the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes - July 2008 and focused on the Government's key housing policy goal of ensuring that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. This is still the Government's key housing policy goal as set out in the recently published PPS 3 in June 2010.

The justification for the provision in the RSS was based on the South West being a high demand region for housing, which is a function of population growth (through in-migration to the region), demographic and social trends (which manifest themselves in declining household size) and rates of economic growth above the national average. The advice in the NHPAU report "Affordability Matters" outlined the need to test a housing supply range of between 28,700 to a high point of 34,000 for the region by 2016 in order to address long term affordability in the region. This was reinforced by further advice from the NHPAU "Meeting the Housing Requirements of an Aspiring and Growing Nation – June 2008).

The Secretary of State was of the view that the consideration of the best available evidence supported an overall regional provision equivalent of a minimum of 29,623 dwellings per annum of over the plan period. In this context the housing requirement for BANES was increased to 21,300 dwellings. Whilst the latest 2008 based household projections show a lower increase of 16,000 households (ie 16,720 dwellings) for BANES, this is due to the different assumptions in migration. However, the fluctuations in migration can also be due to the restricted housing supply, the more restricted the housing supply, the lower the levels of household growth. There are also concealed households which because of affordability cannot enter the housing market.

The direction of travel in terms of the need for housing arising from the household projections which are a function of population growth, support the need for the increasing housing requirement for BANES. Population growth is the main driver of household growth. One person households are anticipated to equate to two thirds of the increase in households. There is still a strategic need for housing, the Coalition Government White Paper "Local Growth: realising every place's potential" October 2010 is new government policy which confirms that one of the 3 purposes of the planning system is to provide sufficient homes to meet demand (paragraph 3.1), that new Neighbourhood Plans will provide homes locally to meet need (paragraph 3.9) and that a new local plan will provide homes where a Neighbourhood Plan does not exist (paragraph 3.11).

Whilst the latest economic growth is less than what was anticipated in the RSS, the plan covers a 20 year period and more than one economic cycle, consequently the BANES strategy should be based on the long term. The role of the Core Strategy is to set out the long term spatial vision for BANES up to 2026 and the broad locations for new housing, jobs and other strategic development over the plan period. Over the life of the Core Strategy it is inevitable that the economic climate will change, consequently the Core Strategy should be prepared so as to enable appropriate levels of housing provision to occur over the lifetime of the Plan and for it to be monitored accordingly. If the Core Strategy is based on low levels of economic growth then it will not be in a position to respond to the economy when rates are higher.

Historically, the supply of housing in the South West has been lagging behind demographically based need/demand and the affordability of housing has been worsening. No where is this more evident than in BANES, where the housing provision in the adopted Local Plan has fallen short of the that envisaged , with an over reliance on brownfield sites which have failed to deliver during the economic boom. Affordability has worsened in the authority.

The SHMA evidence refers to the overwhelming message is one of very high housing need, in relation both to household growth and in relation to likely future supply. It concluded that current policies will

not be sufficient to meet even a significant proportion of the housing need identified in this SHMA. There is a high demand for family housing which is not being matched by recent supply, which in some areas has emphasised flats and smaller units. BANES has a lower number of detached houses, almost 30% terraced houses and 18% flats.

The latest evidence that the Council refers to is within the BANES Future Housing Growth Requirement to 2026 Stage 2 Report September 2010. This pre-dated the latest DCLG 2008 household projections which were published in November 2010 and shows that the number of households for 2006 – 2026 is 16,000 whilst this is less than the 2006 based figures it confirms the increase from previous projections. The figure of 16,000 households is also closer to the figure BANES submitted as part of the First Detailed Proposals (Options 1 figures which the Coalition Government indicated that some local authorities may want to use these figures rather than those in the RSS). It is not clear how the Council can justify the reduction from 15,500 dwellings (include in the Spatial Options Consultation in 2009) to 11,000 dwellings when the underlying trend is one of an increasing population growth.

During the preparation of the Regional Strategy the First Detailed Proposals for the Joint Study Area of the West of England were submitted to the Regional Assembly by the West of England Partnership. Whilst the Core Strategy states that account has been taken of the Districts functional relationship with neighbouring authorities what has not happened is any collective/joint work in the housing figures and employment requirements for the West of England, including BANES. Each authority has made its own forecasts and established its own targets, at different times and using different approaches from its neighbours, in which case these figures mean that there is a significant under provision. If the figures are compared for the Core Strategies as proposed for the four unitary authorities (i.e. 72,300) with the figures proposed in the RSS Proposed Changes (117,350) then the housing figure shortfall is 45,050 during the plan period. If a comparison is made with the latest 2008 based household projections then the shortfall is 83,700 dwellings (this is largely due to the significant increase in Bristol City, but never the less BANES reduction to 11,000 dwellings for the plan period is a reduction of a third.

Any shortfalls in provision not only have an impact on significant sections of the area in question, its local population and the local economy, but also increase the pressures felt by surrounding local authorities. The consequences lead to housing stress or excessive commuting to access jobs and services outside the immediate areas.

The West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (June 2009) states that whilst the West of England Housing Market is a relatively prosperous area with a diverse economic base. "It needs to retain its population to contribute to the wider local economy and to ensure that lack of housing does not begin to cause labour shortages potentially threatening the competitiveness of the area. The growth of longer distance car commuting is ultimately unsustainable in its impact on the local environment and its contribution towards congestion. Future housing supply strategies need to recognise these wider impacts and seek to maximise completions within the existing stock and on new sites within the sub region close to economic centres."

Paragraph 2.8.1

Some of the need for new housing in the area is closely linked to economic growth of the West of England sub region which acts as the "powerhouse" for the South West region. The key issue is how the under provision in housing will affect the local authorities in the West of England in terms of their aspirations for future levels of economic growth, such reductions in housing growth do not appear to be consistent with their aspirations in the LEP submission for economic growth. (The West of England LEP submission in September 2010 envisages 95,000 new jobs by 2030 and 3.4% cumulative annual growth in total GVA by 2020.)

Change sought to The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in
make sound: accordance with PPS 3 para 33. The housing provision should be at least 18,500 dwellings for the plan period 2006 - 2026

Representation (legal compliance): no comment supplied

Change sought to make legally compliant: no comment supplied

RepresentationReference: 180\4

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.16

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. The latest DCLG household projections confirm the trend for higher levels of housing and the Strategic Housing Needs Assessment also confirms the need for provision for a higher number of housing in the plan period. The strategy appears to be based on the short term economic situation i.e. one economic cycle rather than considering the implications of the population growth and household growth for the plan period. Over the life of the Core Strategy it is inevitable that the economic climate will change, consequently the Core Strategy should be prepared so as to enable appropriate levels of housing provision to occur over the lifetime of the Plan and for it to be monitored accordingly.

Paragraph 1.16 states that the Council in setting out the policy approach it has taken into account national policy guidance, the results of key studies and other relevant evidence as well as the issues identified through the consultation on the Core Strategy. National Policy Guidance PPS 3 is to make provision for sustainable development and the government's key housing policy goal as set out in paragraph 9. Paragraph 33 states that in determining the level of housing provision Local Planning Authorities working together should take into account evidence of current and future levels of need and demand for housing and affordability levels based on local and sub regional evidence if need and demand as set out in the SHMA and other relevant housing market information. Advice from the NHPAU, and the Government's latest published household projections and the needs of the regional economy, having regard to latest economic growth factors. In determining the local level of housing provision PPS 3 advises in paragraph 33 that the advice from the NHPAU should be taken into account. The West of England Housing Market Assessment (June 2009) states in paragraph 11.1.8 that "Regional analyses by NHPAU indicate that the South West region is one where greater housing supply will be needed to moderate affordability pressures and meet demographic demand." There is a high level of need for affordable housing which is not being met through existing policies and levels of delivery.

Economic projections – latest evidence from the SWRDA and OBR points to the risk of weaker growth, lower employment and higher inflation for the period 2011 – 2013, but beyond that the economy starts to improve. Office of Budget Responsibility (OBR) forecasts produced in November 2010 indicates a steady rise in GDP over the years to 2014. The Core Strategy as currently prepared will fail to meet housing needs and respond to demographic and social changes. Failure to meet housing needs will increase those in need of affordable housing and those who do work in parts of the authority e.g. Bath who cannot afford to live there to travel further, increasing commuting and congestion. The lack of housing provision will not support the economic development objectives and increase labour supply and have an adverse effect on the local economy.

Change sought to make sound: The spatial strategy for BANES should be revised to reflect the need to provide for additional dwellings in accordance with the latest 2008 based household projections. The spatial vision for Keynsham in particular should be amended to include the opportunities for development at Keynsham.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not in general conformity with the development plan as set out in PPS 12 paragraph 4.50 i.e. it should conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest Government guidance in terms of the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision

should be made to meet the latest household projections.

The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

RepresentationReference: 180\5

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.19

Representation Paragraph 1.19 refers to the detailed bottom up assessment of the capacity of the District's settlements **(soundness):** which has been undertaken. The assessment has included identifying suitable and deliverable development sites, having regard to the environmental constraints including the potential flood risk and assessing the appropriate mix of land uses and density. The SHLAA identifies only 11,289 dwellings which are available, suitable and deliverable. The density assumptions in the SHLAA appear to be based on higher densities that would be considered undesirable, now given that PPS 3 published in June removed the minimum density. Consequently, if densities were reduced on some sites there would be a need for more land to be made available to meet even the Councils housing figure of 11,000 dwellings in the plan period without even considering the higher housing figure from the latest 2008 based household projections. The recent PPG13 will also affect density assumptions. The deliverability of some sites included in the SHLAA is also questioned, if they are reliant on public sector funding coming forward e.g. Bath Central Area and Western Riverside where £27.6 million of public investment will be needed to ensure that the key infrastructure schemes are addressed.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33. Sites within the SHLAA should be reconsidered in view of the public sector investment required to deliver those sites. Density assumptions of sites should be reconsidered, this will lead to more sites being needed to meet the existing figure in the Core Strategy and an even greater number of

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 180\6

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.23

Representation The Core Strategy is unsound as the Council states in paragraph 1.23 that it has assessed the post recession likely need for new housing both market and affordable housing over the plan period. Whilst the Council have correctly looked the implications of projected population changes arising from births and deaths and increasing life expectancy, the likely housing requirement this entails including the decline in average household size; what is at issue is that the Council have then looked at the need for housing generated from economic growth and based on this a lower housing figure is included in the Core Strategy.

The Roger Tym and Partners Report "Business Growth and Employment Land Update" Revised June 2010 states in paragraph 1.2 that the Council has taken the opportunity to revise the emerging RSS employment target of 21,000 net additional jobs for BANES over the plan period 2006 – 2026 because of the Coalition Government's intention to abolish the RSS, and secondly that the recession has made these targets unrealistic. The Core Strategy should take a more long term view rather than basing its assumptions on the recent years.

The housing target should not be focussed on the short term i.e. what has happened in the last 2 years. The amount of housing growth affects growth in the economy. Latest figures indicate that the trend GVA figure is 2.25%, evidence indicates that there is no reason why a full economic recovery is not possible. The evidence from the SWRDA does not point to restricted potential in growth, consequently it is important to plan for full recovery. SWRDA evidence points to SW growth patterns after the recession for future growth between full recovery to recovery with loss. Restricted potential is not

envisaged, this is would occur if recovery was severely constrained as a result of the implications of the recession.

If a low level were achieved then this could be as a result of the shortage of housing. Forecasts need to build in aspiration as well as other factors such as the demography, climate change, energy and technology change. RDA forecasts for 2015 – 2030 suggest that GVA average change + 2.4% compared to + 3.2% in 1995 – 2005. GVA per head is + 1.5% compared to 2.6% in 1995 - 2005. Employment (FTEs) is +1.1% compared with +1.8% where as productivity is +1.3% compared to 1.4%.

It is not clear why the Council believe that growth will be significantly lower in future. The Council need to explain why the future will be radically different from the past and address the implications in terms of the affect on investment in the local economy. Even if the Council believe that the economic forecasts are low now, it should plan for improvement. The implications of planning for lower levels of growth are that only low levels will be achieved. A lower housing requirement will not assist in meeting housing need. The SHMA (June 2009) states that there is already a backlog of need and the total net housing need for BANES for the period 2009 – 2021 is 847 per annum – this equates to 10,164 dwellings for those in housing need i.e. for social rented housing and intermediate housing for only 12 years of the plan period. The Core Strategy provision of 11,000 dwellings is for the 20 year period for all types of housing. The SHMA concluded that there is an overwhelming very high housing need, in relation both to household growth and in relation to likely total future supply and the continuation of current policies will not be sufficient to meet even a significant proportion of the housing need identified in the SHMA.

The Core Strategy is unsound as it has reduced the housing requirement based on lower economic projections. Over the life of the Core Strategy it is inevitable that the economic climate will change, consequently the Core Strategy should be prepared so as to enable appropriate levels of housing provision to occur over the lifetime of the Plan and for it to be monitored accordingly.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33 and taking into account evidence of housing need in accordance with PPS 3. The spatial strategy for BANES should be revised to reflect the need to provide for additional dwellings in accordance with the latest 2008 based household projections. The spatial vision for Keynsham in particular should be amended to include the opportunities for development at south west Keynsham.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally complaint as it is not general conformity with the development plan as set out in PPS 12 paragraph 4.50 i.e. it should conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest government guidance in terms of the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections and evidence of housing need. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

RepresentationReference: 180\7

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.24

Representation 6b Why you consider the Core Strategy is unsound:

(soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives. The latest DCLG household projections confirm the trend for higher levels of housing, and the Strategic Housing Needs Assessment also confirms the need for provision for a higher number of dwellings in the plan period. The strategy appears to be based on the short term economic

situation i.e. one economic cycle rather than considering the implications of the population growth and household growth for the plan period. Over the life of the Core Strategy it is inevitable that the economic climate will change, consequently the Core Strategy should be prepared so as to enable appropriate levels of housing provision to occur over the lifetime of the Plan and for it to be monitored accordingly. The Core Strategy will fail to meet housing needs and respond to demographic and social changes.

