

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change Ref. Consultation Process

Plan Ref.: N/A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170
Comment Number: 21
Respondent Name: Mr. Phil Hardwick

Respondent Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 Agent Name: Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment?

Change Reference: Consultation Process

Plan Reference: N/A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Pegasus Planning Group has been instructed by Robert Hitchins Ltd. to respond to the above consultation. I enclose 20 completed representation forms on the Proposed Changes.

As you will recall we have been acting for Robert Hitchins during the preparation of the BANES Core Strategy. We have experienced some difficulty with the evidence base, as draft documents have been placed on the website only to be replaced by further versions as the consultation has progressed.

Since the consultation opened on the 26th March the evidence base documents which support the proposed changes have been revised and re-published without notification. For example, the SHMA dated 21st February which was available at the beginning of the consultation was later revised on an unknown date to a version dated 18th March 2013. Similarly, a revised Green Belt Assessment dated April 2013 was published at some point during the consultation, again with no obvious notification. A further updated version of the SHLAA has been produced and additional documents the Arup Concept Options had also appeared during the consultation. Again consultees have not been notified of these significant changes to the evidence base.

In addition, several changes to the Proposed Schedule of Changes made since the consultation opened have also resulted in changes to all of the reference numbers of the Proposed Changes from those originally published. The various versions of the Proposed Schedule of Changes have not been given a different title or version number and the change to all reference numbers was not highlighted by BANES.

This has made it extremely difficult to keep up to date with the consultation and has made it even harder for participants to engage in the process effectively. The consultation should not have started until all finalised evidence base documents were available, or if revised documents did need to be published participants should have been notified, changes flagged up on the Core Strategy webpage, and the consultation period extended.

I recall that in ID/28 the Inspector at paragraph 12 said "If the Examination is eventually to continue the Council must have first published all necessary updated evidence and consulted on all the changes arising from that evidence" it is impossible to consult on all the changes arising from the evidence if BANES keep publishing different versions of it and not informing those who have made precious representations and are on the mailing list.

The Inspector set out in ID/29 that "the Council should ensure that updated evidence is published alongside any consultation on the proposed changes" and was concerned that a "very protracted Examination would make it harder for the public and participants to engage effectively with the process". The way in which BANES has undertaken this latest consultation has only added to the already very complicated nature of this Core Strategy process and does not represent effective consultation.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 3511
Comment Number: 2
Respondent Name: Duncan Tyler

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: Agent Name:

Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment?

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** Consultation Process Plan Reference: N/A**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I would also like to comment on this consultation process and general communication from the council which is so complex it makes it virtually impossible for professional time poor people like myself to get involved in local matters. I have contacted the council a number of times regarding this and not had any acknowledgement or response. Producing 100+ page documents and complex user unfriendly webpage's which link off to lots of other documents that link to other pages/documents is very poor user experience. I am not sure of the target audience, younger people like myself give up through lack of time/patience. Older or less experienced web users are probably baffled by it all. I dread to think how much of my substantial taxation is wasted on poor execution such as this.

I expect my comments above will be ignored as I am only meant to be commenting on 'changes' to the core strategy, but there seems no other way of making ones view heard. Anyway I am writing with only vague hope that someone might actually take any notice of this!

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Respondent Number:** 4619 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Michael Spratt**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process Plan Reference: N/A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

(1) IS THE CORE STRATEGY LEGALLY COMPLIANT ? "The process of community involvement for the Core Strategy should be in general accordance with the Council's Neighbourhood Planning Protocol." MY VIEW IS THAT THIS PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE GREEN BELT AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT HAS BEEN INSUFFICIENTLY PUBLICISED AS MANY AFFECTED PEOPLE ARE UNAWARE OF WHAT IS HAPPENING; MORE TIME SHOULD BE GIVE FOR MEMBERS OF THE AFFECTED COMMUNITY TO GIVE THEIR REACTION.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4721 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process Plan Reference: N/A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

1.2.1 We do not believe that the approach taken by the Council reflects the coalition government's drive for localism. The Proposed Changes have been prepared without reasonable input from local people and other stakeholders.

1.2.2 Annex 1 to the Council Report of 4th March

(<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s24562/Core%20Strategy%20Annex%201.pdf>

f) notes at paragraph 4.1 (although the reference to NPPF para 151 appears to be an error and should presumably have referred to para 155):

The vision and aspirations of local communities will also need to be taken into account (NPPF para 151).

1.2.3 The Council's own SOUNDNESS TOOL SELF ASSESSMENT

(<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/DCSAppraisal-SoundnessToolkit.pdf>) asks as its first question:

“Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?”

Bearing in mind the substantive nature of the Proposed Changes, we think that they fail this first basic test of “soundness”.

1.2.4 It appears from the Council's response in ID/40

(<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/bnes40.pdf>) that the Council is simply intending to prepare a schedule of representations to the Proposed Changes without themselves further considering those representations. It therefore appears that the Council is avoiding any proper consideration of this and any other representations and is leaving decisions on all matters to the Inspector, rather than taking an active role in its own Core Strategy.

1.2.5 The Council's proposals to simply “collate the comments” made on the Proposed Changes appears to optimistically assume that they will not be substantive and will not require a robust response or the examination of existing or new evidence.

1.3.2 The Inspector will note that much of the evidence that is used to support the Proposed Changes has been completed at a very late stage in the process and, in many case (e.g. the SHLAA), without reasonable stakeholder engagement. The list of evidence on the Council's website (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ProposedChanges/scspc_background_evidence.pdf) sets out the dates when the evidence base documents have been published and illustrates that a number of these have been published during, rather than at the start of, the formal 6 week consultation process. This reinforces our view that the Proposed Changes are not legally compliant or sound.

1.4 PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE

1.4.1 The Inspector further noted in ID/28 that:

“If the Examination is eventually to continue I would want the Council to first have published all necessary updated evidence and consulted on all the changes arising from that evidence.”

1.4.2 Instead, the Council has developed proposals without first presenting the evidence and consulting on those proposals. Instead, the Special Council Meeting (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cid=272&Mid=3911>) made a decision about the Proposed Changes without undertaking any substantive consultation (it is understood that even English Heritage is only now being consulted about the Proposed Changes).

1.4.3 The Inspector noted in ID/31 dated 22nd March 2013 that:

All ... information should be put in the public domain. Much would be of relevance and assistance to those wishing to make further representations during the forthcoming consultation. The information should be published as soon as possible with an indication at the outset of the consultation period when it will be available.

1.4.4 Much of the information has been issued late in the consultation period, rather than before, or at the start of that period. Given that the Proposed Changes have not been the subject of consultation prior to their publication, it is extremely difficult for us to comment in a comprehensive manner of these Changes.

1.5 CORE STRATEGY PROGRAMME

1.5.1 The Council's Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel considered a report about the Core Strategy on the 23rd August 2012 (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22189/Core%20Strategy.pdf>).

1.5.2 Further consideration was given to progressing the Core Strategy by the Cabinet at its meeting on the 12th September 2012 (see the report and appendices at <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22312/E2464%20Core%20Strategy.pdf> and <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22313/Appendices%201-2.pdf>). At those meetings, the Council agreed to review its evidence base and develop changes to the spatial strategy between then and January 2013. The programme at Appendix 2 of the reports suggested that the Council would, until the end of February 2013, "Update evidence base, develop policy options, Community engagement".

1.5.3 However, it appears that some time elapsed before the Council commissioned the necessary work to review its existing evidence and prepare new evidence, and there is little evidence of "community engagement" during that period.

1.5.4 In particular, it appears that the Council awaited the outcome of its assessment of the overall housing requirement before it commissioned a Green Belt Review in December 2012 and further evidence base studies in 2013. This approach has:

- provided no time for community engagement;
- required the reporting of the Proposed Changes to the Council on 4th March, prior to the completion of the evidence base studies; and
- led to the late publication of a number of the evidence base studies during, rather than at the start of, the 6 week consultation period.

1.5.5 The report to that Panel also set out (at 4.8) the reasons for progressing the Placemaking Plan "in good time" and suggests that the options consultation (planned in Jan 2013) would be delayed by 3 months (i.e. until April 2013).

1.5.6 Many of the evidence base documents appear to have only been commissioned and completed in 2013. The Council's intention to consider the areas now being promoted for development in the Proposed Changes must have been selected by the Council, without any significant consultation, by the end of 2012. It is difficult to understand why consultation about the options for accommodating the increased level of housing within the Council's area was not undertaken to inform the Council's decision making process.

1.5.7 Instead, the Council made a decision about the Proposed Changes on the 4th March with very limited opportunity for the careful consideration of the new and updated evidence base. The reports to the Council were presumably finalised before the end of February, before some of the evidence base had been updated and new additions made to it. This is remarkable given that the areas being considered are the subject of such a wide variety of important landscape, heritage, ecology and green belt designations.

1.5.8 Any decision by the Inspector to progress with the Core Strategy hearings is at substantial risk of subsequent challenge. We request that the Inspector seeks the Council's clarification about the consultation undertaken by the Council prior to the 26th March 2013 on:

- the various new evidence base studies, including the SHLAA and green belt review;
- the SA and process for the selection of sites to be released from the green belt around Bath;
- the impact of the proposals on the Bath Conservation Area (including, in particular, whether English Heritage has been consulted about the proposals to release green belt land for development in the Bath Conservation Area on land adjoining Weston).

1.5.9 We also request that the Inspector requests a programme that sets out the dates when the Council:

- commissioned the new and updated evidence;
- received the completed new and updated evidence; and
- completed the new and updated evidence;

because we do not think that the it has been prepared in a manner to properly inform the Council's selection of land for release from the green belt and its allocation for development.

1.5.10 We think that, on the basis of the evidence, there are more sustainable options to accommodate the growth that

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Bath needs than on land adjoining Weston, particularly the land that is within the Bath Conservation Area.

1.6 SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

1.6.1 The Inspector himself set out in paragraph 9 of his note of the 21st June 2012 (ID/28 http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/id-28_preliminary_conclusions_final_21_june_2012.pdf) that he:

“would be concerned if significant changes were needed which resulted in the final Plan being fundamentally different from the submitted plan.”

1.6.2 It appears that is now the case with a substantially higher number of new homes planned within the area, particularly in very sensitive areas around Bath that are severely constrained by international, European, national, regional and local landscape, heritage and other designations. Indeed, the Inspector in his most recent note ID/31 states:

“I note that the Council is proposing substantial changes to the Core Strategy involving new sites in the Green Belt and that there are a large number of new evidence studies.”

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.2 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

1.2.1 We do not believe that the approach taken by the Council reflects the coalition government’s drive for localism. The Proposed Changes have been prepared without reasonable input from local people and other stakeholders.

1.2.2 Annex 1 to the Council Report of 4th March (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s24562/Core%20Strategy%20Annex%201.pdf>) notes at paragraph 4.1 (although the reference to NPPF para 151 appears to be an error and should presumably have referred to para 155):

The vision and aspirations of local communities will also need to be taken into account (NPPF para 151).

1.2.3 The Council’s own SOUNDNESS TOOL SELF ASSESSMENT

(<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/DCSAppraisal-SoundnessToolkit.pdf>) asks as its first question:

“Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?”

Bearing in mind the substantive nature of the Proposed Changes, we think that they fail this first basic test of “soundness”.

1.2.4 It appears from the Council’s response in ID/40 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/bnes40.pdf>) that the Council is simply intending to prepare a schedule of representations to the Proposed Changes without themselves further considering those representations. It therefore appears that the Council is

avoiding any proper consideration of this and any other representations and is leaving decisions on all matters to the Inspector, rather than taking an active role in its own Core Strategy.