Failure to meet housing needs will increase those in need of affordable housing and that those who do work in parts of the authority e.g. Bath, will have to travel further, increasing commuting and congestion. The lack of housing provision will not support the economic development objectives and increase labour supply. Paragraph 1.24 acknowledges that Bath has one of the widest house price earnings ratios outside London, but affordability varies across the District. The SHMA states that there is a high level of need for affordable housing which is not being met through existing policies and levels of delivery. Historically, the supply of housing in the South West has been lagging behind demographically based need/demand and the affordability of housing has been worsening. No where is this more evident than in BANES, where the housing provision in the adopted Local Plan has fallen short of the that envisaged , with an over reliance on brownfield sites which have failed to deliver during the economic boom. Affordability has worsened in the authority.

The SHMA evidence refers to the overwhelming message is one of very high housing need, in relation both to household growth and in relation to likely future supply. It concluded that current policies will not be sufficient to meet even a significant proportion of the housing need identified in this SHMA. There is a high demand for family housing which is not being matched by recent supply, which in some areas has emphasised flats and smaller units. BANES has a lower number of detached houses, almost 30% terraced houses and 18% flats.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33. The housing provision should be at least 18,500 dwellings for the plan period 2006 – 2026 which will be able to deliver more affordable housing.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not in general conformity with the development plan as set out in PPS 12 paragraph 4.50 i.e. it should conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest government guidance in terms of the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

Representation Reference: 180\8

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.25

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as the Council states in paragraph 1.25 that it has taken account of the sub-regional context. The spatial strategy must take account of the strategies and programmes of neighbouring authorities, especially the West of England.

The local authorities worked together to submit First Detailed Proposals for the West of England Joint Study Area to the South West Regional Assembly as Section 4 (4) authorities in 2005. This formed the basis of the housing figures in the Draft RSS as submitted in June 2006. Whilst to some extent joint working has continued through the West of England Partnership with the preparation of the Multi Area Agreement and the submission for the Local Enterprise Partnership; the issue is that the local authorities in determining the level of housing provision should take into account relevant local, subregional, regional and national policies and strategies i.e. PPS 3 paragraph 32 and also PPS 3 Bath

and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form paragraph 33.

However, if the housing provision of the local authorities in the West of England is examined, the shortfall for each local authority and the West of England is evident. The shortfall for BANES on the RSS dwelling figures is 10,300 dwellings and compared with the 2008 based household projections in the order of 6,000 dwellings.

Local Authority Core Strategy proposed housing figures RSS Proposed Changes 2008 based household projections

BANES	11,000	21,300	16,000
Bristol	26,400	36,500	72,000
South Glos	21,500	32,800	32,000
North Somerset	13,400	26,750	36,000
Total for West of England	72,300	117,350	156,000

It is the implications of the shortfall both in the local authority and the West of England in terms of housing need and the implications for the local economy that should be addressed. The West of England SHMA (June 2009) demonstrates the need for housing. The West of England HMA represents the largest concentration of business activity and employment in the South West region. One of the key messages in the SHMA is that there is a high level of need for affordable housing which is not being met through existing policies and levels of delivery. The SHMA states in the Executive Summary that migration is likely to continue at current levels but with migrants coming from outside the UK, households moving to the area from the UK are likely to be economically active. The Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) September 2010 sets out its priorities are, to facilitate the supply of readily available workforce and the skills that businesses need, to encourage the high levels of business start-up and growth of small businesses and, to facilitate new housing and community infrastructure. Within the priorities the LEP aim to promote the key growth sectors in the West of England, both nationally and abroad, to contribute to 3.4% cumulative annual growth in total GVA by 2020.

In constraining the levels of housing growth in BANES to 11,000 dwellings for the plan period this is inconsistent with the aspirational approach for economic growth in the LEP.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan as set out in PPS 12 paragraph 4.50 i.e. it should conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy.

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest government guidance in terms of the development plan and the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections. The Council's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections and evidence of housing need. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

Representation Reference: 180\9

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.26

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as the Council states in paragraph 1.26 that provision is made for 11,000 dwellings for the plan period. Whilst the strategy is to locate new development in the most sustainable locations, there is an over reliance on brownfield sites some of which have been included in the adopted Local Plan and failed to come forward in the local plan period. Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form This point has been made in detail in

representation to Policy DW01 and in representations on the spatial vision.

Although there are acknowledged constraints in the district such as the AONB, it was considered through the preparation of the RSS that there was capacity to accommodate in the order of 21,300 dwellings in the plan period. This was consistent with the principles of sustainable development and for BANES included a review of the Green Belt which had been deemed necessary as long ago as in the first RPG10 in 1994. Circumstances have not changed since then and the long term trend is for an increasing population and a strategy based on sustainable growth. The necessary provision of new homes and also to fulfil the roles of the SSCTs in terms of their economic potential could not be met within the existing urban areas. Through the preparation of the RSS exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated. The RSS identified urban extensions as part of the most sustainable solution for delivering housing and other development. This requires changes to be made to the general extent of the Green Belt. An urban extension to Keynsham was identified.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33 and taking into account the latest evidence of housing need.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply. It also fails to take account of the evidence base supporting the latest version of the RSS.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections and taking into account the evidence of housing need. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

Representation Reference: 180\10

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.28

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as the Council states in paragraph 1.28 that no changes are proposed to the Green Belt boundary at Keynsham, in the context of seeking to maintain the towns separate identity. Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form The Draft RSS states that although the Green Belt will continue to maintain the separate identities of Bristol and Bath, it was necessary for the provision of new homes, and in order to fulfil the SSCT's economic potential that could not be accommodated in the existing urban area; that the most sustainable solution was to provide for urban extensions to the SSCTs, including at locations that had been subject to a review of the Green Belt. The housing needs were deemed to be sufficiently pressing to constitute "exceptional circumstances". In order to address these exceptional circumstances, the RSS Proposed Changes to the general extent of the green belt, removing the designation from the areas required to accommodate the proposed urban extensions.

Policy HMA1: West of England HMA makes provision for 21,300 dwellings during the plan period, 2006 - 2026. Bristol is defined as a Strategically Significant City and Town and is a major driver of the regional economy. The policy is that a better balance between homes and jobs is required to reduce the need to travel. To this end, provision for sustainable urban housing growth is made and a number of urban extensions are proposed. An urban extension to Keynsham was included in the Draft RSS Proposed Changes. The emerging Regional Strategy stated that the general extent of the Green Belt would be maintained subject to alterations to enable the areas of search for urban extensions to be

brought forward through the preparation of Core Strategies. Where the general extent of the Green Belt is changed detailed boundaries where to be revised through Local Development Frameworks.

Even though the RSS is due to be abolished, through the Localism Bill and subsequent Act, there are still strong grounds for an urban extension within the Green Belt at Keynsham. Keynsham is a sustainable location. The Panel at the EIP concluded that there was scope for development around Keynsham without compromising or threatening the integrity of the separation of Bristol and Bath by developing in the Green Belt. This would involve a relaxation of the Green Belt boundary in order to achieve the housing numbers but the Examining Panel specifically indicated that in order to meet housing needs of the town as well as the wider HMA, there was an urgent need to relax the Green Belt, the housing pressures within the HMA constitute the exceptional circumstances required by PPG 2 to justify such relaxations.

Changes to the Green Belt are therefore considered necessary in order to accommodate housing needs in accordance with the development plan and in accordance with the latest 2008 household projections, which whilst they give a lower figure than included in the Proposed Changes to the RSS given the development constraints in the remainder of the district, necessitate a need for an urban extension to Keynsham. Land at south west Keynsham is well placed and is not subject to constraints such as flooding, it will not prejudice the visual amenity of Queen Charlton, Chewton Keynsham and the River Chew Valley. Development at south west Keynsham although within the Green Belt would not compromise the main principles of the function of the Green Belt. Unlike other areas around the periphery of Keynsham which are constrained by floodplain, the A4 and the railway line and a nature conservation sites.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33 so that provision is made for in the order of 18,500 dwellings to take into account housing need. The general extent of the Green Belt should be redefined at south west Keynsham, so that development needs can be accommodated sustainably in accordance with national guidance.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009. . The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections taking into account evidence of housing need. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

RepresentationReference: 180\11

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.31

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as the Council states in paragraph 1.26 that provision is made for 11,000 dwellings for the plan period. Whilst the strategy is to locate new development in the most sustainable locations, there is an over reliance on brownfield sites some of which have been included Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form in the adopted Local Plan

and failed to come forward in the plan period. This point has been made in detail in representations to Policy DW01.

Although there are acknowledged constraints in the district such as the AONB, it was considered through the preparation of the RSS that there was capacity to accommodate in the order of 21,300 dwellings in the plan period. This was consistent with the principles of sustainable development and for BANES included a review of the Green Belt which had been deemed necessary as long ago as in the first RPG10 in 1994. Circumstances have not changed since then and the long term trend is for an increasing population and a strategy based on sustainable growth.

The necessary provision of new homes and also to fulfil the roles of the SSCTs in terms of their economic potential could not be met within the existing urban areas. Through the preparation of the RSS exceptional circumstances have been justified. The RSS identified urban extensions as part of the most sustainable solution for delivering housing and other development. This requires changes to be made to the general extent of the Green Belt. An urban extension to Keynsham was identified. Land at south west Keynsham can accommodate development needs. The location has been promoted in response to the Spatial Options Consultation in 2009.

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33. The general extent of the Green Belt should be altered at south west Keynsham as exceptional circumstances have been proven through the preparation of the RSS.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections and take account of evidence of housing need. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

Representation Reference: 180\12

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.33

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy in paragraph 1.33 refers to the scale of new homes leading to a significant uplift on past building rates of delivery from around 380 to around 550 dwellings per annum. The actual Bath and North East Somerset's Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form delivery even on the Council's own housing projection figures needs to be higher because it needs to take into account the under build during the years of the Local Plan. The adopted Local Plan envisaged 6,855 dwellings being built in the period 1996 – 2011 i.e. 457 per annum. However, the actual build rate was only 385 dwellings per annum. The delivery of housing is significantly below the rate needed to achieve the requirement in the Local Plan. The Council's AMR 2009/2010 includes the Local Plan Housing Trajectory 1996 – 2011 and shows that the build rate since 1996 has only been above that intended for 4 years of the Local Plan period. In many years it has been significantly below the annual figure intended in the Local Plan (Local Plan Housing Trajectory 1996 – 2011 Part 2).

In order to meet the Local Plan target a further 1,462 dwellings are needed during the final year of the plan, but according to the AMR only 500 units are considered to be deliverable, consequently the

delivery will fall short by about 962 dwellings meaning that only 86% of the Local Plan target will have been achieved. The Local Plan strategy was reliant on brownfield sites (up to 68%) and one of the largest sites in the Local Plan was the Western Riverside (450 – 600 units in the Local Plan). The AMR gives the reason for the shortfall in housing completions, as the collapse in the residential housing market and delays in securing external funding at Bath Western Riverside. PPS 3 states that a flexible responsive supply of land needs to be maintained and that the Local Planning Authority should identify sufficient specific deliverable sites to deliver housing in the first five years. To be considered deliverable sites need to be available now, be suitable and achievable.

Local Planning Authorities should also identify a further specific developable sites for years 6 – 10 and where possible for years 11- 15. The Core Strategy is starting from a point of under provision against the adopted Local Plan and therefore this shortfall needs to be made up in the Core Strategy plan period, early in the plan period given the level of housing need. The SHLAA envisages that 3,977 dwellings are deliverable in years 2010/11 – 2014/15 this would equate to approximately 795 dwellings per year (however this would be nearly twice the build rate of the last year 2009/2010 of 420 dwellings which is below the build rate envisaged in the adopted Local Plan i.e. 457 dwellings per annum). It is consider that this is unrealistic given the current economic climate, and particularly given that much of the Central area and Western Riverside is reliant on £27.6m of public investment for key infrastructure schemes, including flood alleviation, land assembly and remediation.

Change sought to The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in
make sound: accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33 and to ensure that there is a 5 year responsive supply of housing in accordance with PPS 3 paragraphs 52- 57.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest Government guidance in terms of the development plan and does not take into account the latest evidence base for the SW RSS.

Change sought to make legally compliant: The Regional Spatial Strategy remains part of the development plan, despite the Coalition Government announcing that the RSS was to be abolished. The 6th July 2010 revocation of Regional Strategies was announced with immediate effect. The 6th July revocation decision was then subject to challenge in the Cala Homes (South) Ltd case. The effect of the Cala Homes decision was that the Regional Strategy as it stood on 5th July forms an ongoing part of the development plan. PINs Advice confirms that the RS is part of the development plan until legislation to formally repeal or revoke the RS is implemented. The Core Strategy should be consistent with the development plan and the latest national advice, which now includes the DCLG 2008 based household projections. In the South West the Regional Strategy remains part of the development plan and in this case that is RPG10 September 2001 which became the Interim RSS in 2004.

The Core Strategy does not conform to the Regional Spatial Strategy and no local justification is provided for the lack of conformity.

The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings.

RepresentationReference: 180\13

Plan Reference: Whole Document

Representation The Core Strategy envisages the deliverability of 11,000 dwellings in the plan period, section 2g refers
(soundness): to Infrastructure and Delivery. Of the 11,000 dwellings, the strategy envisages 6,000 at Bath i.e. 54.5%

(3,500 in the Central Area and Western Waterfront and 2,500 in outer neighbourhoods and surplus MOD land.) This strategy relies on land that “has been earmarked for a major programme of residential led regeneration for a number of years.” (page 44 of the Consultation document). The Western Riverside was allocated in the adopted BANES Local Plan of October 2007 and although supported by a Master Plan Supplementary Planning Document of March 2008 it has failed to come forward as anticipated. Its deliverability must be questioned and therefore its contribution to meeting the housing needs of BANES given paragraphs 2.40 and 2.41.

The delivery of the Bath spatial strategy as acknowledged in the Core Strategy will need to be supported by the provision of necessary infrastructure. Paragraph 2.40 states that in order to realise the development potential of the Central Area and Western Corridor, parallel enabling investment will be needed. Given the investment required in transportation and flooding the deliverability must be questioned.

Paragraph 2.41 refers to the Council securing programme entry for £54m major scheme of Transport Proposals for Bath and is currently moving towards full Government approval. Several questions arise in terms of how the timescale for funding the transport proposals will affect the deliverability of much needed housing. Concerns are expressed about the availability of funding given the Comprehensive Spending Review. If funding is not forthcoming this will delay the deliverability of the scheme.

Change sought to make sound: There is a need to allocate more housing not only to meet housing forecasts consistent with the latest 2008 based household projections but also to provide sufficient flexibility in housing delivery should the funding for the Central Area and Western Corridor not come forward in the timescale. Land at South West Keynsham is consistent with the urban extension identified in the Regional Strategy and can come forward to meet identified housing needs. Representations were made to the Consultation on the Spatial Options in 2009 to support the location and its contribution to meeting the housing needs of BANES (see representations in particular on Policy DW01 and Policy KE1).

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 180\14

Plan Reference: Paragraph 3.13

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as it does not meet housing needs. The Proposed Changes to the RSS identified the need to alter the general extent of the Green Belt at Keynsham in order to accommodate an urban extension to meet housing needs. An objection is made to the spatial strategy for Keynsham which is set out in Policy KE1 (representations have been made to Policy KE1. Bath and North East Somerset’s Core Strategy – Publication Stage Representation Form
It is considered possible to remove land from the Green Belt at south west Keynsham without affecting the individual character and identity of Saltford, and enable housing needs to be met in a sustainable location.

Change sought to make sound: Changes are required to make the Core Strategy sound – these have been proposed in response to Policy KE1.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009.

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 180\15

Plan Reference: Paragraph 3.14

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as it does not meet housing needs. The Proposed Changes to the RSS identified the need to alter the general extent of the Green Belt at Keynsham in order to accommodate an urban extension to meet housing needs. An objection is made to the spatial strategy for Keynsham which is set out in Policy KE1 (representations have been made to Policy KE1).

Change sought to make sound: The changes that are required to make the Core Strategy sound are set out in the representations to Policy KE1.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections and take into account evidence of housing need. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

RepresentationReference: 180\16

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.44

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is considered unsound in respect of its deliverability – the Strategy is predicated on the deliverability of large areas of brownfield land. To be sound the Core Strategy must be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. To be effective the document must be deliverable, flexible and able to be monitored (paragraph 4.52 of PPS 12).

Flood risk is identified as one of the major constraints to the regeneration of Bath and other market towns within the District (paragraph 3.5 of the Flood Risk: Sequential and Exception Tests Core Strategy Paper November 2010).

In Bath a number of the potential development locations fall within Flood Zone 3a and 2. The Core Strategy states that a Flood Risk Management Strategy has concluded that there is no comprehensive strategic solution for reducing peak flow through Bath which is technically and economically viable. The Flood Risk Sequential /Exception Test states that the SHLAA indicates that there is capacity for 6,213 homes to be delivered within the city of which 3,672 are within the river corridor and 2,541 are within the outer neighbourhoods. Whilst it is noted that the majority of the Outer Neighbourhood areas are within Flood Zone 1 or are not subject to the sequential test as they are already built or have gained planning permission. The issue is that 230 dwellings are within Flood Zone 2 and 1,096 dwellings are in Flood Zone 3a. That is 20% of the housing provision in Bath is within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3a and relies on substantial investment as set out in paragraph 2.48 of £27.6M of public sector investment.

The Central Area and Western Riverside (referred to as Bath City Riverside) is not only important to the deliverability of the BANES Core Strategy but also the aspirations for the West of England. This area is reliant on the investment of £27.6 million of public investment to ensure that matters of infrastructure, flood alleviation, land assembly, remediation and affordable housing. Given the current position in the public sector it must be questioned whether this investment will be available in the timescale set out in the Core Strategy. The deliverability of the strategy is therefore questioned.

Even if all the sites with planning permission in Bath and all the Flood Zone 1 sites were developed this does not meet the identified need for housing of about 6,000 according to BANES reduced housing provision, the Council have included some sites within the river corridor. The Core Strategy Information paper on page 13 states that there are no alternative areas elsewhere within Flood Zone 1 in the district which could facilitate the level and type of development required in the policy areas to support regeneration of the city centre and wider sustainable development principles. This is not entirely true as there are alternative sites within Flood Zone 1 elsewhere in the district which could facilitate development to meet housing needs of the district and support regeneration. Given the constraints affecting Bath the Panel recommended an area of search around Keynsham. Land to the south west Keynsham is well placed to meet housing needs and supporting local regeneration.

Change sought to make sound: In addition to objections made about the overall housing figure being inadequate to meeting housing needs and being inconsistent with the latest 2008 based household projections, there are also concerns about the overall deliverability of the strategy in BANES, in particular at Bath. Therefore the housing figure for the district should be increased in order to provide some flexibility and also in recognition of the need to meet the needs set out in the 2008 based household projections. See representations on Policy DW01 and Policy KE1 for proposed wording.)

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 180\17

Plan Reference: Policy CP2: Sustainable Construction

Representation (soundness): Policy CP2 Sustainable Construction is considered unsound as it includes a timescale when Codes for Sustainable Homes will be expected to be adhered to. Previously in response to the Spatial Options Consultation, Bloor Homes had indicated that the changes to the Building Regulations in 2010, 2013 and 2016 will allow for the opportunity to adjust policy in light of experiences. This is particularly significant given that there are acknowledged issues in terms of the technology being available in a useable form on a volume scale. The policy framework developed will need to be capable of dealing with changing circumstances. It is the industry's view that by 2016 Code Level 4 will be achieved rather than Code Level 6 and in doing so there will need to be some flexibility depending on the local circumstances and national context. Achieving Code Level 5 will add significantly to costs and basically as the number of dwellings decreases the cost per unit rises and there will come a point between £20,000 and £30,000 per unit where the community energy ceases to be the most economic solution.

Change sought to make sound: Consideration should be given to what are realistic in terms of deliverable targets for the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 180\18

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as it does not alter the Green Belt around Keynsham as advocated in the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the RSS. Although the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the RSS were not finalised, the evidence base to support the RSS is a material consideration and sets out the exceptional circumstances which justifies the changes to the general extent of the Green Belt. The Interim RSS (ie RPG10 September 2001) set out in Policy SS 4 Green Belt, the need to critically review the Green Belt and examine whether boundary alterations were needed to allow for long term sustainable development needs.

There is a need to allocate more housing not only to meet housing forecasts consistent with the latest 2008 based household projections, but also to provide sufficient flexibility in housing delivery should the funding for the Central Area and Western Corridor not come forward in the timescale, and to recognise that the assumptions about density in the Core Strategy are high. Actual density on sites could be much less and in accordance with PPS 3 (June 2010).

The Core Strategy is unsound as it does not meet housing needs. The Proposed Changes to the RSS identified the need to alter the general extent of the Green Belt at Keynsham in order to accommodate an urban extension to meet housing needs. The RSS considered that in order to make the necessary provision for new homes and to fulfil the role of the SSCTs in terms of their economic potential which could not be met in the existing urban areas, then the most sustainable solution is to provide for urban extensions to the SSCTs. This was debated at the Regional EIP and was a recommendation of the Panel. To address these exceptional circumstances, the RSS makes changes to the general extent of the Green Belt, removing the designation from the areas required to accommodate the proposed urban extensions.

The Panel considered that Keynsham was a suitable sustainable location for housing development in order to support economic growth in the Bath TTWA. Keynsham was considered as a suitable location as it would allow development to serve the wider needs of the conurbation. The Panel considered that Keynsham can provide a wide range of community services for new development and that it would be an attractive location for associated employment development. The combination of these factors makes Keynsham a sustainable location. The Panel considered that there was sufficient scope for development around Keynsham to allow development to proceed without threatening the integrity of the separation that the Green Belt ensured.

This was endorsed by the Secretary of State in the Proposed Changes to the RSS. The Secretary of State agreed that Keynsham has a strong function relationship with Bristol and forms part of the Bristol SSCT. It was considered that there were opportunities at Keynsham both for housing and employment to strengthen its role, so it could better serve its own population and that of the surrounding area.

Given the above, land at south west Keynsham is considered to be suitable, available and deliverable. Development south west of Keynsham would not compromise the principles of the Green Belt. Keynsham as a market town should be the focal point for locally significant development including the provision of the bulk of district housing provision outside the Bath SSCT and also taking into account Bristol SSCT, thereby increasing its self containment.

Bloor Homes consider that land to the south west of Keynsham provides the best opportunity to accommodate future housing needs. This area would not lead to the coalescence of Keynsham with Salford. The area is not constrained by flood plain or conservation area, but is within the Landscape Character Area subject to Policy NC1, this is however a local designation. Bloor Homes consider that land to the south west of Keynsham is suitable for an urban extension to meet local needs. The Bloor land control extends to approximately 55.94 hectares which sits between Charlton Road and Parkhouse Lane to the north and Redlynch Lane to the south. (Representations including a Site Location Plan were submitted in response to the Spatial Options Consultation in January 2010.)

(see representations in particular on Policy DW01 and Policy KE1)

Change sought to make sound: The Core Strategy should be amended to reflect the latest published household projections in accordance with PPS 3 paragraph 33 so that provision is made for in the order of 18,500 dwellings and the general extent of the Green Belt is redefined at Keynsham so that land south west of Keynsham is removed from the Green Belt and development needs can be accommodated sustainably in accordance with national guidance.

Changes would need to be made to Policy DW01 to increase the housing provision for the plan period

to at least 18,500 dwellings. Changes would need to be made to the spatial vision for Keynsham and also to Policy KE1 to reflect the strategic location and the need to make provision for 3,000 dwellings instead of 1,500 dwellings at Keynsham. Policy KE1 would also need to define the general extent of the Green Belt by removing land to the south west of Keynsham from the Green Belt.

Changes would need to be made to Policy CP8 to redefine the boundary of the Green Belt south West of Keynsham.

“The general extent of the Green Belt is set out on the Core Strategy Key Diagram. Land to the south west of Keynsham has been removed from the Green Belt. The detailed boundaries and inset villages are defined on the Proposals Map.....”

See proposed changes to Policy KE1

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant and therefore does not conform generally with the development plan as set out in PPS 12 paragraph 4.50 i.e. it should conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy.

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in conformity with the RSS, (ie the Interim RSS) and taking into account the evidence base for the latest RSS that has not been progressed beyond the stage of the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes.

The Core Strategy is not compliant as it fails to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to the latest Government guidance in terms of the development plan and the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: The Core Strategy is not legally compliant with the development plan. In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and also consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections in the most appropriate sustainable locations; exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to make the changes to the general extent of the Green Belt.

Representation Reference: 180\19

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is based on 11,000 dwellings for the plan period 2006 – 2026 which is a significant reduction on the housing figure in the Proposed Changes to the RSS and in the latest 2008 based household projections. It is even a reduction on the First Detailed Proposals that BANES submitted to the preparation of the Regional Spatial Strategy in December 2005. The figure of 15,500 dwellings was included in the RSS which was in effect the First Detailed Proposals. The housing figures in the RSS were based on the 2003 based household projections and by the time the Examination in Public had taken place and the Secretary of State Proposed Changes were published the 2004 based projections had been updated and amended. By increasing the housing figures the Secretary of State took into account a number of factors which still remain relevant to the consideration of housing provision for BANES. These factors are the strategic context, economic growth, demographic evidence, long term affordability, strategic potential, deliverability and the Sustainability Appraisal.

The Proposed Changes to the RSS increased the figure for BANES to 21,300 dwellings based on the 2004 household projections. BANES in producing the Core Strategy Spatial Options consultation in October 2009 reduced the housing figure to the Draft RSS figure of 15,500 dwellings on the basis that major changes had taken place in the country's economic position. However, the 2009 consultation document stated in respect of the 15,500 dwellings “If this level of housing is not provided then it will have serious implications, preventing some people having access to a decent home, making housing less affordable (to buy or rent) and in the longer term damaging the local economy by reducing labour supply and mobility.”

It must be questioned what has changed in the last 12 months for BANES to reduce the housing figure by 26%. The South West Gross Value Added (December 2010) produced by the South West RDA shows that the GVA figures for the South West show that the South West region showed a relative degree of resilience to the recession during 2009. The report states that; "Sub regionally the pattern showed relative strength in the counties of Cornwall, Bristol and Bournemouth and Poole all showing growth in 2008."