1.2.5 The Council's proposals to simply "collate the comments" made on the Proposed Changes appears to optimistically assume that they will not be substantive and will not require a robust response or the examination of existing or new evidence.

1.3.2 The Inspector will note that much of the evidence that is used to support the Proposed Changes has been completed at a very late stage in the process and, in many case (e.g. the SHLAA), without reasonable stakeholder engagement. The list of evidence on the Council's website (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning- and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core- Strategy/ProposedChanges/scspc_background_evidence.pdf) sets out the dates when the evidence base documents have been published and illustrates that a number of these have been published during, rather than at the start of, the formal 6 week consultation process. This reinforces our view that the Proposed Changes are not legally compliant or sound.

1.4 PUBLICATION OF EVIDENCE

1.4.1 The Inspector further noted in ID/28 that:

"If the Examination is eventually to continue I would want the Council to first have published all necessary updated evidence and consulted on all the changes arising from that evidence."

1.4.2 Instead, the Council has developed proposals without first presenting the evidence and consulting on those proposals. Instead, the Special Council Meeting (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?Cid=272&Mid=3911>) made a decision about the Proposed Changes without undertaking any substantive consultation (it is understood that even English Heritage is only now being consulted about the Proposed Changes).

1.4.3 The Inspector noted in ID/31 dated 22nd March 2013 that:

All ... information should be put in the public domain. Much would be of relevance and assistance to those wishing to make further representations during the forthcoming consultation. The information should be published as soon as possible with an indication at the outset of the consultation period when it will be available.

1.4.4 Much of the information has been issued late in the consultation period, rather than before, or at the start of that period. Given that the Proposed Changes have not been the subject of consultation prior to their publication, it is extremely difficult for us to comment in a comprehensive manner of these Changes.

1.5 CORE STRATEGY PROGRAMME

1.5.1 The Council's Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel considered a report about the Core Strategy on the 23rd August 2012 (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22189/Core%20Strategy.pdf>).

1.5.2 Further consideration was given to progressing the Core Strategy by the Cabinet at its meeting on the 12th September 2012 (see the report and appendices at <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22312/E2464%20Core%20Strategy.pdf> and <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22313/Appendices%201-2.pdf>). At those meetings, the Council agreed to review its evidence base and develop changes to the spatial strategy between then and January 2013. The programme at Appendix 2 of the reports suggested that the Council would, until the end of February 2013, "Update evidence base, develop policy options, Community engagement".

1.5.3 However, it appears that some time elapsed before the Council commissioned the necessary work to review its existing evidence and prepare new evidence, and there is little evidence of "community engagement" during that period.

1.5.4 In particular, it appears that the Council awaited the outcome of its assessment of the overall housing requirement before it commissioned a Green Belt Review in December 2012 and further evidence base studies in 2013. This approach has:

- provided no time for community engagement;
- required the reporting of the Proposed Changes to the Council on 4th March, prior to the completion of the evidence base studies; and
- led to the late publication of a number of the evidence base studies during, rather than at the start of, the 6 week consultation period.

1.5.5 The report to that Panel also set out (at 4.8) the reasons for progressing the Placemaking Plan “in good time” and suggests that the options consultation (planned in Jan 2013) would be delayed by 3 months (i.e. until April 2013).

1.5.6 Many of the evidence base documents appear to have only been commissioned and completed in 2013. The Council’s intention to consider the areas now being promoted for development in the Proposed Changes must have been selected by the Council, without any significant consultation, by the end of 2012. It is difficult to understand why consultation about the options for accommodating the increased level of housing within the Council’s area was not undertaken to inform the Council’s decision making process.

1.5.7 Instead, the Council made a decision about the Proposed Changes on the 4th March with very limited opportunity for the careful consideration of the new and updated evidence base. The reports to the Council were presumably finalised before the end of February, before some of the evidence base had been updated and new additions made to it. This is remarkable given that the areas being considered are the subject of such a wide variety of important landscape, heritage, ecology and green belt designations.

1.5.8 Any decision by the Inspector to progress with the Core Strategy hearings is at substantial risk of subsequent challenge. We request that the Inspector seeks the Council’s clarification about the consultation undertaken by the Council prior to the 26th March 2013 on:

- the various new evidence base studies, including the SHLAA and green belt review;
- the SA and process for the selection of sites to be released from the green belt around Bath;
- the impact of the proposals on the Bath Conservation Area (including, in particular, whether English Heritage has been consulted about the proposals to release green belt land for development in the Bath Conservation Area on land adjoining Weston).

1.5.9 We also request that the Inspector requests a programme that sets out the dates when the Council:

- commissioned the new and updated evidence;
- received the completed new and updated evidence; and
- completed the new and updated evidence;

because we do not think that the it has been prepared in a manner to properly inform the Council’s selection of land for release from the green belt and its allocation for development.

1.5.10 We think that, on the basis of the evidence, there are more sustainable options to accommodate the growth that Bath needs than on land adjoining Weston, particularly the land that is within the Bath Conservation Area.

1.6 SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

1.6.1 The Inspector himself set out in paragraph 9 of his note of the 21st June 2012 (ID/28 http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/id- 28_preliminary_conclusions_final_21_june_2012.pdf) that he:

“would be concerned if significant changes were needed which resulted in the final Plan being fundamentally different from the submitted plan.”

1.6.2 It appears that is now the case with a substantially higher number of new homes planned within the area, particularly in very sensitive areas around Bath that are severely constrained by international, European, national, regional and local landscape, heritage and other designations. Indeed, the Inspector in his most recent note ID/31 states:

“I note that the Council is proposing substantial changes to the Core Strategy involving new sites in the Green Belt and that there are a large number of new evidence studies.”

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

No comment

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Respondent Number:** 251 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Bovis Homes**Agent ID:** 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process**Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

2.1 Our main objections relate to the Council failing to respond to the requirements of the Inspector and fulfil the requirements of the NPPF in the changes that are proposed to the Core Strategy. However, we also have some more general comments relating to the preparation of the Plan, outlined below.

Consultation of Proposed Changes to Core Strategy

2.2 The Inspector set out at paragraph 12 of ID/28 that “If the Examination is eventually to continue the Council must have first have published all necessary updated evidence and consulted on all the changes arising from that evidence”.

2.3 This was reiterated in the Inspectors’ paper in ID/29, where he stated that “the Council should ensure that updated evidence is published alongside any consultation on the proposed changes”.

2.4 However, throughout the six week consultation period on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy, there have been a series of revisions to evidence base documents and new documents published without notification. This includes the SHMA (a fundamental part of the evidence base that the Core Strategy is founded upon), which was originally published at the start of the consultation period, dated 21st February; and replaced at a future unknown date with a subsequent version, dated 18th March 2013. The Green Belt Assessment has also been updated during the course of the consultation period, again without notification.

2.5 Further, the 2013 SHLAA Report was not published at the start of the consultation period; and the Arup Development Concept Options Reports have also been published during the period of consultation.

2.6 These changes to the evidence base have made it very difficult for interested parties such as ourselves to keep track of the relevant and most up to date evidence and engage in the process, which the Inspector has previously raised concerns about. We have also sought further information and clarification on a number of issues within the SHMA which the Council has not provided a response to. Whilst we have tried to provide as comprehensive a response as possible at this stage this has not been made easy by the Council and we therefore reserve the right to provide further comments on the evidence base within our submission papers ahead of the next set of Hearings if additional information comes to light. We would in the meantime be willing to work with the Local Authority to agree as much common ground as possible ahead of the start of the Examination in Public Hearing Sessions.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 110 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Robert Sawyer**Respondent Organisation:** Wedco Limited**Agent ID:** 163 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change Reference: Consultation Process

Plan Reference: N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I write to express my concern that the public consultation process adopted by the Council in respect of the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy was fundamentally flawed and did not conform to the Inspector's advice of 22 March 2013 (ID/31). The Inspector emphasised:

"All the above information should be put in the public domain. Much would be of relevance and assistance to those wishing to make further representations during the forthcoming consultation. The information should be published as soon as possible with an indication at the outset of the consultation period when it will be available."

However, as shall be outlined below, the Council did not make all of the relevant information referenced by the Inspector (e.g. clarification on the sites listed in the SHLAA) available until weeks after public consultation had commenced on 26 March 2013 and the overall consultation period was not extended to account for the late publication of information.

Our concerns regarding the robustness and transparency of the public consultation include:

1. The late publication of the following evidence base documents which inform the proposed changes to the submitted Core Strategy (CS) :
 - The Concept Option Reports for the proposed new development sites identified in the revised CS 'as used to help the consideration of potential development locations'. These were not published on the Council's website until 03 April 2013.
 - The SHLAA Findings Report and Appendices detailing individual sites and the SHLAA Methodology was only published on 19 April 2013. I understand from the Council's website that a further update is due in May, making it difficult, if not impossible to come to any clear understanding of the relationship between the evidence base and the housing target proposed for adoption in the draft CS.
 - The updated SHMA was only published on the Council's website on 27 March 2013, the day after consultation began.
2. There appears to have been no 'stakeholder' consultation on the SHMA, a matter on which I am seeking confirmation from Curo the Registered Provider with the greatest presence in the area.
3. The Council organised Core Strategy public exhibitions, the last of which I attended on the 30th April at the Council's One- Stop -Shop in Manvers Street. The attached photos of the Rural Areas Board states;

"It is reasonable for villages that meet the requirements of policy RA1 (the most sustainable villages) to review their Housing Development Boundaries over the plan period to allocate a site of around 20 extra dwellings each through the Placemaking Plan or Neighbourhood Planning. This yields about 80 extra dwellings".

This is misleading as Policy RA1 actually states as amended at SPC140 on page 84 in the March 2013 Schedule of Changes to the Core Strategy and on page 96 in para 5.21 for the Published Core Strategy.

"The 250 200 additional dwellings to be accommodated within the rural areas under the District-wide spatial strategy will be distributed as appropriate with small scale housing developments of up to and around 30 50 dwellings at each of the villages which meet the criteria referred to in Para 5.17 (see of Policy RA1). This will be considered in more detail through the Placemaking Plan in conjunction with Parish Councils as the locally elected representatives of their communities. The Housing Development Boundaries shown on the Proposals Map (saved from the existing Local Plan) will also be reviewed as part of the Placemaking Plan to incorporate the sites identified and /or enable new sites to come forward. Sites identified in adopted Neighbourhood Plans that adjoin the housing development boundary of villages meeting the criteria of Policy RA1 will also be appropriate and these may come forward for inclusion as a part of the Placemaking Plan or subsequent to it."

Change to the policy requested:

In order to make the consultation sound it is suggested that the consultation be extended to allow the following steps to be taken.

- To allow additional consultation on the SHLAA documents which were uploaded on the 19th April rather than at the commencement of the consultation.
- To allow additional consultation on the further revisions to the SHLAA due to be published in May.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- To allow the Council time to conduct a proper stakeholder consultation on the SHMA in line with CILG guidance and to add the responses to those consultations to the evidence base.
- To allow the Council time to conduct further public consultation events with the Rural Areas Boards corrected, as visitors to the events cannot be expected to respond to misleading information.

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 26 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Pegasus Planning Group has been instructed by J S Bloor Ltd to respond to the above consultation. I enclose 25 completed representation forms on the Proposed Changes.

As you will recall we have been acting for Bloor Homes during the preparation of the BANES Core Strategy. We have experienced some difficulty with the evidence base, as draft documents have been placed on the website only to be replaced by further versions as the consultation has progressed.

Since the consultation opened on the 26th March the evidence base documents which support the proposed changes have been revised and re-published without notification. For example, the SHMA dated 21st February which was available at the beginning of the consultation was later revised on an unknown date to a version dated 18th March 2013. Similarly, a revised Green Belt Assessment dated April 2013 was published at some point during the consultation, again with no obvious notification. A further updated version of the SHLAA has been produced and additional documents the Arup Concept Options had also appeared during the consultation. Again consultees have not been notified of these significant changes to the evidence base.