The latest 2008 based household projections for England and the Regions indicate that for BANES the increase from 2006 – 2026 will be 16,000 households i.e. 800 households per annum. In terms of dwellings this amounts to approximately 16,720 dwellings i.e. 850 dwellings per annum. Evidence of the total households in need as set in SHMA in Figure 20 of the Executive Summary (June 2009) Table 4.11 in the Main Report indicates that there are 847 per annum in households need i.e. those who need social rented and intermediate housing. For the period 2009 – 2021, provision needs to be made for 10,164 dwellings to meet those in housing need; however this only corresponds to 12 years of the plan period. If this figure were replicated for the remaining years of the plan period i.e. 17yrs from the 2009 base years this would equate to the need for 14,399 dwellings that would need to be provided to meet those in housing need. A 20 year plan period based on 847 per annum would equate to a need to provide for 16,940 dwellings (this figure is similar to the latest 2008 based household projections of 16,000, or 16,750 dwellings), but only meets those in need of affordable housing as opposed to also meeting needs for market housing.

The Core Strategy is unsound as it is not justified, effective and consistent with national policy. It is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base as it is based on projections of lower levels of growth of recent years rather than taking a long term approach for the plan period. The SWRDA Report "Economic Prediction and the Planning Process" January 2011 states that: "There is a danger that the South West's historical under provision is exacerbated if planning figures are linked solely to a particular low "average" growth rate scenario. In turn, this tends to create higher carbon outcomes in terms of commuting and extended travel to work areas and negative social externalities related to housing affordability". Representations on Strategic Objective 5 make reference to the SWRDA report in more detail; the housing target should not be focussed on the short term i.e. what happened in the last 2 years.
[Http://economy.swo.org.uk/publications/special-economy-module-publications/](http://economy.swo.org.uk/publications/special-economy-module-publications/)

The Core Strategy is not consistent with national guidance in PPS3 paragraph 9 which states that: "The Government's key housing policy goals is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live." Constraining the housing supply to 11,000 dwellings for the plan period will fail to meet the Government's key housing objective. Constraining the supply of housing is not consistent with the overall national objective of increasing the availability of housing. This has been reiterated in recent ministerial statements and in particular the White Paper "Local Growth: realising every place's potential" October 2010. Box 2A states:

"Local authorities have a critical role to play in supporting the economy in their area and have wide range of levers at their disposal.... Supporting growth and development through ensuring a responsive supply of land that supports business growth and increases housing supply;"

PPS 3 (June 2010) paragraph 32 states that: "The level of housing provision should be determined taking a strategic, evidence based approach that takes into account relevant local, sub-regional, regional and national policies and strategies achieved through widespread collaboration with stakeholders."

PPS 3 paragraph 33 is also relevant to this point, it states that "In determining the local,.... Level of housing provision, Local Planning Authoritiesworking together should take into account:
-Evidence of current and future levels of housing need and demand for housing and affordability levels based upon:

- Local and sub regional evidence of need and demand, set out in Strategic Housing Market Assessments and other relevant market information such as long term house prices.
- Advice from the National Housing Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU) on the impact of the proposals for affordability in the region.
- The Government's latest household projections and the needs of the regional economy, having regard to economic growth forecasts." Local and sub- regional evidence of the availability and suitability of land for housing using the SHLAA..... The Governments overall ambitions for affordability across the housing market, including the need to improve affordability and increase in housing supply....."

Policy DW01 Criterion 3

Policy DW01 prioritises the use of brownfield sites, whilst this is consistent with PPS 3 it should not be at the exclusion of non brownfield sites. There is an over reliance on brownfield sites to meet the housing need. Evidence from the Local Plan period shows that a reliance on brownfield sites led to a shortfall in housing provision. Only in four years of the Local Plan period did completions reach and exceed the Local Plan target. There is a need to provide a sufficient quantity of housing taking into account need and demand and seeking to improve choice, which is set out in PPS 3 planning for housing policy objectives. The figure of 11,000 dwellings is based on the capacity of the SHLAA which is based on density assumptions of 50 dph which are much higher compared to what is likely to be achieved. If lower densities were to be achieved then there would be a need for more locations to be included in the Core Strategy even based on the Council's assumptions of 11,000 dwellings.

Policy DW01 Criterion 4

Policy DW01 retains the Bristol Bath Green Belt within BANES with no strategic change to the boundaries of the Green Belt within the Plan period. The need to review the Green Belt was recognised in the 1994 Regional Planning Guidance 10, paragraph 4.11 and subsequently in RPG10 in 2001 which became the Interim RSS in 2004. Policy SS4 Green Belt stated that as a key element of the future planning of the region , local planning authorities when preparing their development plans:

- " critically review the Green Belt to examine whether the boundary alterations are needed to allow for long term sustainable development needs;
- Remove land from the Green Belt for development, if on balance, this would provide the most sustainable solution for accommodating future development requirements."

A review of the Green Belt for Bath and Bristol was required. This was to be taken forward in the review of the Joint Avon Structure Plan; however this was overtaken by the review of the RSS. More recently the review of the Green Belt was specified in the RSS and the Proposed Changes. There are exceptional circumstances that require the review of the Bristol – Bath Green Belt; namely the need to accommodate development required in the period to 2026 in the most sustainable locations. In order to make the necessary provision for new homes and to fulfil the Strategically Significant Cities and Towns economic potential which cannot be met in the existing urban areas; the most sustainable solution is to provide for urban extensions. There are exceptional circumstances that require the review of the Bristol – Bath Green Belt; namely the need to accommodate development required in the period to 2026 in the most sustainable locations. It is necessary for BANES to examine and review the detailed boundaries of the Green Belt given that the RSS makes changes to the general extent. To address these exceptional circumstances, the RSS makes changes to the general extent of the Green Belt, removing the designation from areas required to accommodate the proposed urban extensions. The supporting text to proposed Policy HMA1 sets out the exceptional circumstances which justify the changes to the general extent of the Green Belt and 3,000 dwellings in an urban extension to Keynsham was identified by the Panel following the Examination in Public into the RSS. Irrespective of the fact that the RSS has not been finally approved the evidence base is up-to-date and endorse the need to alter the boundaries of the Green Belt. (This need was also originally raised in the RPG 10 Interim RSS for the South West). This need is further supported by the latest 2008 based household projections. Consequently, there is a need to remove land from the Green Belt given the level of

housing that needs to be provided to meet the forecast requirements. The Core Strategy is therefore unsound; by failing to review the Green Belt the Council is failing to meet housing needs in BANES for the plan period.

The housing provision in Policy DW01 of 11,000 dwellings for the plan period fails to meet the housing needs of BANES, "Housing Growth Requirements to 2026: Stage 2 Report" provides insufficient justification for the lower housing figure included in the Core Strategy. The approach is inconsistent with national guidance and is based on a low economic growth scenario of recent years rather than taking a view of the long term. It is inappropriate to base the long term spatial vision on the current economic climate. Over the life of the Core Strategy, it is inevitable that the economic climate will change, consequently the Core Strategy should be prepared so as to enable appropriate levels of housing provision to occur over the lifetime of the Plan and for it to be monitored accordingly. Failure to provide sufficient housing will have serious implications as the Council has indicated previously in the Consultation on the Spatial Options against the higher figure of 15,500 dwellings, preventing some people having access to a decent home, making housing less affordable (to buy or rent) and in the longer term damaging the local economy by reducing labour supply and mobility.

Change sought to make sound: The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings. Amend sub paragraph 2 of Policy DW01 to read, "making provision for.....at least 925 dwellings to be constructed annually (18,500 between 2006 and 2026). Amend sub-paragraph 4 of Policy DW1 to provide for the release of land at Keynsham from the Green Belt, and amend the Key Diagram to this effect.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in Policy DW01 to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest Government guidance in terms of Regional Strategy which remains part of the development plan and the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest CLG 2008 based household projections. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: The Regional Spatial Strategy remains part of the development plan, despite the Coalition Government announcing that the RSS was to be abolished. The 6th July 2010 revocation of Regional Strategies was announced with immediate effect. The 6th July revocation decision was then subject to challenge in the Cala Homes (South) Ltd case. The effect of the Cala Homes decision was that the Regional Strategy as it stood on 5th July forms an ongoing part of the development plan. PINs Advice confirms that the RS is part of the development plan until legislation to formally repeal or revoke the RS is implemented. The Core Strategy should be consistent with the development plan and the latest national advice, which now includes the DCLG 2008 based household projections. In the South West the regional strategy remains part of the development plan and in this case that is RPG10 September 2001 which became the Interim RSS in 2004. The Core Strategy does not conform to the Regional Spatial Strategy and no local justification is provided for the lack of conformity. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings.

RepresentationReference: 180\20

Plan Reference: Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): The Core Strategy is unsound as it does not meet housing needs. The Proposed Changes to the RSS identified the need to alter the general extent of the Green Belt at Keynsham in order to accommodate an urban extension to meet housing needs. Objection is made the following points of the Policy:

1 Natural and Built Environment

The policy maintains the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham. The need to review the Bristol/Bath Green

Belt has been a long stranding issue and was raised in RPG10 published in 1994, paragraph 4.11 stated that the need to provide for additional development consistent with the principle of reducing the need to travel set out in PPG13, may require some physical reappraisal of the current configuration of green belts. This was then taken forward in RPG 10 published in 2001 which became the Interim RSS in 2004 pending the review of RPG10. Policy SS 4: Green Belt set out the policy framework for the region – while Green Belts should continue should continue to fulfil the purposes as set out in PPG2, Local Planning Authorities should:

- “...critically review the Green Belt to examine whether boundary alterations are needed to allow for long term sustainable development needs;
- “remove land from the Green Belt for development, if on balance, this would provide the most sustainable solution for accommodating future development requirements.”

Policy SS4 of the RPG 10 (i.e. the Interim RSS) concluded that there was a need for the Green Belts in the region to be critically reviewed in the next round of Structure Plans. This Review was intended to examine whether the Green Belts needed to be amended to meet the long term sustainable development needs, given climate change objectives. The Avon Joint Replacement Structure Plan (JRSP) 2002 states that the full implications of new RPG10 (the 2001) version would be addressed in the next review of the Structure Plan. However, with the introduction of Regional Spatial Strategies in 2004 – the strategic review of the Green Belt became the responsibility of the South West Regional Assembly and was undertaken by the West of England Partnership Joint Study Area Section 4 (4) authorities during the preparation of the RSS. The urban extension to Keynsham was identified following the debate at the Regional EIP and was a recommendation of the Panel in their report Dec 2007. This was endorsed by the Secretary of State in the Proposed Changes to the RSS in 2008. In view of the housing need as evidenced in the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections, the need to remove land from the Green Belt remains justified, consequently Policy KE1 should reflect this and make provision to change the boundaries of the Green Belt.

2 Housing

The Core Strategy makes provision for 1,500 new homes at Keynsham in the plan period 2006 – 2026 this is half the number of new homes that the RSS envisaged for Keynsham in Policy HMA1: West of England HMA.

The RSS considered that in order to make the necessary provision for new homes and to fulfil the role of the SSCTs in terms of their economic potential, which could not be met in the existing urban areas, then the most sustainable solution is to provide for urban extensions to the SSCTs. This was debated at the Regional EIP and was a recommendation of the Panel. To address these exceptional circumstances, the RSS makes changes to the general extent of the Green Belt, removing the designation from the areas required to accommodate the proposed urban extensions. The Panel considered that Keynsham was a suitable sustainable location for housing development in order to support economic growth in the Bath TTWA. Keynsham was considered as a suitable location as it would allow development to serve the wider needs of the conurbation. The Panel considered that Keynsham can provide a wide range of community services for new development and that it would be an attractive location for associated employment development. The combination of these factors makes Keynsham a sustainable location. The Panel considered that there was sufficient scope for development around Keynsham to allow development to proceed without threatening the integrity of the separation that the Green Belt ensured. This was endorsed the Secretary of State in the Proposed Changes to the RSS. The Secretary of State agreed that Keynsham has a strong function relationship with Bristol and forms part of the Bristol SSCT. It was considered that there were opportunities at Keynsham both for housing and employment to strengthen its role, so it could better serve its own population and that of the surrounding area. The vision for Keynsham should as part of the vision for BANES and be in general conformity with the RSS (albeit that it is the Interim RSS i.e. the former RPG 10 of September 2001 that is the RSS in the absence of the latest RSS being finally adopted). Whilst in principle the need to critically review the Green Belt was established through RPG10, in order to allow for long term sustainable development, the evidence base of the latest version of the RSS takes this further and the latest evidence base is a material consideration. Clearly the vision is not in general conformity with the RSS, as the Core Strategy has not reviewed the Green Belt in the context of making provision for long term sustainable development

needs.

3. Economic Development

The Core Strategy proposes that some of the former Cadbury Somerdale site should be used for housing rather than and greenfield sites in Keynsham. It is not clear what the justification is for reducing the amount of employment on this site, when the BANES Economic Strategy states that the future use of the Somerdale site will be critical to the future of Keynsham, and the action plan places an emphasis on developing employment space on this site. The BANES Economic Strategy page 41 also states that: "A targeted inward investment plan should be put together for Keynsham in order to raise its profile as a future alternative office location to Bristol as the area has good transport links and the strategic employment site of Somerdale." The Core Strategy seeks to focus new employment development in the central area of Keynsham including the town centre and the 25 hectare Somerdale Factory site and the transition area between the northern end of the High Street and the Somerdale Factory. The strategy is seeking to provide more High Value Added Jobs in order to reduce the current pattern of out-commuting. It is noted that the town centre is a regeneration priority areas which is key to the successes of the local economy and the district as a whole.

Some land (approximately 10 hectares) within the Somerdale site falls within Flood Zone 2 (partly) and this is expected to accommodate 600 dwellings. The justification for this is that there are no alternative sites to offer the same level and type of opportunity to serve the town as a whole. It is noted that the allocation of this site has not taken place as yet and that further work on the sequential test will need to be undertaken. Master planning for Somerdale has not been undertaken – but it is stated that the most vulnerable uses should be directed to flood Zone 1; but as no master planning has been done for the site it is not clear how this relates to the design proposals for the site. The SFRA also identified that part of the area is subject to increased risk from climate change.