In addition, several changes to the Proposed Schedule of Changes made since the consultation opened have also resulted in changes to all of the reference numbers of the Proposed Changes from those originally published. The various versions of the Proposed Schedule of Changes have not been given a different title or version number and the change to all reference numbers was not highlighted by BANES.

This has made it extremely difficult to keep up to date with the consultation and has made it even harder for participants to engage in the process effectively. The consultation should not have started until all finalised evidence base documents were available, or if revised documents did need to be published participants should have been notified, changes flagged up on the Core Strategy webpage, and the consultation period extended.

I recall that in ID/28 the Inspector at paragraph 12 said "If the Examination is eventually to continue the Council must have first have published all necessary updated evidence and consulted on all the changes arising from that evidence" it is impossible to consult on all the changes arising from the evidence if BANES keep publishing different versions of it and not informing those who have made precious representations and are on the mailing list.

The Inspector set out in ID/29 that "the Council should ensure that updated evidence is published alongside any consultation on the proposed changes" and was concerned that a "very protracted Examination would make it harder for the public and participants to engage effectively with the process". The way in which BANES has undertaken this latest consultation has only added to the already very complicated nature of this Core Strategy process and does not represent effective consultation.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The website containing the modifications subject to this Consultation is confusing and difficult to use .

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 265 **Comment Number:** 27 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

CP2: Although stated as not being part of the present consultation it is amended text and should be compatible with SPC149, and this isn't. The expected life and embodied energy in materials chosen needs to be stated as sustainability factors .

Change to the policy requested:

Sustainable design and construction will be integral to new development in Bath & North East Somerset. All planning applications should include evidence that the standards below will be addressed:

- Maximising energy efficiency and integrating the use of renewable and low-carbon energy (i.e. in the form of an energy strategy with reference to policy CP4 as necessary);
- Minimisation of waste and maximising of recycling of any waste generated during construction and in operation'
- Conserving water resources and minimising vulnerability to flooding;
- Efficiency in materials use, including the type, life cycle, embodied energy and source of materials to be used;
- Flexibility durability and adaptability, allowing a long design life, future modification of use or layout, facilitating future refurbishment and retrofitting;

Respondent Number: 4606 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ms Sally Winter**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Firstly, I should like to apologise for not sending my comments on the changes to the Core Strategy on your online form but it did not allow me to enter comments directly, and it was a difficult if not impossible form to complete. I would ask that you pass this email containing my comments to the planning inspector, and confirm by return that you have done this. I also could not find the reference numbers you referred to in your instructions so I hope my comments are nevertheless acceptable.

I would also like to comment on the fact that your plans of the Weston area which I picked up from your very packed consultation evening in the Church Rooms in Weston are not easy to interpret, and this makes it difficult for local people to give the plans adequate consideration and a real opportunity to be involved in the development of the local area.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4633 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Louise Worlock**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 155 **Agent Name:** Aspect360 Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Firstly we would comment that this process is fundamentally unsound. The Council is rushing through major proposals for extension to urban areas in the Green belt without adequate consultation with local residents. The Councils Members have agreed to put forward significant allocations on 5 sites before carrying out consultation with residents. These decisions have been taken before feedback has been received. This directly conflicts with the advice in the NPPF which requires that plans “be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;”

This process has been rushed through to prevent a more comprehensive process departure from previous established principles we would advocate that this process is fundamentally unfair and flawed.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4633 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Ms Louise Worlock**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 155 **Agent Name:** Aspect360 Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Firstly we would comment that this process is fundamentally unsound. The Council is rushing through major proposals for extension to urban areas in the Green belt without adequate consultation with local residents. The Councils Members have agreed to put forward significant allocations on 5 sites before carrying out consultation with residents. These decisions have been taken before feedback has been received. This directly conflicts with the advice in the NPPF which requires that plans:

“be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;”

This process has been rushed through to prevent a more comprehensive process departure from previous established principles we would advocate that this process is fundamentally unfair and flawed.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4652 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** John Wetherill**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1. The “new” greenbelt has not been defined clearly (see also the National Planning Policy Framework document (link below) which discusses green belts and how they should be protected etc..)
2. The access to the land at the eastern end of the Weston development area (Weston Park West) would unreasonably burden the existing road network in that area, especially after the opening of the Royal High Junior School on Weston Park East;
3. Weston already has had new development – Holcombe Green and Southlands were/are being rebuilt with higher density housing;
4. Does Bath really need 12,700 new houses?;
5. Risk of flooding to existing properties due to topography, springs and already strained water courses/culverts etc.;
6. The access indicated by the playground on Purlewent Drive is narrow and constrained by a water pumping station;
7. The access indicated by the playground on Purlewent Drive would unreasonably burden the existing road network in that area, especially as many hospital workers already use this road for all-day parking;
8. The access indicated off The Weal is narrow and steep and would unreasonably burden the existing road network in that area;
9. The area indicated for development in Weston is mostly (possibly all) a Conservation Area. The law dictates that any development must enhance or preserve conservation areas and yet this does not seem possible if houses and roads are constructed within it. The land above Weston is rural and creates a green rim to the bowl of built-on land lower down. If more houses are built on the green slopes above then this visual effect will be damaged.
10. The whole process has been rushed with no real consultation with the residents beforehand;

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4657 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Lisa Vernalls**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Process
The whole process for the core strategy seems to have been lacking on a number of levels from the way that the initial legislation was rushed through in a matter of days to the lack of provision of materials to hand out at the meetings to the complete lack of understanding of the locality being considered.

With such a short lead in time to the decision being made by the council there was no opportunity for the general public to influence or inform the council representatives or for those representatives to seek the views of their constituents. At the consultation meetings for the core strategy the printouts provided ran out before even an hour of the three hour meeting had passed and despite pointing this out to an official, there was no means of dealing with this and so those turning up for the majority of the meeting would have been left unable to know what there should have been available. There was also only a single board displaying the immediate local area and so everyone had to crowd around that with very little opportunity of actually viewing and discussing in an appropriate environment. There were no paper forms available (for those not online or not confident with technology) to raise comments about the process, nor was there any obvious

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

indication of what the link to this form. These points lead to the fact that unless you a) have access to online facilities; b) are confident using online facilities; and c) are able to navigate the complexity of the local council website; then it is unlikely that any significant points which residents may be able to contribute will be made. This is aside from the fact that the council have been moving files related to the process around on it's website, so even if you are confident at all of the above points then you may still find yourself unable to locate a relevant document that you'd previously found. In addition to these points it comes across that no-one actually bothered to visit the sites in question or obvious things such as the incline and width of an access road would have been immediately apparent. Plus simple things such as not looking up correct bus timetables and assuming a route that was discontinued five years ago.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. REPRESENTATIONS TO THE BANES SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SUBMITTED CORE STRATEGY (MARCH 2013)

1.1 Pegasus Planning Group is instructed by Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd to submit representations to the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy (May 2013).

1.2 It is important to note from the outset that these representations are based upon what we understand to be the most up-to-date evidence base documents and proposed changes references.

1.3 Since the consultation opened on the 26th March the evidence base documents which support the proposed changes have been revised and re-published without notification. For example, the SHMA dated 21st February which was available at the beginning of the consultation was later revised on an unknown date to a version dated 18th March 2013, still marked as 'draft'. Similarly, a revised and finalised Green Belt Assessment dated April 2013 was published during the consultation, again with no obvious notification.

1.4 The SHLAA Site Assessment and Findings Report were also not made available for the start of the consultation, with no notification when they did finally become available.

1.5 In addition, several changes to the Proposed Schedule of changes made since the consultation opened have also resulted in changes to all of the reference numbers of the proposed changes from those originally published. The various versions of the Proposed Schedule of Changes have not been given a different title or version number and the change to all reference numbers was not highlighted by BANES.

1.6 This has made it extremely difficult to keep up with the consultation and has made it even harder for participants to engage in the process effectively. The consultation should not have started until all finalised evidence base documents were available, or if revised documents did need to be published participants should have been notified, changes flagged up on the Core Strategy webpage, and the consultation period extended.

1.7 The Core Strategy Inspector set out in ID/29 that "the Council should ensure that updated evidence is published alongside any consultation on the proposed changes" and was concerned that a "very protracted Examination would make it harder for the public and participants to engage effectively with the process". The way in which BANES has undertaken this latest consultation has only added to the already very complicated nature of this Core Strategy process and does not represent effective consultation.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:****Respondent Number:** 4713 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Phillip Chichester **Respondent Organisation:** JPC Strategic Planning**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.2 Following the limited time made available by Bath & North East Somerset to consider the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy, it is considered that the Core Strategy is unsound.

1.3 Positive planning cannot be reactionary, from the outset of BANES decision to significantly reduce the housing requirements identified in the South West Regional Spatial Strategy the core strategy process has been flawed. The failure to identify and fully comprehend the authorities housing requirements has created a process of reactionary planning, which has led to a wholly undesirable and unsustainable core strategy. The fundamental shift in policy identified in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy is the latest evidence of reactionary planning. The authority has completely reversed its position on Greenbelt development. The change in policy has been forced due to fundamental flaws in their perceived housing demand and their deliverable supply. The identification of the strategic Greenbelt locations is via a forced process, not through positive planning.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4740 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Hilary Bickford **Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Consultation Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am very disappointed by the very short consultation period afforded to Weston residents. The first we knew of anything was right at the end of February when an article appeared in the local paper (which I am sure you will agree is not read by everyone) and we had to rely on word of mouth to receive this information from other residents- no formal notification was sent to residents of the area who would be affected by the proposed development. I also consider the information on the website was extremely difficult to navigate.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref.** Duty to Co-operate Process **Plan Ref.:** N/A**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 276 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett**Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust**Agent ID:** 151 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Duty to Co-operate Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.2.1 The legal 'duty to cooperate' introduced by s110 of the Localism Act imposes a statutory duty that local planning authorities preparing plans should do so with 'maximum effectiveness'. The legal duty has been found not to apply to this plan as it was submitted before 15 January 2012, though it is very clearly still in preparation. This was the judgment in the case of University of Bristol vs North Somerset Council. This judgment continues to confound and amaze PBA and HFT. The Government announced its intention to abolish Regional Strategies and set out its provisions for strategic planning to continue but to be undertaken by different means. The Government has never said it did not want strategic planning – quite the contrary. Neither can it have been its intention that the legal position should appear to provide for a hiatus of some months in some local authority areas which were entirely randomly determined by a fluke of their plan preparation programme, during which there was no to be no strategic planning at all.

1.2.2 The requirement for planning authorities to cooperate and to act on the findings of their cooperation to bring about the necessary outcomes was put in place to replace the influence of the RSS. But in the south west, the extant RSS was already out of date – on housing numbers and the exposition of its spatial strategy - and was not being effective, so that exercise of the strategic function through the local plan was wanted at the earliest possible date. This must have been the intention of the Government in its drafting of the Duty to Cooperate.

1.2.3 It is surely not to be assumed that the Council believes it is entitled to plan with 'minimum effectiveness'.

1.2.4 Whatever the legal application of the duty to cooperate however, the duty is a means to an end. The actual requirement on local planning authorities is to address strategic issues in their plans. This requirement has always been there and is not removed by the changes enacted in 2011 and 2012, but rather has been reiterated in the Framework. The expression of this requirement that is critical to the Examination of the BANES Core Strategy is the soundness test which echoes but critically is separate from the legal test imposed by the Duty to Cooperate. Para. 182 says that: 'The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role it is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound' (our emphasis). The test of soundness as set out in the Framework is to be met if the legal test in the Duty to Cooperate is met, or in any case if the Duty to Cooperate is believed not to apply; it is not time critical and there is no other 'default' test of soundness. The definition of the test of soundness to be applied to this plan as set out at para. 182 of the Framework therefore includes whether it is:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

1.2.5 This test of soundness is not limited to process; it specifically deals with the outcomes to be sought by a plan. It is HFT's submission that the changes that should be made to the BANES Core Strategy to meet the test that it has to meet should be different to, and be an extension, to what is now proposed by the Council. The changes suggested by HFT would mean the plan is one which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements with the most appropriate strategy.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 251 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Bovis Homes

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Duty to Co-operate Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Duty to Co-operate

2.7 Paragraph 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by 110 of the Localism Act 2011) introduces a Duty to co-operate in relation to planning of sustainable development.

2.8 We recognise that this issue has been examined and it has been concluded that the Duty to Co-operate does not apply on Submitted Plans, because they are generally no longer under 'preparation' (Paragraph 33A, 3, a). However, as a result of the extent of changes sought by the Inspector in respect of the Submitted B&NES Core Strategy; the fact that B&NES Council has prepared additional evidence, (including the preparation of a SHMA); has published proposed changes to the Core Strategy; and is undertaking additional consultation on these changes; we suggest that these stages should be seen as the continuation of the preparation of the Plan (albeit after being Submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination). As such, we contend that despite the fact that the Core Strategy was originally submitted prior to the Duty being introduced; the Council should still be obligated to accord with the requirements of the Duty as the Plan is clearly still under preparation by the Local Authority.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson **Respondent Organisation:** Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Duty to Co-operate Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

2.4 The Proposed Changes to the Strategy do not assess cross-boundary housing needs. Including this element of housing need would significantly increase the housing provision for B&ANES. Whilst we accept the findings of the Inspector in respect of the Duty to Co-operate this short coming ignores the whole premise of assessing housing needs based on appropriate evidence i.e. the requirements of the NPPF. Furthermore, whilst an early review of the SHMA may be advocated by the Council this is to be questioned as the timing of an early review is unknown. We suggest given the age of the original core SHMA (2008) that this exercise should be completed within the next two years. This evidence base should be used by Council to consider the housing target, which we expect to increase. A further delay to

appropriately assess the exact housing needs of District may, (based on the whole of the West of England Housing Market Area) perpetuate the failings of undersupply, meaning the current inequalities in the housing market are exacerbated and the shortfall of affordable housing continues to escalate.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 2564 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins

Respondent Organisation: Strategic Land Partnerships

Agent ID: 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Duty to Co-operate Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Council are required by the NPPF to cooperate with all their neighbouring authorities, not just in reviewing their plan, but also in its preparation. This is a key test of soundness and once which had not been met.

The Core Strategy should recognise that the administrative area of BANES does not accord with the functional area of the West of England, or with the housing market areas that exist across the area. Consequently the plan should be prepared and informed by discussions with Mendip, Wiltshire, Bristol and the other West of England authorities. This should be made explicit in the plan and also in any commitment to its review.

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy should demonstrate how it has cooperated with all its neighbouring authorities including Mendip, Wiltshire, Bristol and the other West of England authorities. In addition it should make clear that discussions with take place with these stakeholders in any future review.

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Withies Farm Landowners' Group,

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Duty to Co-operate Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The scale of housing growth for which provision is made in para. 1.26 and Policy DW1 (2) is insufficiently justified and inconsistent with a plan that is positively prepared to meet objectively assessed needs. Moreover, there is little evidence that the plan has been prepared in accordance with the 'Duty to Cooperate', as required in order to ameliorate the potential consequences of the abolition of an overarching regional tier of strategic planning policies.

The Core Strategy provision for around 12,700 new homes represents an annual requirement of around 700 dwellings over the Plan period, representing a reduction of over one-third (34%) compared with the RS requirement. Bearing in mind that a substantial proportion of the annual requirement now provided for is made up of a housing backlog from the previous Local Plan period, the like for like reduction from the RS figure is significantly greater. Whilst the latest 2011-based Interim Household Projections indicate a slowing in the rate of household growth, such a reduction would seem to be disproportionate to the reduction in household growth rates and inconsistent with the NPPF objective to 'boost significantly' the supply of housing.

In the RS, Bath and North East Somerset was included in the West of England HMA, which included the districts of West Wiltshire and Mendip parts of which are acknowledged as falling within the Bath HMA as commissioned for the current purposes. It is apparent that the higher quantum of housing proposed in the RS was in part due to the recognition of the influence of Bath on those parts of West Wiltshire and Mendip within the HMA, and the appropriateness of accommodating such growth at Bath.

Notwithstanding the statutory obligations on the local planning authority in accordance with S33A of the 2004 Act, there is no evidence that the Council has discharged its duty cooperate with its neighbouring planning authorities, in particular Wiltshire and Mendip Councils, in the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. It has already been conceded that there has been little joint working with Bristol City Council in the matter for that part of the district that has been identified as having a HMA that is influenced by the neighbouring Bristol urban area.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Whilst Bristol City Council has indicated that there are no unmet housing needs that should be accommodated within BANES at the present time, there is little evidence of any constructive dialogue with Wiltshire and Mendip Councils to ascertain whether they are intending to meet their housing requirements in full, and in particular whether there are any needs arising from within those neighbouring authority areas that are more appropriately accommodated within BANES.

It is interesting to note that one of the considerations that has delayed the Wiltshire Core Strategy from proceeding to Examination is that Inspector's concerns regarding the lack of clear evidence concerning the duty to cooperate, not least with BANES, concerning the accommodation of housing requirement. The Inspector's attention is drawn to the Wiltshire Core Strategy Inspector's Second Procedural Letter to Wiltshire Council seeking clarification on, inter alia, how the housing evidence base and provisions had had regard to cross border matters, with Bath being identified as one of the relationships of particular concern to him. Attention is also drawn to the Council's reply, which did little to provide any substantive evidence to demonstrate how the Plan had responded to such considerations. Copies of both these items of correspondence are available on the Wiltshire Council Web Site (Core Strategy Examination page).

Just as the Duty to Cooperate and the requirements of para. 159 of the NPPF are of relevance to the Wiltshire Core Strategy Examination Inspector, they are of equal relevance to the current Inspector in coming to a view on whether the Plan is sound. However, at the present time there is no clear or substantive evidence relating to how the duty has been discharged, and in particular, how it has influenced the provisions of the Plan. In terms of housing provisions there is little to demonstrate how cross-border issues may have caused an adjustment to the housing provisions in terms of either an increase or decrease in the provisions that have been made. Since the neighbouring authorities in the West of England HMA, including Bristol, North Somerset and Wiltshire Councils, are all providing for significantly reduced housing requirements compared with the requirements for the HMA as identified in the RS, there is a significant risk of full objectively assessed needs not being met.

In order for the current Plan to be found sound it is essential for the Council to demonstrate how the duty to cooperate has been discharged, and to provide clear evidence as to how it has affected the provisions of the Plan. At the present time there is little in the way of clear evidence from any of the neighbouring authorities to demonstrate that this duty has been discharged in a satisfactory and meaningful manner. As such, the housing provisions of the Plan cannot be held to be sound as the present time.

Neither Wiltshire Council nor Mendip Councils are able at the present time to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land, which is being reflected in appeal decisions, a most recent example of which relates to a site at Evercreech in Mendip District which was allowed on the basis of the lack of a five year supply of housing land (18 April 2013). This is clear evidence that there are unmet needs in those neighbouring authority areas that it may be more appropriate to accommodate in BANES owing to the influence of Bath on the HMA.

The Council has correctly increased its overall housing provision to take account of the need to deliver a significant quantum of affordable housing. However, the overall increase presumes that affordable housing will be delivered in conjunction with market housing in accordance with the target proportions set out in the policy provisions. This is an unlikely scenario bearing in mind that the policy criteria are maxima and aspirational. Bearing in mind prevailing market conditions, together with the quantum that is allowed for on brownfield regeneration sites in Bath where there are significant costs of site reclamation and infrastructure, the funding for which remains uncertain, it is unlikely that affordable housing will be delivered in full accordance with the policy aspirations. It will therefore be necessary to increase the provisions for market housing in order to ensure that the affordable housing need is met in full.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Change Ref. Sustainability Appraisal
Process

Plan Ref.: N/A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 233 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas**Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Sustainability Appraisal Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The land around Avon Valley Farm has been remapped largely as Subgrade 3b with some Subgrade 3a as the result of a field survey carried out in 1997. I have attached a copy of the original map for this survey which comprises the same mapped information as on the Magic website (post 1988 sites) .

Thank you for your interest in the problem at Avon Valley Farm, it is imperurs ative that we hve the correct land classification for agricultural use for avon valley farm.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston****Respondent Number:** 4721 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Sustainability Appraisal Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We also think that the proposals for the land adjoining Weston (we have not been able to analyse the Proposed Changes in respect of the other sites around Bath and elsewhere in the area) are not justified by the Council's own evidence base. It is also unclear as to how the Council took decisions between competing alternative approaches to accommodating the housing growth identified in the SHMAA, once it had concluded that Bath represented the most sustainable location for that new development.

We do not think that the Council has demonstrated, through its evidence base or sustainability appraisal, that its decision to allocate land adjoining Weston is the most sustainable strategy for development, when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** Sustainability Appraisal Process **Plan Reference:** N/A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.3.1 We also think that the proposals for the land adjoining Weston (we have not been able to analyse the Proposed Changes in respect of the other sites around Bath and elsewhere in the area) are not justified by the Council's own

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

evidence base. It is also unclear as to how the Council took decisions between competing alternative approaches to accommodating the housing growth identified in the SHMAA, once it had concluded that Bath represented the most sustainable location for that new development.

1.7 JUSTIFIED

1.7.1 We do not think that the Council has demonstrated, through its evidence base or sustainability appraisal, that its decision to allocate land adjoining Weston is the most sustainable strategy for development, when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4639 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Lands Improvement

Agent ID: 156 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: Sustainability Appraisal Process **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Lands Improvement has significant concerns on the adequacy of the "Sustainability Appraisal Report on the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy" dated March 2013. These concerns relate to the following issues:

1. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) fails to adequately assess the impacts of a range of growth options both at a district wide level and in respect of the scale and location of urban extensions at specific settlements
2. The SA fails to adopt a consistent approach in assessing potential impacts
3. The SA appears to simply be aimed at justifying the approach of the Core Strategy

SA Approach to Growth Options

Whilst we note that the SA incorporates an assessment of various growth options, the approach is considered to be both inadequate and confused. The SA, at Annex L, claims to test three growth options:

Option 1 – 10,800 dwellings (the Submitted Core Strategy approach);

- Option 2 – 12,700 dwellings (the Propose Changes approach based on low growth trends); and
- Option 3 – 14,000 dwellings (based on medium growth).

It is clear from Annex L that higher growth levels are not tested because it would require a different strategy from that currently being proposed. Given that the SHMA identifies a high growth scenario (as set out in our response to SCP 14), we consider that this is a major and unjustified omission which significantly undermines the credibility and robustness of the SA.

We also believe that the testing of various growth options, based on an objective assessment of the full needs of the area, should have underpinned the SA from the outset rather than languishing at the end of Annex L. That is to say, the consequences of not meeting the full need as well as the benefits of positively planning for higher growth rates should have been understood from the beginning. Instead, it appears that the SA simply serves as a tool for justifying the Council's approach of identifying the lowest possible levels of growth which, whilst politically expedient, fails the requirements of the NPPF.