Given the above uncertainties about the deliverability of the Somerdale site and its role and location in terms of accommodating jobs; and given the need to accommodate BANES housing needs sustainably; land to the south west of Keynsham should be considered as a strategic location. The exceptional circumstance for removing this land from the Green Belt has already been proven through the preparation of the RSS, the site is not within the Flood Zones and can be delivered to serve the town and complement the employment opportunities at Keynsham that will be delivered through the regeneration of the town centre.

Change sought to Policy KE1 should be amended as follows:

make sound: 1. Natural and Built Environment

a. Land to the south west of Keynsham will be removed from the Green Belt. In all other area around Keynsham the Green Belt will be retained.

2. Housing

a. Make provision for around 3,000 new homes (net) between 2006 and 2026.....

b. Allow for residential development if it is within the housing development boundary defined on the proposals map or if it forms an element of Policy KE2. The housing development boundary will be revised to include land within south west Keynsham.

Representation (legal compliance): The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not consistent with the development plan. PPS12 paragraph 4.50 states that under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S 20 (5) (a) an Inspector is charged with firstly checking whether the Core Strategy has complied with legislation. It is considered that for two reasons the Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it is not in general conformity with the development plan (i.e. the RS has now be re-instated as part of the development plan and will remain so until the Localism Bill is enacted – this is envisaged to be late in 2011) and secondly as it fails to take account of national policy in terms of PPS 3 paragraph 33, the Governments latest published household projections (2008 based published in Nov 2010) and evidence of current and future housing need as stated in the West of England Housing Market Assessment June 2009.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4

of the Interim RSS and also the evidence base for latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections. The housing figures for the Core Strategy plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings.

RepresentationReference: 180\21

Plan Reference: Strategic Objective 2: Protect and enhance the District's natural, built and cultural assets and provide green infrastructure.

Representation Whilst Strategic Objective 2 is supported in principle in terms of the need to protect and enhance the **(soundness):** District's natural environment and cultural assets, an objection is made to the second bullet point of the Strategic Objective as there is an over reliance on brownfield sites to meet housing needs. The review of the sites in the SHLAA is based on sites which satisfy current policy i.e. no sites that are within the Green Belt have been considered as potential development sites. The SHLAA states that sites which are available, suitable and achievable when aggregated together give a total of 11,289 units, however, this includes some sites within the Western Riverside which are within Flood Zone 3a.

The Core strategy is unsound as it relies on the contributions from brownfield sites which require significant investment from the public sector £27million. Sufficient land should be made available to meet the level of housing need in line with the Government's objective in PPS3 that the Government's key housing goal is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. (PPS 3 paragraph 9) PPS 3 Planning for housing policy objectives also sets out the specific outcomes that the planning system should deliver PPS 3 paragraph 10) - one of which is to provide a sufficient quantity and housing taking into account need and demand and seeking to improve choice; also a flexible supply, responsive supply of land - managed in a way that makes efficient and effective use of land, including the re-use of previously developed land, where appropriate.

An objection is made to the second bullet point in Strategic Objective 2 "avoiding greenfield land as far as possible". Development on some greenfield land is necessary in order to make sufficient provision to meet housing needs to 2026. The latest 2008 based household projections indicate a need to make provision for at least 16,000 households, the SHLAA has demonstrated that land is available, deliverable and suitable for only 11,289 units, consequently provision should be made on greenfield sites to meet the shortfall.

The implications of failing to meet housing need has already been acknowledged by the Council in the consultation on the Spatial Options in 2009 and this was on the basis of a much higher figure of 15,500 dwellings included in the consultation. There is a significant affordable housing issue in BANES which should be addressed. The reduction in the housing provision will not assist in meeting much needed affordable housing as set in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009).

Change sought to make sound: The spatial vision for BANES should be revised to reflect the need to provide for additional dwellings in accordance with the latest 2008 based household projections and taking into account evidence of housing need. The spatial vision for Keynsham in particular should be amended to include the opportunities for development at south west Keynsham. Strategic Objective 2 should be amended by deleting the words in the second bullet point ".....and avoiding greenfield land as far as possible."

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to be consistent with the development plan provision should be made for at least 18,500 dwellings in the plan period.

RepresentationReference: 180\22

Plan Reference: Strategic Objective 5: Meet housing needs.

Representation The Core Strategy is unsound as it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the **(soundness):** reasonable alternatives. The latest DCLG household projections confirm the trend for higher levels of housing and the Strategic Housing Needs Assessment also confirms the need for provision for a higher

number of housing in the plan period. The strategy appears to be based on the short term economic situation i.e. one economic cycle rather than considering the implications of the population growth and household growth for the plan period. It is inappropriate to base the long term spatial vision on the current economic climate.

The Core Strategy should take a more long term view rather than basing its assumptions on the recent years. It is inappropriate to base the long term spatial vision on the current economic climate. If planning is based on a low growth scenario, higher growth will create severe market distortions when it occurs. The SWRDA report "Economic Prediction and the Planning Process" January 2011 states that:- "There is a danger that the South West's historical under provision is exacerbated if planning figures are linked solely to a particular low "average" growth rate scenario. In turn, this tends to create higher carbon outcomes in terms of commuting and extended travel to work areas and negative social externalities related to housing affordability."

The report states that there is not a simple arithmetical relationship between a particular growth rate and the need for new housing. The housing target should not be focussed on the short term i.e. what has happened in the last 2 years. The amount of housing growth affects growth in the economy.

SWRDA report "Economic Prediction and the Planning Process" January 2011

<http://economy.swo.org.uk/publications/special-economy-modulepublications/> Sets out key messages, the assumptions of less buoyant economic and demographic growth for twenty years were built into the Oxford Economics work because at the time this is what those commissioning the report wanted to be investigated. The SWRDA report states that a more rounded approach would be based on:-

- Demographic change implies a growing demand for new housing going forward across SW England, regardless of the economic growth rate average achieved within the likely range (1.5 – 3.0% per annum.)

- There is already a backlog of unsatisfied, ineffective demand in the region, which distorts a range of behaviours linked to employment, commuting, affordability and cohesion.

- In the short term, economic and employment growth will be restrained below pre-recession experience because of government policies and ongoing crisis adjustment.

- Current policy is designed to improve sustainable growth and job creation rates in the longer run (including efforts to encourage living closer to places of work) when that kicks in, growth potential is expected to be higher than before. Whether the South West gets the growth sooner or later, it still gets it and the broad scope of housing need is unaffected and planning policy should therefore reflect this.

- A return to real incomes growth will generate fresh demands for housing, including multiple home ownership, formation rates, dependency ratios and new unit size mixes.

- Even the modest growth forecast in Oxford Economics work for the 2020s, implies much smaller reductions in house build numbers than local authorities are calculating at present. A 29% reduction in central growth forecast (from 2.8% to 2.0%) extrapolates into cuts in housing need of much less than half that once all relevant economic factors are computed. The paper also states that: predictive planning should be based on a range of scenarios, including one that envisages a return to high growth because single point estimates will be wrong, national and local economic policy wants and expects higher future growth. It is easier to adjust plans lower in the event of a relatively subdued growth outcome than to correct the errors of under planning retrospectively. The report concludes that it would be a major constraint and distortion of future local SW economic development if at the outset, low growth rates are assumed for the analysis of planning.

The SW real growth rate for 1998 - 2008 was 2.5% per annum compound, this is slightly better than the UK average of 2.4%. The SWRDA report states that without a permanent, negative step change in the economy's development process, which implies an unprecedented loss of inventive and entrepreneurial spirit in the SW region, it is difficult to argue that growth rates around 2.5% per annum will not reoccur going forward. Growth rates could return to 2.8%- 3.2% range that existed before the current malaise once economic rebalancing is achieved.

Latest figures indicate that the trend GVA figure is 2.25%, evidence indicates that there is no reason

why a full economic recovery is not possible to pre-recession rate of about 3.2% per annum. The evidence from the SWRDA does not point to restricted potential in growth and it is important to plan for full recovery. SWRDA evidence points to SW growth patterns after the recession for future growth between full recovery to recovery with loss. Restricted potential is not envisaged.

Over the life of the Core Strategy, it is inevitable that the economic climate will change, consequently the Core Strategy should be prepared so as to enable appropriate levels of housing provision to occur over the lifetime of the Plan and for it to be monitored accordingly as set out in PPS 3. As proposed the Core Strategy will fail to meet housing needs and respond to demographic and social changes. Failure to meet housing needs will increase those in need of affordable housing and that those who do work in parts of the authority e.g. Bath will have to travel further, increasing commuting and congestion. The lack of housing provision will not support the economic development objectives and increase labour supply.

Change sought to make sound: Strategic Objective 5 meeting Housing needs is supported in principle, but it is argued that the housing provision included in the Core Strategy should be increased in line with national DCLG latest household projections of at least 18,500 dwellings.

Representation (legal compliance):

The Core Strategy is not in general conformity with the development plan as set out in PPS 12 paragraph 4.50 i.e. it should conform generally to the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it fails in to make adequate provision for housing needs during the plan period. It does not conform to latest Government guidance, the development plan i.e. the RS for the SW being the former RPG10 and also in terms of the latest evidence base for the SW RSS or the latest DCLG 2008 based household projections. The Councils own Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicate that there is a very high housing need, both in household growth and in relation to likely total future supply.

Change sought to make legally compliant: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections and take into account evidence of housing need. The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

RepresentationReference: 180\23

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation (soundness): In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections.

The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

Change sought to make sound: In order to make the Core Strategy legally compliant, the preparation of the Core Strategy should have completed a review of the Green Belt, this would be consistent with Policy SS4 of the Interim RSS and consistent with the evidence base of the latest RSS. Provision should be made to meet the latest household projections.

The housing figures for the plan period should be increased to at least 18,500 dwellings

Representation (legal compliance): Review of Green Belt not carried out

Change sought to make legally compliant: Review of Green Belt required

Respondent Number: 181 **Respondent:** Simon Banks

RepresentationReference: 181\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation A requirement of the DPD is that it should provide evidence of an justification for recommendations.
(soundness): In the matter of ODN.3 , Land to the rear of 93-123 Englishcombe Lane, this test fails on both counts.

Evidence – in previous submissions by residents , considerable evidence of the unsuitability of this land for development has been submitted both for access and drainage. This has not been included or referred to in the assessment. In particular the statement that this land could be available in 5 years is entirely without foundation given the level of opposition and legal challenges likely at all stages of development

Justification - Previous strategic plans have been vigorously and unanimously opposed by residents and developers. There is no reference to any evidence of participation of the local community in this document nor attempts to secure any such participation. Alternative uses of the land such as Allotment use or sustainable CHP use have not been considered as reasonable alternatives, despite the considerable requirement in the community for both.

In previous plans, officers have removed this land from development use, only to re-instate it when pressured to deliver central government house building targets, now removed. There is clearly no need for this land to be included in the DPD .

Change sought to ODN.3 should be removed from the SHLAA and community consultations held to determine the best
make sound: use of the land for sustainable community use. In doing so, the authority can further reinforce its sustainability objectives and fulfil the wishes of the local and wider community to use green land for housing only as a last resort when other re-usable sites have been exhausted. If maintained within the plan this should only be done with a full and fair assessment of costs and timescales (including legal costs and land preparation costs) to bring this land to development so that this is transparent to all.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 182 Respondent: Meadow View Residents Action Group

Representation Reference: 182\1

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: Vision and District-wide Strategy

Representation A) There needs to be a better awareness of the regional demographics. For example, the population is
(soundness): predicted to grow by 17% by 2026, and Radstock has a higher than average birth rate. We ask where and how our children and grandchildren will find work. We are informed that there are 11,800 jobs in the Somer Valley in 2006 but an increase of 1,000 jobs will provide an increase of approximately 8% only.

B) Boy babies born in 2009 will live ten years less than children born in Midsomer Norton two miles away. Already men live on average seven years less than Odd Down Bath males.

Change sought to
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance): Secondly, unlike the Amended and adopted Local Plan (2007), there is no evidence based data or supporting documentation referenced in statements about rising population and so on. Bath and North East Somerset Council has the data available in the reports submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Panels for Children and Young People, Healthier Communities, Safer Stronger Communities and The Enterprise and Environment Panel, but ordinary people would not know how to access this. In particular, the Area Assessment of Family Poverty, (2010) is not considered in this context.

Although Local Plan policies are being rolled forward, it needs to be embedded better in European environmental law and recent government directives 2007-2010. It needs to be transparently evidence based with supporting documentation as the Local Plan was, and it needs to be internally consistent, one section with another.

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 182\2

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.12

**Representation
(soundness):**

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance): We consider that the Core Strategy document is not legally compliant because of the internal inconsistencies, especially between the earlier chapters on 'The Vision and Objectives' and the 'District Wide Spatial Strategy', and the later chapters on 'Climate Change', Environmental Quality and 'A prosperous economy' on the one hand and the sections devoted to the Bath, Keynsham, Somer Valley and Rural Areas' on the other.
The other question is whether the Core Strategy's provisions will be consistent with the Localism Bill when it is passed, presumably before the public enquiry.

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 182\3

Plan Reference: Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

**Representation C) The Challenges outlined in Section 1b (pp 9-10) are not addressed by the policies for the Somer
(soundness):** valley.

D) The question of how jobs will be created is not sufficiently addressed. Infrastructure improvements will clearly help, but more than that is necessary.