In that respect, the Council's position set out at the earlier sessions of the Examination, that it "weighs environmental costs, infrastructure implications and overwhelming public resistance to development" (para 6.8 of Topic Paper 9) more highly than meeting housing needs appears to remain unchanged. This is despite the NPPF requirement to meet the full objectively unless the impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The SA simply does not consider the benefits the higher levels of growth.

base/strategic-housing-land) purports to set out, inter alia,

“a supply of specific deliverable site sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements.”

1.10.2 The primary role of the SHLAA (see SHLAA Practice Guidance at:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/11500/39926_7.pdf) is to:

- identify sites with potential for housing;
- assess their housing potential; and
- assess when they are likely to be developed.

1.10.3 The SHLAA Findings Report of March 2013 (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_findings_report.pdf) brings into question the status of the ARUP Development Concept Options Reports in that it states at

1.8 that these Reports have been used to inform the SHLAA, although they were not finalised and published until April 2013. The Reports have presumably been used to inform the SHLAA assessment of the housing potential of the land adjoining Weston (although the Council’s evidence provides no indication as to how the figure of 300 homes was derived from that Report and other evidence).

1.10.4 In the Inspector’s comments of in Annex A to ID/28 he states at 2.1 that:

The assessment of the suitability of sites has been strongly influenced by the emerging strategy rather than being an objective assessment of opportunities and capacity to inform the strategy. There appears to have been little or no direct contact with owner/developers about the achievability of sites. There is an absence of supporting evidence from developers about delivery on most of the largest sites.

1.10.5 We believe that this remains the case and the comment at of the SHLAA says as much in the Findings Report at 1.9: Whilst no stakeholder involvement or panel has been convened during the preparation of the SHLAA, the findings are open and transparent and enable interested parties to critically review the outputs and relay any observation to the Council for consideration.

1.10.6 Key stakeholders have not therefore been involved at any point in the Assessment, let alone “at the outset” as recommended in the SHLAA Practice Guidance

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/11500/3992_67.pdf).

1.10.7 The SHLAA identifies, at Appendix 1b, the sites considered in the green belt

(http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_plans.pdf), including the land adjoining Weston that is referenced A3i Weston Slopes (North Lower). It sets out an analysis of each site in a Report of Findings Appendix 1b: Bath Green Belt (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) and concludes that the site is suitable for 300 homes and notes that the development suitability credentials are “low to moderate”.

1.10.8 It is entirely unclear how the report derives area A3i’s potential as 300 dwellings and how the capacity of the other identified sites is derived, although there are references to the ARUP Development Concept Options Reports.

1.10.9 The SHLAA Appendix 1b (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence- Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) notes that development on the lower slopes would inevitably have a lesser landscape impact than the development of the higher slopes. However, the suggestion on page 10 that the development of this area would only have a “medium impact” is not borne out by the Council’s own evidence in the Landscape and Visual Study (LVS).

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: General **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

DELIVERABLE

1.6.4 We question whether the proposals in the Core Strategy are deliverable before 2029. The proposal to effectively delay key decisions to the Placemaking Plan, including the release of green belt land, will not give the Inspector confidence that the proposals will be deliverable. The Council itself has stated that the delivery of the Placemaking Plan by the end of 2014 will be “challenging” and its own website suggest the adoption of that Plan in 2015. This will be 4 years after the start of the Core Strategy period in 2011!

1.10 SHLAA AND FIVE YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

1.10.1 The council’s SHLAA (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/evidence-base/strategic-housing-land>) purports to set out, inter alia,

“a supply of specific deliverable site sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements.”

1.10.2 The primary role of the SHLAA (see SHLAA Practice Guidance at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/11500/39926_7.pdf) is to:

- identify sites with potential for housing;
- assess their housing potential; and
- assess when they are likely to be developed.

1.10.3 The SHLAA Findings Report of March 2013 (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_findings_report.pdf) brings into question the status of the ARUP Development Concept Options Reports in that it states at

1.8 that these Reports have been used to inform the SHLAA, although they were not finalised and published until April 2013. The Reports have presumably been used to inform the SHLAA assessment of the housing potential of the land adjoining Weston (although the Council’s evidence provides no indication as to how the figure of 300 homes was derived from that Report and other evidence).

1.10.4 In the Inspector’s comments of in Annex A to ID/28 he states at 2.1 that:

The assessment of the suitability of sites has been strongly influenced by the emerging strategy rather than being an objective assessment of opportunities and capacity to inform the strategy. There appears to have been little or no direct contact with owner/developers about the achievability of sites. There is an absence of supporting evidence from developers about delivery on most of the largest sites.

1.10.5 We believe that this remains the case and the comment at of the SHLAA says as much in the Findings Report at 1.9:

Whilst no stakeholder involvement or panel has been convened during the preparation of the SHLAA, the findings are open and transparent and enable interested parties to critically review the outputs and relay any observation to the Council for consideration.

1.10.6 Key stakeholders have not therefore been involved at any point in the Assessment, let alone “at the outset” as recommended in the SHLAA Practice Guidance

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

(https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/11500/3992_67.pdf).

1.10.7 The SHLAA identifies, at Appendix 1b, the sites considered in the green belt (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_plans.pdf), including the land adjoining Weston that is referenced A3i Weston Slopes (North Lower). It sets out an analysis of each site in a Report of Findings Appendix 1b: Bath Green Belt (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) and concludes that the site is suitable for 300 homes and notes that the development suitability credentials are “low to moderate”.

1.10.8 It is entirely unclear how the report derives area A3i’s potential as 300 dwellings and how the capacity of the other identified sites is derived, although there are references to the ARUP Development Concept Options Reports.

1.10.9 The SHLAA Appendix 1b (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) notes that development on the lower slopes would inevitably have a lesser landscape impact than the development of the higher slopes. However, the suggestion on page 10 that the development of this area would only have a “medium impact” is not borne out by the Council’s own evidence in the Landscape and Visual Study (LVS).

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 96 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Keynsham Town Council - Planning and Development **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: General **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

No comment made

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 27 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: General **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

“This is a summary of the comments made by Pegasus Planning in respect of the B&NES SHMA – please note that the full comments are available as a hard copy report (Pegasus Planning, Respondent number 170: ‘Pegasus Planning Critique of The ORS B&NES SHMA Update 2013’)
- The housing target being promoted by BANES Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy is equivalent to the low-migration scenario modelled within the SHMA. It assumes that low economic growth and household formation rates, as seen during the last 5 years, continue. Furthermore, due to an error in Figure 42 of the SHMA, the level of net international migration per annum fed into this model is incorrect and the level of internal migration assumed per annum is well below the average

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

seen historically, including the past five years. The low- migration scenario does not therefore satisfactorily take account of migration and demographic change;

- The housing target being promoted by BANES is also equivalent to the 11,000 jobs led scenario modelled within the SHMA. This model assumes that the existing female population of BANES working longer (due to increased pension age) will provide sufficient labour to fill the majority of the jobs proposed by the Core Strategy. No real detail is provided on this assumption (e.g. assumed growth of female residents aged 16-67 and economic activity rates by age) however, given that DCLG household projections show a decrease in BANES female population aged 16-67, it appears highly unrealistic. Without an increase in females in employment, the SHMA housing target will not support the level of jobs growth planned;
- In calculating the need for affordable homes the SHMA model assumes that the private rented sector will meet a significant proportion of the need by accommodating tenants with housing benefits. This assumption is too simplistic and fails to recognise that tenants receiving housing benefit are often excluded from the private rented sector by legal restrictions on buy-to-let mortgages. It also fails to consider other drivers of the private rented sector such as concealed households and students who compete more effectively in this market;
- The SHMA does not take account of existing affordable need as quantified by the housing register;
- The SHMA does not take account of currently suppressed needs within the existing population, such as concealed, shared and overcrowded households. Such demand will be unlocked as the market recovers and compete more effectively in the market than households in need; and
- The SHMA does not take account of the fact that BANES will always attract a number of affluent households from the South East and London who have second homes in the area or choose to live in the area for lifestyle aspirations rather than economically driven reasons.

1.4 It is therefore concluded that the BANES SHMA update report is based on a one-size-fits-all model which fails to take account of how the housing market in BANES operates in the real world.

1.5 The SHMA is therefore still not NPPF compliant and fails to address the Inspectors concerns raised in ID/28.

1.6 A joint West of England SHMA is already being commissioned by the four West of England Authorities, including BANES. First results will be available in 2014. It is therefore suggested that BANES await the results of the joint SHMA before moving forward with its Core Strategy housing target.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: General **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

In addition, PHSV consider that there is scope to identify safeguarded land to the South and West of Keynsham which should have formed part of the Consultation on the proposed changes to the Local Plan. In the absence of that we consider there should be an additional modification that a review of the Green Belt boundary around Keynsham will be undertaken to consider the identification of safeguarded land for future release from the Green Belt and this should not be a decision which is deferred for the Place Making Plan, as set out in SPC118.

Change to the policy requested:

In addition, SPC87 says there is no scope to identify safeguarded land in the longer term. We consider it is inappropriate for the Core Strategy to make this pre-judgement. SPC88 and Proposed Policy B3A requires detailed work which will inform the process for identifying whether or not safeguarded land is appropriate. Either a proper comprehensive Green Belt Review should have been carried out to enable this judgement to have been made now, or if the 2 stage Local Plan process continues, the pre-judgement regarding scope for our safeguarded land at Odd Down should be deleted.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 276 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett**Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust**Agent ID:** 151 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** General

Plan Reference: N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.1.9 As a general comment, it is apparent that in the preparation of the plan, evidence has not been used by the Council as it should have been. Rather the Proposed Changes to the plan appear to be the product of a pragmatic view by the Council that whilst it does not wish to make provision for development, it cannot expect to have a plan in place to influence the location and form of development unless it is seen to have done something to address the criticisms and questions raised by the Inspector in his ID28. The proposed changes represent what is acceptable to the Council. In getting to the changes now proposed by the Council some of the evidence presented does not stand up to scrutiny and some of it has been used in a selective way. On some matters there is simply no identifiable link or trail between what is proposed for inclusion in the plan and the evidence presented. In some cases the Council's own evidence clearly points to another conclusion from the one the Council has drawn in putting forward its Proposed Changes.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 300 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson**Respondent Organisation:** Curo**Agent ID:** 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** General

Plan Reference: N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)

2.5 It is clear that the Council need to produce an up to date NPPF compliant SHMA, which assesses the housing needs of the wider West of England area. The Inspector recognises that B&NES cannot undertake this task alone, which we fully accept puts it in a difficult position. It is inescapable though that the current evidence base does not incorporate an up to date SHMA fully compliant with the NPPF.

2.6 We contend that the proposed housing provision of 12,700 does not seek to meet the housing requirements in full, based on the 'Average Migration Scenario' in the updated SHMA.

2.7 Furthermore, Curo has the following particular doubts about the updated SHMA::

- It is to be noted that the SHMA is only an Update following up the previous SHMA 2008 (1.5). We do not believe that the document fulfils a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, nor even an update of one. This is because it is only an update covering part of the West of England SHMA (Section 2). Its base date therefore remains as 2008. Moreover, the Update in no way can be deemed an up-to-date, stand alone or comprehensive SHMA.
- The report reaffirms the validity of the West of England as the SHMA area (Section 2).
- The Updated SHMA appears not to follow some of the essential principles of the SHMA Practice Guidance Version (DCLG, August 2007).
- The updated SHMA simply looks at the level of housing need arising from within the District contrary to the Inspector's direction in ID/28.
- The Council claims it has a five year housing supply with a 20% buffer and frontloads provision for the Local Plan shortfall, but bases this on a target (648dwellings per annum 2011 – 2016 and 415dwellings per annum 2016 – 2029). Both of these

figures are well below the annual average housing target (700 dwellings per annum)

for the District. The Council remain unsure when the additional annual shortfall will be “made-up”.

- The level of identified affordable housing need is 3,300 dwellings over the period 2011 to 2031 (165 dwellings per annum). This is well below the 847 dwellings per annum of newly arising affordable housing need identified in the 2008 West of England SHMA.
- The SHMA has assumptions on the impact of welfare reforms and the private rented sector however in reality these impacts are yet to be fully understood particularly in relation to welfare reforms which have only recently started to be implemented and the effects of which will take a number of years to become clear.
- The SHMA appears to take no account of backlog for affordable housing need which was 2,608 dwellings in the 2008 SHMA.
- The Council’s own housing register data appears to have been overlooked. Whilst it is accepted that such open registers cannot in themselves be the sole determinant of housing need they should be analysed and form part of the evidence base. The homelessness data quoted (5.25) is at least four quarters older than it need be. No attempt has been made to assess the existing backlog of need as distinct from newly arising need.
- The SHMA has not properly assessed the housing needs of older people in the District, as required by paragraph 159 of the NPPF.
- The updated SHMA notes it is based on a range of information including existing policy documents (1.7) yet these are not identified in the document.
- The cross-reference between the NPPF and the RSS is could be misleading. In any event the quotations from the NPPF are incomplete. In particular paragraph 47 regarding the imperative “to boost significantly the supply of housing” is overlooked (1.10).
- The NPPF does not suggest producing a range of housing forecasts (1.11). It advocates meeting objectively assessed housing needs.
- The projection of the housing requirements appears to be based substantially on the ORS Housing Mix Model (Section 8). The full assumptions and how the Model works are not clear. This is not a widely used approach and certainly differs substantially from that used by Professor Bramley in the original SHMA.
- It appears as though the private rented sector is noted as being a proxy for affordable housing (8.33). This is not supported by the preceding Chapter 7 which is very cautious about the potential effects of the current welfare reforms on the private rented sector as it should be in looking ahead as far as 2031(Summary).
- There is little or no further information on the spatial distribution of housing demand and need across the District.
- The SHMA does not clearly underpin or justify the either the revised overall housing figure or the affordable housing target in the Core Strategy Proposed Changes (SPC179).
- A comparison of the methodology with the 2009 West of England SHMA demonstrates that there was a much higher level of affordable housing need in the District (around five times higher).
- The SHMA provides only superficial information on the housing needs of older people and thus is not NPPF compliant. Ensuring that there is a full assessment of this need is essential to ensure that it the plan is sufficiently flexible to cater for this growing requirement.

2.8 According to the March 2013 Sustainability Appraisal Report, the 12,700 housing requirement now being proposed by the Council has been derived as follows:

“The revised housing target proposed is 12,700 homes from 2011 to 2029, based on the findings of SHMA, adding the Local Plan backlog, an extra to address affordable housing needs, 5 year land supply and flexibility to respond to non-delivery risks” (page 37).

2.9 We have been unable to obtain any explanation as to which of the scenarios in the SHMA Update has been applied here, which alternative scenarios were rejected and why. As such, whilst we welcome the increase of affordable provision we consider there to be no sound evidence for the selected figure. We are aware, however, that the shortfall or ‘backlog’ accrued under the old Local Plan is 850 dwellings. This accounts for the majority of the 1,200 additional dwellings being proposed leaving just 350 to deal with the above mentioned ‘affordable housing needs’.

2.10 Clearly this is insufficient and the Core Strategy should seek to accommodate the full needs with consideration of a housing option nearer to the higher end of the 5,100 and 15,300 dwellings range. Given the limitations of the 2011-based interim projections, which only take into account selected 2011 Census data; only model forward to the end of 2021; and project forward unrealistically low assumptions about a depressed housing market, it is still relevant to take into account the 2008-based household projections’ indication of 16,000 new households by 2026, even if this now falls three years short of the proposed Core Strategy end date of 2029.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 1415 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Peasedown St John Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: General **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

At our Planning Committee meeting on Friday 3rd May, the Parish Council discussed the Core Strategy and agreed to respond that they support the proposed changes as detailed in the consultation documents found via the web links.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4746 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Terrace Hill (Midsomer) Limited

Agent ID: 154 **Agent Name:** Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: General **Plan Reference:** N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We have concerns that the assessment of the Welton Bibby Baron Site within the 2013 SHLAA is insufficiently robust to support the assertion at paragraph 1.19 of the revised Core Strategy.

Please see accompanying letter of representation from Daniel Lampard of NLP dated 08/05/2013 (Ref: 30869/DL/LC/4763437v1)

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC5

Plan Ref.: Para 1.03

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC5 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.03

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC5 Plan Period

Persimmon Homes Severn Valley (PHSV) note the change to the Plan Period. However, this is not matched by supporting

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

evidence, in particular the BANES Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013 Report of Findings which uses a timeline of 2011 to 2031 as distinct from the end date of 2029 now adopted for the Local Plan. We consider it would be simpler and more logical and match the evidence base had the Plan Period been changed to 2011 to 2031. In addition, the reasons for the change are not set out in response to SPC5.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC6

Plan Ref.: Para 1.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis

Respondent Organisation: Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC6

Plan Reference: Para 1.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

PHSV note that the Council is proposing an LDF approach by preparing a Part 1 and Part 2 Local Plan, rather than an all inclusive Local Plan. We consider this will cause confusion and delay. The Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy identify potential locations where future growth may occur and precise site boundaries (i.e. the purpose of a Local Plan) are reserved for a Place Making DPD. It is clear that the preparation of this document will be considerably delayed by the extended Core Strategy (Part 1 Local Plan) timetable. This approach will cause a considerable period of uncertainty and will not boost the delivery of housing supply, as required by the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

PHSV note the identification of land at Odd Down for a potential Green Belt release. However, because of the reliance on the Place Making Plan for the identification detailed boundaries, this creates confusion. PHSV support the principle of the identification of land at Odd Down, but consider that the Part 1 Local Plan should set out a detailed boundary for comment so that land can be properly promoted now.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC6

Plan Reference: Para 1.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC6

1.10 SPC6 states that the Core Strategy will form Part 1 of a Local Plan which will identify broad locations for development, followed by the Placemaking Plan which will form Part 2 of a Local Plan and set out specific site allocations.

1.11 An objection is made to the fact that the Core Strategy is to become Part 1 of the Local Plan, however no strategic site allocations are proposed.

1.12 The Core Strategy identifies that Green Belt releases at land adjoining East Keynsham, South West Keynsham and Whitchurch will be required in order to meet the housing target for the plan period. However, allocation of a specific site and the revised Green Belt boundary will have to await the Placemaking Plan (Local Plan Part 2).

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1.13 Such sites are critical to the delivery of the overall housing target to 2029, and therefore in accordance with paragraph 47, bullet one of the NPPF they should be identified from the outset of the Plan.

1.14 As currently proposed, the Core Strategy policies identify broad areas where strategic development will be delivered but do not give a “clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal” (NPPF paragraph 154) in these areas if they were to come forward before the Placemaking Plan. This will unnecessarily delay delivery of sites which are critical to the soundness of the plan.

1.15 Without a complete assessment of the available sites in these strategic locations now, including capacities, the Plan cannot be considered deliverable and therefore does not meet the tests of soundness.

1.16 Given the time taken to prepare the Core Strategy (commenced in 2007 and consultation on the Spatial Options in 2009), it is considered that there is a need for certainty in respect of how and where housing needs will be met now. Preparation of a complete Local Plan now is likely to be quicker than a second examination of a Local Plan Part 2.

1.17 In order to be consistent with national planning policy and found sound, the Core Strategy must identify specific sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy, such as those required at Keynsham and Whitchurch.

Change to the policy requested:

Sites which are critical to the delivery of the overall housing target must be identified (as opposed to broad locations) to demonstrate that the Plan is deliverable.

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC6

Plan Reference: Para 1.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to object to the land being allocated in the core strategy for Odd Down and Weston,

SPC6 (Broad Locations) object to allocation for the sites at Weston and Odd Down for the following reasons, which are expanded on later:

- Their allocation doesn't fit NPPF guidance on allocation of land in the AONB
- The sites are urban sprawl and against green belt policy
- Neither site is sustainable as employment would be in the city centre not on the outskirts.
- There is no need, by increasing the housing density on the brownfield sites the need for greenfield development would be removed.
- In the case of Odd Down would damage the setting of the Wansdyke
- Co-coalescence of Bath and Southstoke may occur.
- For Weston this site is visual from a number of locations in Bath and would damage the world heritage setting of the City.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC6

Plan Reference: Para 1.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC6 (Broad Locations) object to allocation for the site at Odd Down for the following reasons.

- Their allocation doesn't fit NPPF guidance on allocation of land in the AONB
- The site goes against green belt policy
- There is no need if the housing density is increased per hectare on the brownfield sites the need for greenfield development would be removed.
- In the case of Odd Down it would damage the setting of the Wansdyke and have detrimental environmental effect on bats which can be seen foraging in the hedgerows and surrounding trees
- Joining of Bath and the village South Stoke may occur.
- Traffic Congestion

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: No comment on Development Locations****Respondent Number:** 170 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick**Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC6

Plan Reference: Para 1.05

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

An objection is made to the fact that the Core Strategy is to become Part 1 of the Local Plan and that the site specific proposals, even those that are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period will not be identified until the Placemaking Plan (Part 2 of the Local Plan) is prepared. Sites which are critical to the delivery of the Plan (ie those that are identified to be released from the Green Belt should be identified from the outset in the Plan.

As currently proposed, the Core Strategy policies identify only the broad areas where strategic development will be delivered, but do not give a "clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal." (NPPF para 154). This will delay delivery of sites which are critical to the delivery of the Plan.

This approach is unsound as it is not consistent with national policy. Pegasus objects to this :-

1. This approach is not consistent with the NPPF para 47 which states that the Local Plan "...meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. " (my emphasis).
2. The approach taken in the Proposed Changes is not consistent with the NPPF para 153 which states that, "Each Local Planning authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. This can be reviewed in whole or in part to respond flexibly to changing circumstances. Any additional development plan documents should only be used where clearly justified. " (my emphasis)
3. Given the time taken to prepare the Core Strategy , it commenced in 2007 and consultation on the Spatial Options took place in 2009, it is considered that in addition to the points above that there is a need for certainty in respect of how and where housing needs will be met.
4. There seems to be a lack of certainty in terms of the capacity of locations, in particular what can be delivered eg reference is made in SPC79 para 2.22 to the fact that the Placemaking Plan may reveal that a higher level of development here is appropriate than could be evidenced during the preparation of the Core Strategy. This reflects an uncertainty which is not addressed in the evidence base. (It is noted that this sentence does not appear in the latest version of the Schedule of the Proposed Changes, but it remains as a change in the Composite Version of the Plan.)

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

The Local Plan should be amended so that it is a composite document and identifies key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period in accordance with the NPPF para 47, para 153

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC6 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.05

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

An objection is made to the fact that the Core Strategy is to become Part 1 of the Local Plan and that the site specific proposals, even those that are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period will not be identified until the Placemaking Plan (Part 2 of the Local Plan) is prepared. Sites which are critical to the delivery of the Plan (i.e. those that are identified to be released from the Green Belt should be identified from the outset in the Plan). As currently proposed, the Core Strategy policies identify only the broad areas where strategic development will be delivered, but do not give a “clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal.” (NPPF para 154). This will delay delivery of sites which are critical to the delivery of the Plan.