Change sought to P82 Should include Combend/Clandown Potential.
make sound:

Representation (legal compliance): Finally, although the Regional Spatial Strategy, which originally informed this document, is extinct, the Directive from the Secretary of State for Communities, that job creation should match the number of new houses built (or vice versa) is still in force, we believe, and indeed is found in all the figures except for the Somer Valley, where the disproportionate houses to be built compared with the number of job will lead to increased 'out-commuting' or 'retirement villages', neither of which serve the aim of sustainable well-balanced communities.

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 182\4

Plan Reference: Policy CP5: Flood Risk Management

**Representation
(soundness):**

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance): The Failure to take adequate account of food risks is probably in breach of government directives on flood prevention and avoiding building on flood plains, yet in 2008 the Environmental Agency re-assessed the Somer Valley and doubled the estimated risk in some areas, which are still allocated for major development. (para. 4.23 page 86)

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 182\5

Plan Reference: Policy CP6: Environmental Quality

**Representation
(soundness):**

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance): We also question whether sufficient notice has been taken of the European Habitat Directive, which was ruled to have been breached in the case of the NRR development on the former GWR railway lands in Radstock.

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 182\6

Plan Reference: Paragraph 4.14

Representation E) There is no consideration of the best driver for economic regeneration in the Somer Valley, providing
(soundness): means to facilitate self-employment, helping those who work in their homes on the internet, creating advice and financing hubs, appropriately sized industrial units (those in Radstock are too small for our succesful businesses) etc. (para.4.14 is inadequate)
F) The glaring omission of an Economic Plan for Radstock which local community groups could have provided if BANES will not re-activate the masterplanning process property.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 182\7

Plan Reference: Paragraph 4.22

Representation G) Failure to consider the potential of Combend, Clandown and Writhlington, Radstock.
(soundness): H) P86 There is no appreciation of the resilience of Radstock people, and the tightly knit communities of long-settled families who outnumber the 'incomers'. Since the visits of John Wesley and the Evangelical revivals, the churches have nurtured community action and self-help and this should be acknowledged.
I) The emphasis should be on how 'Radstock will continue to provide'

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 182\8

Plan Reference: Policy SV3: Radstock Town Centre Strategic Policy

Representation J) Although the JLTP3 has been amended (P132) to include consideration of the practicalities of re-
(soundness): opening railway lines such as the Radstock to Frome Line, which has only been inoperable for about ten years, the Core Strategy makes no mention of this.
In fact there is little consideration of the contribution of railways to reducing congestion, carbon emissions and air pollution. Re-opening the Radstock-Frome line would not only reduce traffic on Somerset roads, but make commuting to Reading, Swindon and London possible, and open up the area to tourists, which would meet the spirit of Strategic Objective 7.

Change sought to 4.17 a Should include the railway option as per the JLTP3 provision but more precisely stated.
make sound: 4.23 The risk in the first para. Will be intensified if the planned diversion of the A362 through the street is permitted. Radstock will be reduced to a glorified crossroads with boarded up shops because pedestrians will be too much at risk from juggernauts to shop safely. Instead the A362 should provide as

it currently does, an informal 'by pass'. Efforts should be made by signage elsewhere to persuade heavy vehicles not to use the A367.

SV3 P87. 2a) Is Illogical. There is already planning permission for 210 houses on the former railway lands. If only 200 dwellings were built in Radstock town centre before 2026 this will stifle all growth. Already 20-30 year olds have to live with their parents as they cannot find affordable homes. The NNR Planning permission breached the local plan provisions. If it were removed from the equation, this problem would be avoided.

3b) Rail should be included in sustainable transport.

1.) Policy SV3. Add'2d conserve the former GWR rail track and an appropriate area for a future railway station and car park near the Brunel Shed and encourage steps to be taken towards re-opening the line.' P87

2.)MNR1.4 Preserve the GWR railway line Radstock-Frome and facilitate a professional feasibility study for re-opening it as a commuter service.

Phasing: 2010 onwards Cost tba Funding Delivery as for MNR1.2

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 183 Respondent: Simon Trafford

RepresentationReference: 183\1

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.13

Representation REPRESENTATIONS TO THE BANES CORE STRATEGY PUBLICATION VERSION –
(soundness): DECEMBER 2010

Land West of Little Manor and East of Mount Pleasant Farm, Farmborough, Bath & NE Somerset - Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Ref: Far 3.

On behalf of our clients we would like to provide formal comments to the draft Core Strategy Publication Version 2010. The site comprises two land parcels comprising a paddock and open field to the West of Farmborough. The site has a road frontage of approximately 40 metres, and is located between New Manor Farm and Mount Pleasant Farm. Directly to the east the site adjoins a building depot which is well screened, and to the west an open field.

The current adopted local plan identifies the site as falling just outside the housing development boundary for the settlement of Farmborough. As part of the Core strategy process it is understood that the housing development boundaries (saved from the existing Local Plan) will be reviewed as part of the new plan making process.

As background the SHLAA report identifies the quantum of housing that will need to be delivered within rural areas such as Farmborough if sufficient housing is to be provided within BANES over the Core Strategy Period (upto 2026). A target figure of 800 is set out for rural areas which would include the settlement of Farmborough. Currently there is a shortfall of 239 units against this target, in terms of identified sites.

Based on a development potential of 35 dwellings per hectare, and a theoretical site coverage of 80% the site could yield about 25 dwellings. The site presents an opportunity for a housing led development set within open space to help meet the shortfall of units that are required to comply with the SHLAA target. The type of housing would be designed to respond to local needs.

With careful design and landscape treatment, the development of the site could represent a planned expansion of Farmborough beyond the existing settlement boundary in a sensitive manner, whilst retaining a strategic gap between the settlement areas and not adversely affecting the function and purpose of the Green Belt.

On this basis it is recommended that there is clear justification to include the site as part of the proposed housing development boundary for Farmborough.

We look forward to future involvement in the emerging LDF process, in particular the next stages of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the Place making stages of the process. If you require any further information on the issue covered in this letter please do not hesitate to contact me on 0117 988 5356 or at simon.trafford@gva.co.uk

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 184 Respondent: Persimmon Special Projects

Representation Reference: 184\1

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation (soundness): Persimmon Special Projects object to the omission of Bathampton from the Policy RA1 Villages shown in Diagram 18. In our view Bathampton meets the criteria for RA1 Villages, which is further supported by other Policy References in the Core Strategy, as set out in these comments.

In respect of the specific criteria in Policy RA1, Bathampton possesses the necessary key facilities, including a post office, a school, community meeting places and a convenience shop and has a daily public transport service to Bath. Local community support referred to in Criterion C is a detailed matter and it is likely to be dependent on what the proposed development site can offer to improve the vitality of the village. It cannot be resolved in the Core Strategy, but the Core Strategy should have a criteria based Policy to say how it will deal with circumstances where community support would be forthcoming for such a development.

These references which further provide support for inclusion of Bathampton as an RA1 Village are set out as follows: -

- Paragraph 5.04 – this says the settlement pattern has evolved based on the form of the land and villages that run along the valley sides and included within this area are the villages of Bathampton and Batheaston characterised by their strong relationship to Bath. In our view the strategy should enable these villages to continue to evolve.

- Paragraph 5.12 – Persimmon Special Projects consider that development at Bathampton would address 3 of the key strategic issues set out in this Paragraph by: -

a) Providing affordable housing and meeting the needs of the elderly.

B) Providing support for the existing bus services.

C) Supporting existing facilities, services and shops and potentially providing new ones based on local choice.

- Paragraph 5.15 – the particular characteristics of the site proposed are appropriate in scale and character to its location. Underhill Lodge is located on the eastern edge of the village south of Warminster Road. Half of the site is within the curtilage of the existing residential property at Underhill Lodge and the southern part of the site is a disused orchard. Taken together in landscape terms the site is effectively a garden and does not contribute to the character of the AONB. Neither does it impinge on the purposes of green belt designation, as there is no prospect of coalescence with

Bathford, due to the presence of the Kennet and Avon Canal, the River Avon and the railway running through the valley between the two settlements. The site is sustainable, being within walking distance from local shops on Holcombe Lane, other facilities in Bathampton and bus stops providing access to Bath. It could contribute about 20 houses and provide necessary open space, including further allotments and other facilities, if required.

- Paragraph 5.18 – Persimmon Special Projects consider that Bathampton does meet the criteria set out in Paragraph 5.17 and Policy RA1 and would also assist in providing a more logical Settlement Strategy. The villages listed in Policy RA1 are concentrated in the centre of the District with only Batheaston in the East. In terms of the villages listed, Farmborough is conditional. Also, the circumstances in Bathampton are no different to Whitchurch, Batheaston and Bathampton, which are all within the green belt and with very limited opportunities for development within the defined boundary, therefore implying development there will need to take place in the green belt outside the boundaries.

- Policy RA3 – this Policy says “proposals for the development of community facilities or shops will be acceptable within and adjoining all villages, provided that they are of a scale and character appropriate to the village and meet the needs of the Parish and adjoining Parishes”. In other words, this Policy accepts development for community facilities adjoining all villages, including green belt villages and is further supported by Policy RA4.

- Policy RA4 – this Policy accepts affordable housing as an exception and as set out in Paragraph 5.29 this clearly relates to villages outside Policy RA1 and permits a small proportion of market housing where it is essential to cross subsidise the affordable housing. In other words, outside village boundaries within the green belt it would be possible to provide rural exception housing supported by limited market housing in principle.

- Policy CP12 – Persimmon Special Projects note and support that Bathampton Village Centre is identified as a Rural Local Centre in Policy CP12. In this respect there is no difference between Bathampton and Batheaston, which is also a village entirely surrounded by the green belt with limited capacity for further growth. Although Policy CP12 also includes Timsbury and Whitchurch, 3 other Policy RA1 Villages, Bishop Sutton, Farmborough and Temple Cloud are not included. In our view this provides further justification for including Bathampton within Policy RA1. In addition, we note the Policy requirement in CP12 is that the centres set out will be maintained and enhanced and we suggest this would be better achieved by including Bathampton within Policy RA1 to enable additional limited development to be provided outside the village boundary.

Change sought to (2) Include Bathampton as an RA1 Village, as it more appropriately meets the criteria set out in Policy
make sound: RA1 than some existing RA1 Villages.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 184\2

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation Persimmon Special Projects object to Policy DW1, on the basis that there is no evidence base to justify
(soundness): the Settlement Strategy set out in the Core Strategy. A previous document, the Core Strategy Information Paper entitled Settlement Classification October 2009, does not provide evidence for and support the Settlement Strategy set out in the Core Strategy, but instead supports the previous Settlement Strategy based on the emerging RSS. Nevertheless, we consider the information set out in that document and specifically the facilities identified in Appendix 1 supports the inclusion of Bathampton as a Policy RA1 Village.

Change sought to (1) Background evidence to support the Settlement Strategy set out in the Core Strategy.
make sound: (2) Include Bathampton as an RA1 Village, as it more appropriately meets the criteria set out in Policy RA1 than some existing RA1 Villages.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 184\3

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.20

Representation Persimmon Special Projects objects to Paragraph 5.20 and specifically that proposals for development **(soundness):** that adjoin housing development boundaries in the green belt will not be acceptable, unless very special circumstances for development can be demonstrated. Firstly, we object on the basis that this is Policy hidden in an explanatory paragraph and it would appear to preclude sites coming forward in the green belt under the Government's proposals for Community Right to Build, which is also specifically supported in the Core Strategy in Paragraphs 5.13 and 6.64.

Persimmon Special Projects also object to Paragraph 5.20, on the basis that it is not supported by other upper case Policies set out in the Core Strategy. These references which further provide support for inclusion of Bathampton as an RA1 Village are set out as follows: -

Change sought to (1) Background evidence to support the Settlement Strategy set out in the Core Strategy.

make sound: (2) Include Bathampton as an RA1 Village, as it more appropriately meets the criteria set out in Policy RA1 than some existing RA1 Villages.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 184\4

Plan Reference: Policy DW1: District Wide Spatial Strategy

Representation Persimmon Special Projects object to the proposed housing and job provision set out in Policy DW1 for **(soundness):** the following reasons: -

1. It does not take account of the RSS evidence base, which remains a material consideration and neither the Core Strategy, nor the Keith Woodhead Projection Report justifies the significant departure from the RSS figures.
2. The Keith Woodhead Report is based on a pessimistic interpretation of current economic circumstances. If the RSS figures are too high because of a now arguably optimistic scenario, the Woodhead scenario is equally unrealistic.
3. The Woodhead Report is put forward "to provide evidence based guidance on an appropriate future housing requirement". However, it includes a number of Policy assumptions which cast doubts on the objectivity of the evidence. For example, Paragraph 3.2 says that RSS levels "are difficult enough to plan for", Paragraph 3.3 says "there is no realistic possibility of building our way out of the problem", and Paragraph 4.1 says the approach is "realistic about the way the housing market operates in the real world". All this suggests that bias has influenced the production of deliberately low figures, rather than producing a genuine evidence base figure to which Policy considerations are then applied.
4. We consider the jobs projection from which the housing figure is derived is too low in the Woodhead Projections. This is simply illustrated in Paragraph 7.3 which says "more encouragingly (our emphasis), the Oxford strong trend/higher growth scenario growth figures for BANES (11300) are virtually identical to the Stage 2/TYM figure of 11200", which "does provide some reassurance of the validity of this figure as a potential planning tool". This suggests a more realistic jobs total to plan for would be 11300. We set out in 9 below further reasons for this.
5. The 2008 CLG Household Projections show an increase of 16000 households in Bath and North East Somerset between 2006 and 2026. Allowing for conversion from households to dwellings, produces a considerably higher figure than the 11000 dwellings contained in the Core Strategy.
6. Part of the conversion factor required in 5 above is an allowance for unmet backlog. In this regard we consider backlog is inadequately dealt with in the Woodhead Projections. A Methodology is set out in Paragraph 5.1.7, but only addresses the backlog relating to affordable housing, by relying on the West of England SHMA (which itself does not address market housing), or housing waiting lists. An

alternative would be to assess backlog against the unmet RSS figures.