This approach is unsound as it is not consistent with national policy Pegasus objects to this :-

- 1.This approach is not consistent with the NPPF para 47 which states that the Local Plan “... meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.” (my emphasis)
- 2.This approach is not consistent with the NPPF para 153 which states that e, “Each local planning authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. This can be reviewed in whole or in part to respond flexibly to changing circumstances. Any additional development plan documents should only be used where clearly justified.” (my emphasis)
- 3.Given the time taken to prepare the Core Strategy , it commenced in 2007 and consultation on the Spatial Options in 2009, it is considered that in addition to the points above that there is need for certainty in respect of how and where housing needs will be met.
- 4.There seems to be a lack of certainty in terms of what locations can delivery e.g. reference is made in SPC79 para 2.22 to the Placemaking Plan may reveal that a higher level of development here is appropriate than could be evidenced during the preparation of the Core Strategy. This reflects an uncertainty from the evidence base. (It is noted that this sentence does not appear in the latest version of the Schedule of the Proposed Changes, but it remains as a change in the Composite Version of the Plan.)

Change to the policy requested:

The Local Plan should be amended so that it is a composite document and identifies key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period in accordance with the NPPF para 47 and par 153)

Respondent Number: 4650 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Geoff Davis & Ms Tania Rodrigues **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC6 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.05

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The creation of a PLACE-MAKING Plan is a Supplementary Planning Policy devised by Bath and North East Somerset Council as a City-Centric strategy for placing developments. Such a device does not exist in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or the Localism Act, and it seeks to take away from those rural Parishes surrounding the City their democratic right under the NPPF to develop their own Neighbourhood Plans. B&NES Council argue that the development of the Place

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Making Plan would be much quicker than any Neighbourhood Plan. This of course will be the case if the Place Making Plan is the sole priority of B&NES Council.

The amendment is currently NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT as it seeks to supplant Neighbourhood Plans with the Place Making Plan. The Place Making Plan will not be subject to the same democratic processes as a Neighbourhood Plan, as it will be drafted by B&NES Planning Officers and approved only by Cabinet. It therefore excludes sections of the community from the process. This is counter to the Localism Act and is therefore potentially unlawful.

Change to the policy requested:

The section must be re-worded 'The Place-Making Plan together with Neighbourhood Plans will cover site allocations' and will include a statement to the effect that 'The Place Making Plan, together with Neighbourhood Plans will be adopted by Council', where this means B&NES Full Council, and that the Neighbourhood Plans are components of the Place Making Plan constructed and adopted simultaneously.

Respondent Number: 4711	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC6 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.05

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC6

1.10 SPC6 states that the Core Strategy will form Part 1 of a Local Plan which will identify broad locations for development, followed by the Placemaking Plan which will form Part 2 of a Local Plan and set out specific site allocations.

1.11 An objection is made to the fact that the Core Strategy is to become Part 1 of the Local Plan, however no strategic site allocations are proposed.

1.12 The Core Strategy identifies that Green Belt releases at land adjoining East Keynsham, South West Keynsham and Whitchurch will be required in order to meet the housing target for the plan period. However, allocation of a specific site and the revised Green Belt boundary will have to await the Placemaking Plan (Local Plan Part 2).

1.13 Such sites are critical to the delivery of the overall housing target to 2029, and therefore in accordance with paragraph 47, bullet one of the NPPF they should be identified from the outset of the Plan.

1.14 As currently proposed, the Core Strategy policies identify broad areas where strategic development will be delivered but do not give a "clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal" (NPPF paragraph 154) in these areas if they were to come forward before the Placemaking Plan. This will unnecessarily delay delivery of sites which are critical to the soundness of the plan.

1.15 Without a complete assessment of the available sites in these strategic locations now, including capacities, the Plan cannot be considered deliverable and therefore does not meet the tests of soundness.

1.16 Given the time taken to prepare the Core Strategy (commenced in 2007 and consultation on the Spatial Options in 2009), it is considered that there is a need for certainty in respect of how and where housing needs will be met now. Preparation of a complete Local Plan now is likely to be quicker than a second examination of a Local Plan Part 2.

1.17 In order to be consistent with national planning policy and found sound, the Core Strategy must identify specific sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy, such as those required at Keynsham and Whitchurch.

Change to the policy requested:

Sites which are critical to the delivery of the overall housing target must be identified (as opposed to broad locations) to demonstrate that the Plan is deliverable.

Change Ref. SPC8

Plan Ref.: Objective 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC8 **Plan Reference:** Objective 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

PHSV consider that the amendment to Objective 5 now needs to take account of the successful Legal Challenge to the North Somerset Core Strategy and should make it clear that the Local Plan meets latent demand, i.e. demand unrelated to the creation of new jobs.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC8 **Plan Reference:** Objective 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.18 SPC8 proposes to change the text of the Core Strategy to state that the overall housing and jobs targets respond to demographic and social changes and go 'as far as possible' to meet economic development objectives.

1.19 The NPPF is clear that local planning authorities should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area. To meet needs 'as far as possible' is therefore not compliant with national planning policy and is therefore an unsound approach.

1.20 In any case, BANES housing target does not 'go as far as possible' to support the labour supply required to meet its economic objectives.

1.21 The Core Strategy jobs target of 10,170 is based upon BANES delivering 12-15% of the LEP target of 95,000 new jobs by 2030, minus the 2,800 jobs lost at MOD sites in recent years. It is not therefore an overly ambitious target as it does not see the 2,800 jobs lost being recovered.

1.22 The overall jobs target does not therefore proactively drive economic growth as required by the NPPF. The NPPF paragraph 19 states that: "Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system".

1.23 The LEP target of 95,000 is derived from Oxford Economics Projections 2010. The BANES jobs target is therefore also derived from the Oxford Economics Projections.

1.24 According to the Oxford Economics projections you need high economic growth and high migration in order to deliver 95,000 jobs across the West of England by 2030. By contrast BANES Core Strategy is planning for low economic growth and low migration. According to the Oxford Economic Forecasts, low economic growth and low migration will support just 5,077 jobs in BANES by 2030.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1.25 The proposed housing target is derived from the ORS low migration scenario which is considered to be unrealistic for the plan period, taking account of historic trends, forthcoming changes to international migration policy and government/LEP objectives for growth.

1.26 The labour supply generated by the low trend migration scenario is very limited. According to ORS modelling, over 10 years a low migration trend will result in a total population increase of 16,600. By contrast the Oxford Economics Forecasts (from which BANES job target is taken) project a much higher population increase.

1.27 In order to meet its objectives for job growth, BANES is therefore reliant upon increased economic activity within the existing female population as a result of the planned increase in pension age. This is considered to be a novel and overly-optimistic assumption.

1.28 Please see the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update (at Appendix 2) submitted on behalf of Barratt Homes Bristol for full details of the grounds behind this objection.

1.29 The Core Strategy housing target cannot be said to 'go as far as possible' to support the labour supply to meet economic development objectives as it is based upon a low migration trend which does not plan positively for the district and is taken from a SHMA which is not NPPF compliant.

1.30 The Strategy is not therefore positively prepared (based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs), nor is it consistent with national planning policy.

1.31 To be found sound, an NPPF compliant SHMA must be undertaken jointly between the West of England Authorities, which forecasts realistic levels of migration and associated labour force.

1.32 Such a SHMA is already planned, as demonstrated by the Pre-Production Brief published jointly by the for West of England authorities on the West of England LEP website. BANES should await the results of this work before moving forward with the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

The housing target must meet objectively assessed needs in full (rather than go as far as possible). To do this it must be based upon an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, existing demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 170	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: Mr. Phil Hardwick	Respondent Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited
-------------------------------	--------------------------	---	---

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC8

Plan Reference: Objective 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The amended first bullet point of Objective 5 "Meeting housing needs" does not reflect the national policy in the NPPF in particular para 14. The presumption should be in favour of development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision making. The new wording proposed "and as far as possible" implies some limiting factor to objective 5. The NPPF states in para 14 that:

- "local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities, to meet the development needs of their area;
- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless - Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or - specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted." (this relates to e.g. sites protected under the Bird and Habitats Directives , land designated as Green Belt, AONB) However, the NPPF is

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

quite clear through the Core Principles (para 17) that “Every effort should be made to objectively to identify and then meet the housing , business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth”. It is considered that the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy do not respond positively to the wider opportunities for growth and that the West of England LEP projects “Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area – the City of Ideas.”

Change to the policy requested:

Objective 5 should be worded in a positive way which is consistent with the NPPF ie delete the phrase “ as far as possible”.

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton

Respondent Organisation: J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC8

Plan Reference: Objective 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The amended first bullet point of Objective 5 “Meeting housing needs” does not reflect the national policy in the NPPF in particular para 14. The presumption should be in favour of development which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision making. The new wording proposed “and as far as possible” implies some limiting factor to objective 5.

The NPPF states in para 14 that:

- “local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities, to meet the development needs of their area;
- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless -Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this framework taken as a whole; or

-specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.” (this relates to

e.g. sites protected under the Bird and Habitats Directives , land designated as Green Belt, AONB) However, the NPPF is quite clear through the Core Principles (para 17) that “Every effort should be made to objectively to identify and then meet the housing , business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth”. It is considered that the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy do not respond positively to the wider opportunities for growth and that the West of England LEP projects “Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area – the City of Ideas.”

Change to the policy requested:

Objective 5 should be worded in a positive way which is consistent with the NPPF ie delete the phrase “ as far as possible”.

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC8

Plan Reference: Objective 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This amended statement fails to address the fact that Radstock requires homes for local people and the jobs to go with them. Enabling a decline in out-commuting and promoting regeneration of the town; a similar situation applies throughout the Somer Valley. The emphasis on local infrastructure including making transport and sites available for local employment must be stated specifically, otherwise this section could be read as allowing dormitory developments for Bath and Bristol – this would be counter to the aspirations for regeneration and for addressing climate change objectives. Despite some mention of the first of these two in Objective 6, the overriding emphasis is not on this as written at present in Objective 5 as revised.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC8 **Plan Reference:** Objective 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1) RPS objects to the additional policy wording. In essence it renders the entire plan unsound as it automatically fails the test of being positively prepared.
 2) The plan must be prepared to meet the full objectively assessed needs of the area. The terms of paragraph 14 of the NPPF are only engaged once those needs have been established a robust process of environmental and sustainable appraisal has been followed to establish whether the impacts are so adverse that the needs cannot be met.
 3) The objective of the plan must be to meet the full objectively assessed needs of the area. The current wording suggests the pursuit of a restricted approach before the process has even begun.

Change to the policy requested:

Amend first bullet point of objective 5 to read:

- enabling the delivery of new homes needed to respond to expected demographic and social changes and as far as possible to support the labour supply to meet our economic development objectives

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC8 **Plan Reference:** Objective 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC8

1.18 SPC8 proposes to change the text of the Core Strategy to state that the overall housing and jobs targets respond to demographic and social changes and go ‘as far as possible’ to meet economic development objectives.

1.19 The NPPF is clear that local planning authorities should ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area. To meet needs ‘as far as possible’ is therefore not compliant with national planning policy and is therefore an unsound approach.

1.20 In any case, BANES housing target does not ‘go as far as possible’ to support the labour supply required to meet its economic objectives.

1.21 The Core Strategy jobs target of 10,170 is based upon BANES delivering 12-15% of the LEP target of 95,000 new jobs by 2030, minus the 2,800 jobs lost at MOD sites in recent years. It is not therefore an overly ambitious target as it does not see the 2,800 jobs lost being recovered.

1.22 The overall jobs target does not therefore proactively drive economic growth as required by the NPPF. The NPPF paragraph 19 states that: “Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system”.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1.23 The LEP target of 95,000 is derived from Oxford Economics Projections 2010. The BANES jobs target is therefore also derived from the Oxford Economics Projections.

1.24 According to the Oxford Economics projections you need high economic growth and high migration in order to deliver 95,000 jobs across the West of England 2030. By contrast BANES Core Strategy is planning for low economic growth and low migration. According to the Oxford Economic Forecasts, low economic growth and low migration will support just 5,077 jobs in BANES jobs by 2030.

1.25 The proposed housing target is derived from the ORS low migration scenario which is considered to be unrealistic for the plan period, taking account of historic trends, forthcoming changes to international migration policy and government/LEP objectives for growth.

1.26 The labour supply generated by the low trend migration scenario is very limited. According to ORS modelling, over 10 years a low migration trend will result in a total population increase of 16,600. By contrast the Oxford Economics Forecasts (from which BANES job target is taken) project a much higher population increase.

1.27 In order to meet its objectives for job growth, BANES is therefore reliant upon increased economic activity within the existing female population as a result of the planned increase in pension age. This is considered to be a novel and overly-optimistic assumption.

1.28 Please see the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update submitted on behalf of Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd for full details of the grounds behind this objection (this can be found at Appendix 1).

1.29 The Core Strategy housing target cannot be said to 'go as far as possible' to support the labour supply to meet economic development objectives as it is based upon a low migration trend which does not plan positively for the district and is taken from a SHMA which is not NPPF compliant.

1.30 The Strategy is not therefore positively prepared (based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development needs), nor is it consistent with national planning policy.

1.31 To be found sound, an NPPF compliant SHMA must be undertaken jointly between the West of England Authorities, which forecasts realistic levels of migration and associated labour force.

1.32 Such a SHMA is already planned, as demonstrated by the Pre-Production Brief published jointly by the for West of England authorities on the West of England LEP website. BANES should await the results of this work before moving forward with the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

The housing target must meet objectively assessed needs in full (rather than go as far as possible). To do this it must be based upon an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, existing demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Change Ref. SPC9

Plan Ref.: Objective 6

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 233

Comment Number: 1

Respondent Name: Mr John Douglas

Respondent Organisation: Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC9

Plan Reference: Objective 6

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support the greater clarity that 'local employment' and 'training' add to Objective 6 which sets out to address

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

inequalities. We believe that regeneration opportunities as proposed by our development must clearly accommodate local jobs and training alongside local food production for households as well as building homes. Our proposals include an additional 8 full time (FT) park jobs, 30 FT craft and retail unit jobs, 30 FT live/work jobs, 30+ FT micro business jobs, 14 FT marina and boatyard jobs and 2 FT education jobs, in addition to around 25+ part time / summer vacation jobs in peak seasons.

Our project will also incorporate an early learning aquatic centre for infants, an overflow grassed car park for community events and a dedicated mooring for river travellers, who are important members of a sustainable river community

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC10

Plan Ref.: Para 1.18

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC10

Plan Reference: Para 1.18

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Pegasus objects to the change that the plan states that the growth requirements are in accordance with the NPPF. The Proposed Changes are not sound as they are not consistent with national policy in the NPPF in particular the Core Planning Principles in para 17, para 47, they fail to boost significantly the housing supply, para 158 – 159. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has not been prepared for the wider area working with Neighbouring Local Planning Authorities as the housing market assessment crosses the administrative boundaries.

The SHMA update follows the previous West of England SHMA (2008) undertaken by the West of England SHMA Partnership. The Draft SHMA (February 2013) states that a full SHMA review is planned by BANES at later date. It is noted that a Pre-Production Brief for the West of England SHMA is out for consultation until 31st May 2013 but the timescale for the preparation of the SHMA is that the first outputs will not be available until the end of 2014 at best with a draft report anticipated in 2015. However, consultants have yet to be appointed.

The brief states that the West of England HMA will be assessed and redefined as necessary - this means that BANES ORS defined SHMA could change and that the BANES SHMA cannot adequately accommodate a review.

The proposed changes do not address the Inspector's Preliminary Conclusions as set out in ID/28 in particular para 1.2 and para 1.11 and in particular para 1.35 "In the absence of a SHMA based on the HMA, there is no up-to-date and NPPF compliant evidence to indicate housing needs of the wider area and whether there may be needs from Bristol that should be accommodated, in part at least, with this district. A cross border SHMA and the subsequent determination of the optimum spatial distribution of any such future needs around Bristol requires joint working between all the relevant authorities."

Change to the policy requested:

A comprehensive SHMA should be prepared to meet the requirements of the NPPF paras 158 and 159

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC10

Plan Reference: Para 1.18

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC10

1.33 Pegasus objects to the proposed change to paragraph 1.18 which implies that the Core Strategy growth targets now proposed are NPPF compliant.

1.34 The separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update' (at Appendix 2) submitted to the consultation on behalf of Barratt Homes Bristol demonstrates in considerable detail why the housing target proposed by BANES is not NPPF compliant and will not support the delivery of its jobs target.

1.35 The SHMA update and proposed changes to the Core Strategy do not therefore address the Inspector's Preliminary Conclusions as set out in ID/28 which stated: "In the absence of a SHMA based on the HMA, there is no up-to-date and NPPF compliant evidence to indicate housing needs of the wider area and whether there may be needs from Bristol that should be accommodated, in part at least, within this district. A cross-border SHMA and the subsequent determination of the optimum spatial distribution of any such future needs around Bristol requires joint working between all relevant authorities".

1.36 In order to proceed BANES should prepare a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA by working with its neighbouring West of England authorities. Such a SHMA is already planned, as demonstrated by the Pre-Production Brief published jointly by the four authorities on the West of England LEP website. BANES should await the results of this work before moving forward with the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, existing demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 180 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton**Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC10

Plan Reference: Para 1.18

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Pegasus objects to the change that the plan states that the growth requirements are in accordance with the NPPF. The Proposed Changes are not sound as they are not consistent with national policy in the NPPF, in particular the Core Planning Principles in para 17, para 47, the Proposed Change fails to boost significantly the housing supply, para 158 – 159. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) has not been prepared for the wider area working with Neighbouring Local Planning Authorities. The HMA crosses the administrative boundaries of BANES.

The SHMA update follows the previous West of England SHMA (2008) undertaken by the West of England SHMA Partnership. The Draft SHMA (February 2013) states that a full SHMA review is planned by BANES at later date. It is noted that a Pre-Production Brief for the West of England SHMA is out for consultation until 31st May 2013 but the timescale for the preparation of the SHMA is that the first outputs will not be available until the end of 2014 at best with a draft report anticipated in 2015. However, consultants have yet to be appointed.

The brief states that the West of England HMA will be assessed and redefined as necessary - this means that BANES ORS defined SHMA could change and that the BANES SHMA cannot adequately accommodate a review.

The proposed changes do not address the Inspector's Preliminary Conclusions as set out in ID/28 in particular para 1.2 and para 1.11 and in particular para 1.35 "In the absence of a SHMA based on the HMA, there is no up-to-date and NPPF compliant evidence to indicate housing needs of the wider area and whether there may be needs from Bristol that should

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

be accommodated, in part at least, with this district. A cross border SHMA and the subsequent determination of the optimum spatial distribution of any such future needs around Bristol requires joint working between all the relevant authorities.”

Change to the policy requested:

A comprehensive SHMA should be prepared to meet the requirements of the NPPF paras 158 and 159

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 17 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell

Respondent Organisation: South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC10

Plan Reference: Para 1.18

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The core strategy does not explain the close working relationship required by the West of England Partnership with Wilshire Council and the area around Trowbridge, Bradford On Avon, Melksham, Westbury, Warminster, Corsham, Chippenham, Frome, Wells, Glastonbury, and Street. The regional spatial strategy identified Bath and Bristol City region for growth as the Bristol and Bath City region with close working across the West of England authorities including Somerset and Wiltshire to develop a public transport network including the Greater Bristol Metro rail lines through Bristol, Keynsham and Bath through to Bradford on Avon, Trowbridge, Westbury, Warminster, and Frome onwards to Yeovil, Weymouth and Radstock including the bus network to link housing and growth in these areas.

Change to the policy requested:

Duty to cooperate on planning and development between the West of England authorities such as BANES, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire, Bristol City Council, Mendip and West Wiltshire for land use and transport planning.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC10

Plan Reference: Para 1.18

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC10

1.33 Pegasus objects to the proposed change to paragraph 1.18 which implies that the Core Strategy growth targets now proposed are NPPF compliant.

1.34 The separate ‘Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update’ submitted to the consultation on behalf of Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd demonstrates in considerable detail why the housing target proposed by BANES is not NPPF compliant and will not support the delivery of its jobs target.

1.35 The SHMA update and proposed changes to the Core Strategy do not therefore address the Inspector’s Preliminary Conclusions as set out in ID/28 which stated: “In the absence of a SHMA based on the HMA, there is no up-to-date and NPPF compliant evidence to indicate housing needs of the wider area and whether there may be needs from Bristol that should be accommodated, in part at least, within this district. A cross- border SHMA and the subsequent determination of the optimum spatial distribution of any such future needs around Bristol requires joint working between all relevant authorities”.

1.36 In order to proceed BANES should prepare a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA by working with its neighbouring West

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

of England authorities. Such a SHMA is already planned, as demonstrated by the Pre-Production Brief published jointly by the four authorities on the West of England LEP website. BANES should await the results of this work before moving forward with the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, existing demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Change Ref. SPC12

Plan Ref.: Para 1.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC12

Plan Reference: Para 1.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We object to the highlighting of Bath in a catch-all fashion and request that sites of European importance are listed by name or else that further emphasis is placed on the richness of the whole area. The introduction of the issue of Bath as a World Heritage site at this point deflects from the core subject matter of this section. Not accurate or clear as intended in the reasons for change. Development in Radstock might well lead to conflicts around the HRA and development plan as cited in this section.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Change Ref. SPC13

Plan Ref.: Para 1.23

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 301 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South West HARP Planning Consortium

Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC13

Plan Reference: Para 1.23

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC5 - Plan Period

We note that the Council has extended the end of its plan period from 2026 to 2029. We consider this to be sound alteration which brings the Council's policies in line with the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 2564 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins **Respondent Organisation:** Strategic Land Partnerships

Agent ID: 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC13 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.23

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Core Strategy should recognise the changes that are predicted to occur in the population structure and the increasing numbers of elderly people. This generates specific needs for the provision of accommodation for elderly people and also of care homes. This should be recognised within the Core Strategy policies as a specific part of the mix of houses required. This would be in line with the NPPF requirements set out in paragraph 159 which states that authorities should have a clear understanding of housing need in their area. Consequently this policy should specifically include provision for older peoples housing and care home developments

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy should include reference to the provision of older people's accommodation and care homes which meets important needs of the local population.

Respondent Number: 4650 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Geoff Davis & Ms Tania Rodrigues **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC13 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.23

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I quote the proposed amendment:-
'These European Sites are protected through the Habitat Regulations. In this context bats are a significant issue as the District supports important bat foraging areas, commuting routes and roots of importance to the integrity of up to 3 European Sites. For Clarity development likely to have a significant effect on a European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, and which cannot be adequately mitigated, would not be in accordance with the development plan.'
It is difficult to see how this squares with proposals which would put at risk just such a Bat Foraging area.

Change to the policy requested:

Some honesty is required here. Either remove the proposed development on these important areas, or state that the Bats are of secondary importance.
This inconsistency in policy renders the Core Strategy UNSOUND.

Change Ref. SPC14**Plan Ref.: Para 1.26****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Proposed Change is considered to be unsound as it is not consistent with the NPPF, justified or effective. The Core Strategy plan period has changed from 2006 – 2026 to 2011 – 2029. The proposed housing requirement is now 12,700 dwellings an increase from 11,500 dwellings (the figure of 11,500 was agreed during the examination for the twenty year period).

Plans should be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. The provision of housing is a larger than local issue and there is no evidence of joint working in terms of the preparation of the SHMA and the assessment of housing and development needs as