7. Woodhouse accepts the impact of migration on Bath, including in-migration, and we suggest proper account needs to be taken of the impact of migration. Nationally, the ONS Migration Statistics for 2009, published in November 2010, shows less numbers left the UK than arrived (368000 out, 567000 in). Generally this rejects the argument that figures can be reduced due to lower than expected International migration, which will have an impact in the South West, which has the highest net inflow after the South East and particularly in Bath for the reasons put forward in the Woodhead Report.

8. The Woodhead Projections have drawn on work by Oxford Economics for the South West RDA and South West Councils published in June 2010, which uses a substantially reduced growth rate than that in the RSS. This approach has been questioned by the RDA itself and the South West Observatory in a Report published in January 2011 (Economic Prediction and the Planning Process a Contribution to the Current Debate About Regional Planning for Housing Need After the Recession). This challenges the way the data has been used. It shows that even using the lower growth rate of 2.35% for the South West, this is still 80% of the pre-recession growth and would not justify a cut of over 50% in the housing figures.

9. There are 4 other useful reminders in the South West Observatory Report above, which apply directly to BANES: -

a) Current Policy remains to improve sustainable growth and job creation rates in the longer term (including efforts to encourage people to live closer to where they work).

B) It is easier to adjust plans downwards, in the event of lower growth than expected, than to correct the errors of under planning retrospectively.

C) Reliance on single point estimates will always be wrong.

D) "There are no right answers but there maybe wrong ones such as the engendering of negative externalities implicit in a "race to the bottom".

For all the above reasons, we consider the BANES Core Strategy has arrived at the wrong planning answer to housing and job figures.

Change sought to make sound: To increase the housing figures in the Core Strategy based on the alternative evidence sources set out above.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Representation Reference: 184\5

Plan Reference: Policy CP1: Retrofitting Existing Buildings

Representation (soundness): Whilst Persimmon Special Projects recognise the need to improve energy efficiency of existing buildings, we do not support the solution proposed in Policy CP1 of relying on new schemes to address retro-fitting of existing buildings.

New residential building will include energy efficiency measures, but even here technology and solutions are still evolving and consequently can be expensive to implement. Any attempt to increase the burden for contributing to energy efficiency measures off-site, which affect the viability of the project, are unrealistic. If the Policy is retained it should at least include a Viability Test.

Secondly, we consider the Policy is too vague and therefore not effective. In particular, "all schemes are to consider retro-fitting" and "measures to support this will be introduced". This is too vague and does not explain what measures are proposed to address a concept which is not easily implemented anyway. Again, the delivery box is not helpful, referring to "a range of mechanisms".

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance): Persimmon Special Projects considers the Policy should be deleted.

If the Policy is retained, there needs to be a clear explanation of the measures proposed and it should be subject to a Viability Test.

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 184\6

Plan Reference: Policy CP4: Distric Heating

Representation The Policy is not effective due to the lack of clarity. It is not clear whether the measures set out apply
(soundness): to just the District Heat priority areas, or to all development throughout the Core Strategy area. If the Policy applies to the whole area, Persimmon Special Projects object because there would be practical difficulties and viability issues with providing District Heating Schemes in all development.

Even so, it should allow for site specifics exceptions where provision of District Heating could be difficult to achieve, or unviable, or where other solutions would be better in order to introduce some flexibility into the Policy.

Change sought to make sound: Persimmon Special Projects request the changes to the Policy as described in Section 6b.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 184\7

Plan Reference: Policy CP11: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Representation Persimmon Special Projects considers Policy CP11 is contrary to Government Policy and consequently is
(soundness): not effective.

Circular 01/06 requires Policies to be fair, reasonable, realistic and effective in delivering sites. The criteria in Policy CP11 are similar to those in the existing Local Plan Policy HG16, which has failed to deliver any sites. In our view, the principal reason for this is that both Policies fail to include the test in Paragraph 35 of Circular 01/06 that one of the site search criteria should include an assessment of publically owned land. That is because unless private land is owned and being promoted by gypsies and travellers, it is unlikely to be available and deliverable, whereas the Authority can actively deliver publically owned land.

Change sought to make sound: The Policy needs to include a requirement firstly, to assess publically owned land in order to accord with Circular 01/06.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 184\8

Plan Reference: Policy CP13: Infrastructure Provision

Representation See above response to 6a.
(soundness):

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance): Persimmon Special Projects considers the Policy is not sound and may not be legally compliant, on the basis that Policy CP13 relies on a Non-Statutory Planning Obligations SPD to assess infrastructure contributions. That is no longer acceptable because the S106 contributions now have to conform with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations which came into force on the 6th April 2010.

Developer contributions can only be sought where it can be demonstrated that the need for the contribution arises directly as a result of the development. The requirement in Regulation 122 is actually a repeat of one of the tests of validity set out in Circular 05/2005. The test has not changed, but what has is that the Circular advice is just that, advice without the force of Law, whereas the CIL Regulations have statutory force. This places greater onus on Local Planning Authorities to demonstrate the contributions which they seek are directly related to the development. A Developer will have the ability to challenge the contribution on that basis, even if it is included within an Adopted SPD. That will mean Appeals on a case by case basis and an inefficient use of Inspectors and Inquiry time when that position can be avoided.

Equally, Developers will have the ability, on a case by case basis by Appeal, to challenge the Methodology which is led to the calculation of the contribution per dwelling for each element of the contribution sought. This is again likely to lead to inefficient use of Inquiry time and will mean contributions being determined by different Inspectors on a case by case basis with no consistency.

The introduction of CIL sought to overcome these difficulties and will be subject to a single Independent Examination by an Inspector, which is then less likely to be challenged.

In our view, the Council should use the SPD as an evidence base to work towards a full CIL Charging Schedule in parallel with the Core Strategy to avoid the problems set out above.

Change sought to make legally compliant: The Council should prepare a full CIL Charging Schedule.

Respondent Number: 185 Respondent: Rachael Hushon

Representation Reference: 185\1

Plan Reference: Policy B2: Central Area Strategic Policy

Representation I am concerned that diagram 8 page 42 appears to propose that the current central area be extended
(soundness): by 2026 to include the recreation ground and Johnstone Street as part of a city centre extension.

I am concerned that the correct legal and planning justification for this has not been complied with. Rezoning land to benefit BANES Coropate requires more probity and planning/legal justification than has been provided.

This rezoning if allowed to happen could have far reaching implications on any future licensing and planning applications for an area which is currently residential only and green open space. The financial gain of rezoning brings into question the impartiality of BANES in their motives rushing this through.

This rezoning pre-empts the public consultation on uses of the Rec, it ignores the existing covenants which deny commercial development. It also pre-empts the Charity Commision decision regarding the Trusts' uses of the rec.

It also suggests that Johnstone street is an exiting access to the Rec. This is not the case the street has existed as a cul de sac with no access to the Recreation Ground for 200 years.

Change sought to make sound: Central area zoning to remain as currently dilineated.

Representation (legal compliance): BANES Council have sought to regard the Rec and certain residential streets within the PERA areas as "commercial" in the latest version of its Core Strategy, thereby giving further credence to the development of commercial activities on the Rec, and in neighbouring residential areas.

AS you know it is the 1956 conveyance that appears to govern how the Trust should run. This conveyence refers to the conveyence dated April 1922 which imposes on the parties to the 1956 conveyance an obligation "to observe and perform the covenants and conditions contained in the April 1922 conveyance."

The April 1922 conveyance contains a covenant binding on ANY future owner of these specific premises (the current rec land) that "there will be no buildings for the purposes of trade or business which may be a nuisance, annoyance or disturbance or otherwise prejudicially affect the adjoining premises or neighbourhood." This seems to be clear that whoever owns the land, and regardless of any land-swap, that these conditions should be upheld.

BANES have not provided adequate justification for the rezoning of either the recreation ground a green space or Johnstone Street a residential street.

They have presented misleading documents at various consultation events regarding the status of Johnstone Street which is currently a residential cul de sac.

Change sought to make legally compliant: Compliance with existing covenants pursuant to the Recreation Ground. Maintain current status of the Recreational Ground and Johnstone street as residential.

Respondent Number: 186 Respondent: Cave Associates: Derek Barrett

RepresentationReference: 186\1

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation The policy RA 1 is too restrictive. There are many other villages where small scale development can take
(soundness): place that meets the criteria as set out in para. 5.17.

Additionally the odd small scale rounding of the housing development boundary outside and within the Green Belt if adjusted carefully could take place. This last point is contrary to the policy RA 2. The lesser the traffic movements the more sustainable the policy.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 187 Respondent: Cave associates: Edward Drewe

RepresentationReference: 187\1

Plan Reference: Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Representation No reason given
(soundness):

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 188 Respondent: Freshford Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 188\1 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 7.05

Representation Dear Sirs,
(soundness):

The Core Strategy

This Council Boardly supports the Core Strategy and wishes to place on record appreciation of the standard of work and genuine consultation which has applied through to its completion.

We are aware at this juncture that responses will be accepted as consultation only in respect of soundness and legal compliance. However, this Council wishes the Local Authority to note, not necessarily as part of the consultation process, the following which may be of assistance once the policy

becomes active and priorities of application are being considered.

We wish to register particular, priority, support, with comment where necessary, for :

1. Item 7.05. The review of the Strategy in 2016 (Reviewed every 5 years after adoption).

I.S. Campbell
For Freshford Parish Council.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\2 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.05

Representation We wish to register particular, priority, support, with comment where necessary for:

(soundness): 2. Item 1.05. The Creation of the Placemaking Plan. Comment: top priority should be given to creation of this DPD.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\3 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation We wish to register particular, priority, support, with comment where necessary for:

(soundness): 3. Interpretation of Policy RA 1 should not preclude amendment or creation of HDB's in non RA 1 parishes where necessary to allow for small community projects where land is not available for any proven reason with an existing HDB, (other than exceptions policy affordable housing which is subject of course to other policy considerations).

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\4 S

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: Vision and District-wide Strategy

Representation We wish to register particular, priority, support, with comment where necessary for:

(soundness): 4. Policy DW1.4 The approach to the Green Belt. No significant changes to Green Belt boundaries.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\5

Plan Reference: Appendix 2: Saved Local Plan Policies

Representation We wish to register particular, priority, support, with comment where necessary for:

(soundness): 5. Appendix 2. Positive comment: appendix should include Local Plan NE1 - Landscape and NE2- AONB.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\6 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA4: Rural Exception Sites

Representation We wish to register particular, priority, support, with comment where necessary for:

(soundness): 6. Policy RA4. Affordable housing.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\7 S

Plan Reference: Glossary

Representation We wish to register particular, priority, support, with comment where necessary for:

(soundness): 7. Glossary. Soundness in interpretation terms would be improved by definition of the expression "Community". In rural areas communities are represented by their elected parish Councils and we propose that such words "Community" or "Neighbourhood" should, in these cases, be equated with "parish".

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\8 S

Plan Reference: Paragraph 5.46

Representation For rural areas Item 5.46 is strongly supported.

(soundness):

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 188\9

Plan Reference: Paragraph 1.22

Representation Because no reference has been made to the input of Parish Plans to this Strategy. In the period of
(soundness): creation of the Strategy substantial voluntary effort and expertise has been directed in many parishes to the creation and completion of Parish Plans, (Which equate to Neighbourhood or Community Plans) and this work has been encouraged by both Local and Central Government. Parish Plans represent the views and aspirations of rural communities and we understand that they were considered by the local authority as most relevant to, and therefore being taken account in, the creation of the Core Strategy. It would therefore render the Strategy more sound to include reference to their specific value and thereby obviate any implication that the efforts of the rural communities represented by these Plans have not been given due weight.

Change sought to make sound: The following entry would overcome the unsoundness detailed in 6b. In Page 18, 1D 1.22 After 'as well as parish and town councils' insert ' Parish Plans were also taken fully into account'.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 189 Respondent: Paul Warner

RepresentationReference: 189\1

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation I do consider the Core Strategy to be sound if it means NO building on, or changes to Green Belt around
(soundness): Bath. I am slightly worried by the wording 'general extent', which coupled with the wording that says ' 2,500 homes will come forward within the outer neighbourhoods', could be seen to be ambiguous and allow planning events in the future, which those agreeing to the Core Strategy now thought were excluded.

I would like to know that the proposals specifically do NOT, or will NOT, allow for use of the Twerton Site, which was in the previous Core Strategy. My letter of 12th December 2010 outlines why I thought that those proposals were unacceptable.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 190 Respondent: Newton St Loe Parish Council

RepresentationReference: 190\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation Dear Sir,
(soundness):

Draft Core Strategy

We write to endorse the Draft Core Strategy. As you know there has been an enormous amount of research, consultation and heart-searching that has gone in to this strategy. We support the housing target, although would prefer to see more social housing and fewer market-priced houses, as that is the need locally. We support the Council's approach to allocating those houses. We also support the policy of building on brown field sites rather than destroying green fields in green belt that represents an essential part of our heritage.

In particular we strongly resist any arguments to include an Urban Extension to the South West of Bath.

-It is green belt and serves to separate Bath from Saltford, Kaynsham and Bristol.

- It is an important habitat, not least for Horseshoe Bats which are supposed to enjoy European protection.
- It is productive farmland which supplies high quality beef to local school children with almost zero carbon footprint.
- It is a vital part of the setting for the UNESCO World Heritage Site.
- It is an important amenity for City residents in Bath.
- We are in the process of being designated AONB. All of the relevant bodies have shown strong approval for the proposal. It would be wrong to ignore the merit of the land due to timing.
- If greenbelt is built on then urban regeneration on brownfield sites will be delayed a generation at least, as demand is satisfied by despoiling the countryside rather than redeveloping and renewing.

The people of Newton St Loe feel very small and powerless in making our representations: the forces marshalled against the countryside we love are the most powerful in the land with enormous wealth, influence and professional advice to support them. We have to believe in the Rule of Law and that Justice will Prevail in this matter.

Yours Truly,

Jane Giddins
Chairman, Newton St Loe Parish Council

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 190\2

Plan Reference: Policy CP9: Affordable Housing

Representation (soundness): Dear Sir,

Draft Core Strategy

We write to endorse the Draft Core Strategy. As you know there has been an enormous amount of research, consultation and heart-searching that has gone in to this strategy. We support the housing target, although would prefer to see more social housing and fewer market-priced houses, as that is the need locally.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 190\3

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: Vision and District-wide Strategy

Representation (soundness): Dear Sir,

Draft Core Strategy

We support the housing target, although would prefer to see more social housing and fewer market-priced houses, as that is the need locally. We support the Council's approach to allocating those

houses. We also support the policy of building on brown field sites rather than destroying green fields in green belt that represents an essential part of our heritage.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 191 Respondent: Christopher Starling

RepresentationReference: 191\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

**Representation
(soundness):** Dear Sir/ Madam

I feel the need to write to you to express my disappointment that you are considering redeveloping the playing fields at Beechen Cliff School. As a local resident I think it is of the utmost importance to sustain as much open green space as possible so that the local community, be it school children, walkers and residents can continue to enjoy the Lower Field by the school.

I very much hope you will reconsider this redevelopment and consider alternative ideas away from Beechen Cliff, so that the local community can continue to make use of its beautiful open spaces.

Please do not hesitate to contact me, I very much hope you change your decision,

Yours Faithfully,

Christopher Starling

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 192 Respondent: Mrs. A Chapman

RepresentationReference: 192\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

**Representation
(soundness):** Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Proposed Development of Beechen Cliff School Playing Fields.

I am writing to complain about the proposed development of Beechen Cliff School Playing fields. I feel strongly that SHLAA ignores the importance of this land as a wildlife area and all an essential playing field and recreation space for pupils at Beechen Cliff School.

I am also concerned about traffic issues and how building on this site will increase the volume of traffic on what can be a congested rat run during peak hours. This poses a safety risk for the many pupils who walk to school.

Building on this land will also have a negative impact on local residents and the listed Devonshire

Buildings.

I ask you to keep to the 2007 Councillors' agreement to keep the land as open space.

Please protect the playing fields and do not allow this development.

Yours Faithfully,

Mrs. A. Chapman

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 193 Respondent: John Dolan

RepresentationReference: 193\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): To whom it may concern

Re: Core Strategy (Beechen Cliff Lower Fields.)

I am writing to object to the potential re-zoning or re-classification of the lower Field adjacent to the Greenway Lane, for any form of housing development.

My reasons for opposition are as follows:

-The field is used extensively by the school itself.Both for informal play in recreation time and for taught sports training. The school is growing in numbers and does not have extensive sports areas.

-The field forms a green corridor between the Wells Road/ Entry Hill area and the areas around Alexandra Park.

-The field is heavily used on a daily basis both by walkers of all ages and for keep fit activities, and is pf benefit to local residents and as a wider amenity.

-Housing development in this field would cause major additional traffic around the Greenway Lane and Entry Hill areas and significantly worsen congestion which is already heavy at peak hours,

Yours Sincerely,

John Dolan

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 194 Respondent: The Inland Waterways Association

RepresentationReference: 194\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation The Avon and Wilts Branch of the Inland Waterways Association and the Bath and Bristol Branch of the
(soundness): Kennet and Avon Trust, both of who I represent, have over the last 9 years campaigned for Bath, via its Council, to do something about its under utilised and neglected river corridor. This situation has been recognised by The Council in both its World Heritage Site Management Plan and its Public Realm Consultations.

Whilst the acceptance of what can only be described as a glaring deficiency is a step forward what has not been forthcoming, and what should be made into a firm commitment, is the inclusion in the Councils Policy for the Future of Bath to remedy this situation.

What better place to deal with this than the Councils Core Strategy. Surely bath's River Corridor is of sufficient importance to warrant a specific section in the Core Strategy. Please treat this as a formal request on behalf of the two organisations which I represent for such an inclusion.

My address and contact details are: St Christopher, Belmont Road, Combe Down. Bath BA2 5JR- Tel 01225 836133 - email jes.webb@btinternet.com I would formally request that I am kept informed of and involved with the on-going consultation process in respect of this matter.

Yours Sincerely,

John Webb.
The Inland Waterways Association - Avon and Wilts Branch.
The Kennet and Avon Canal Trust - Bath and Bristol Branch.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 195 Respondent: Mrs. M. E. Braem

RepresentationReference: 195\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation I am a resident in Bath and North East Somerset and I am writing to register and represent my support
(soundness): for the revised Cor Strategy under the current consultation.

In particular I support and find Sound

- A) the protection of the green belt surrounding Bath.
- B) the prioritisation of Brownfield sites for new housing development.
- C) the development of MOD sites
- D) the commitment to the environment and to protect local wildlife and habitats.
- E) reducing the housing number to represent a realistic need and affordable level of development and growth in the region.
- F) the eradication of 'planning by numbers'
- G) the development of western riverside.
- H) small scale infilling of new houses within existing neighbourhoods.
- I) support of local farming and food production
- J) the protection of the World Heritage Site and setting.

I am particularly satisfied to see that you have removed the proposed 'urban extension' on the SW of Bath from the draft Core Strategy and I support all efforts by the Council to protect this land from unwanted development and to afford it AONB status.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 196 **Respondent:** Christopher Hughes

RepresentationReference: 196\1 S

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: Vision and District-wide Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am a resident of BANES and am writing in support of the revised Core Strategy.

In particular I support and find sound:
3.Reducing the number of houses to a realistic level.
5. Small scale infilling in existing houses.

I am extremely pleased the Urban Extension has been removed from the draft Core Strategy and strongly support the idea of this land being included in the A.O.M.B.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 196\2 S

Plan Reference: Policy CP8: Green Belt

Representation (soundness): I am a resident of BANES and am writing in support of the revised Core Strategy.

In particular I support and find sound:
1. Protection of the Green Belt.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 196\3 S

Plan Reference: Chapter 1: Vision and District-wide Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am a resident of BANES and am writing in support of the revised Core Strategy.

In particular I support and find sound:
2. Prioritising Brownfield sites for new housing.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 196\4 S

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): I am a resident of BANES and am writing in support of the revised Core Strategy.

In particular I support and find sound:
4. Development of western riverside.
6. Development of MOD sites for housing.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 197 **Respondent:** Railfuture Severnside

RepresentationReference: 197\1

Plan Reference: Somer Valley: The Vision

Representation (soundness): Radstock needs an operating railway, linked to the National Rail System, in order to realise its potential for tourism. Paras 4.03 and 4.09 appear to suggest that cycleways alone can reduce the impact of motorised traffic on the environment. Even if people cycle within the area, few will cycle all the way from other regions of the UK.

A reinstated railway from Radstock to Frome would not only enable tourists to reach the Somer Valley without using cars but could in all probability be the centrepiece of the attraction. It is worth noting that the Dean Forest, Severn Valley and Swanage Railways all serve former missing areas; all three lines have interchange with or physical linkage with the main rail network. The tourist assets named in para. 4.22 (page 86) are close to the Radstock Station site; arguably it would be a working railway that would bring visitors' attention to the other main features of the town's industrial heritage.

The potential for Heritage railways to serve communities in former mining and quarrying areas has been demonstrated by the Weardale Railway in Co. Durham, which has since May 2010 provided an all year, daily passenger service between Stanhope and Bishop Auckland. From May 2011 the Ecclesbourne Valley Railway (Wirksworth-Duffield) in Derbyshire is scheduled to run regular services connecting with the national rail system.

Change sought to make sound: Para. 4.03 and 4.09 need to be amended to include the possibility of restoring the Radstock-Frome railway as a means of access to Radstock's heritage and as a tourist attraction in its own right. (This would meet the spirit of strategic objective 7, which includes delivery of "well connected places accessible by sustainable means of transport.")

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 197\2

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation Para. 5.43 implies total reliance on buses for public transport, or at least no development of rail, within
(soundness): the Rural Areas. Strategic issue 10 (Bath) refers to the need to make the most of existing public transport infrastructure. Arguably this should include selective station openings/reopenings on existing rail routes. A train service at Saltford would provide much faster journeys than by bus and would be more likely to attract motorists. The nearest comparable examples of station re-openings at small towns/large Villages in recent years have been on the Ebbw Valley line in South Wales, which reopened in 2008; actual usage within six months was doubled the official forecast (source: "Today's Railway UK", Oct. 2008)

More Locally, the four existing railway stations with BANES all experienced rising passenger numbers between 2006/07 and 2008/09 according to the Office of Rail Regulation's station files published in 2010. Of the four stations, Freshford (the most rural) had the highest rate of growth, averaging at 16% per year over the two year period.

We are confident that a station at Saltford would be well used because of the demand for travel to both Bristol and Bath. For the same reason we would recommend protection of a station site at Bathampton, which is a populous area and well placed for travel to Bath, Bristol, Swindon and Trowbridge.

Change sought to Amend para. 5.43 to include development of rail services where possible, allowing for reopening of
make sound: Saltford and bathampton Stations.

Representation (legal compliance): It makes no mention of the proposal to reopen Saltford Railway Station, which is an aspiration of the West of England Partnership Joint Local Transport Plan 3. This Station could be served by the Great Bristol Metro Scheme which is being advocated by the West of England Partnership.

Change sought to make legally compliant: Amend para. 5.43 to include reference to safeguarding a site to enable Saltford railway station railway station to reopen within the JLTP3 period.

RepresentationReference: 197\3

Plan Reference: Paragraph 6.66

Representation Para. 6.66 refers to coal reserves which could be worked by surface mining; and to Bath Stone quarried
(soundness): at the Hayes Wood near Limpley Stoke. Rail transport would be the most environmentally friendly way of removing these heavy minerals to distant destinations but there is no medium in the CS as to how they would be transported. The availability of the rail transport is often made a condition of planning permission being given for extraction, as at Quidhampton and Dean, both near Salisbury. Also, rail has been used for short term flows of stone for sea defences in West Somerset in late 2010.

Change sought to Para. 6.66 should be amended to consider using rail transport in any future exploitation of coal
make sound: reserves and for longer distance movement of stone. The disused but largely intact Radstock- Frome railway should be safeguarded for possible future coal (and other freight traffic). Investigations should be made as to the feasibility of forwarding stone by rail at Limpley Stoke (by safeguarding lane for a siding) or any other suitable railhead, in the event of demand for longer distance traffic.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

RepresentationReference: 197\4

Plan Reference: Paragraph 2.44

Representation Para. 2.44 refers to a "segregated park and ride bus route". This is understood to be the proposed bus
(soundness): way along a section of the former Midland Railway line. There is no mention in this paragraph about investment in rail transport.

Railfuture considers that a purely bus-based local transport system which reduces the scope for

development of the local rail system, is unsuitable for a city of such international importance as Bath. Because the city is a World Heritage Site, it generates more national and foreign travel into it than do most towns of similar size.

It therefore needs to safeguard and develop longer distance transport routes without increasing congestion on main roads. Buses and busways essentially cater for local travel whereas railways can bring in commuters and visitors from much further afield as well as make a contribution to local transport (eg. Keynsham or Freshford to Bath).

Given the scale of railway reopenings in Scotland and Wales, it is not inconceivable that all or part of the Somerset and Dorset and Bath- Magotsfield-Bristol lines could be reinstated. If these routes are not safeguarded, people may well ask in 20-30 year's time, and when petrol will probably be less abundant, why they were not.

Change sought to Amend para. 2.44 to include development of the existing rail network in view of possible electrification
make sound: of the Great Western main line via Bath Spa; and safeguarding of disused routes for possible reinstatement.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 198 Respondent: Mr and Mrs. Harrison

Representation Reference: 198\1 S

Plan Reference: Whole Document

Representation (soundness): Supportive of the whole document.

Change sought to make sound:

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 199 Respondent: Beatrice Godwin

Representation Reference: 199\1

Plan Reference: Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy

Representation (soundness): Beechen Cliff School Lower Field was zoned as an open space in the local plan which was approved in March 2007. The New Strategy housing land availability assessment is attempting to overrule that zoning without consulting local residents or Councillors. Rezoning would have an adverse impact on visually important open space: on the setting of Devonshire Buildings; on the use of the open space as a wildlife corridor; and on the use of the land for informal recreation by local residents. Traffic During rush hours has already reached saturation point on Wellsway and Greenway Lane - more housing would worsen an intolerable situation.

Change sought to Continuing the current policy of zoning Beechen Cliff School Lower field as an open space, as approved
make sound: in the local plan in March 2007.

Representation (legal compliance):

Change sought to make legally compliant:

Respondent Number: 200 Respondent: Rosemary Naish

Representation Reference: 200\1 S

Plan Reference: Policy RA1: Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria

Representation The Parish Council has consulted with the whole community on several different occasions, using a **(soundness):** variety of methods, in order to be as inclusive as possible, over a period of years. Therefore their designation of Clutton as being excluded from the RA1 Category is the correct view of the majority of the community and is sound.

**Change sought to
make sound:**

Representation (legal compliance): The Parish Council is the legally elected representative of the community of Clutton and can therefore legally make decisions and recommendations on its behalf.

Change sought to make legally compliant: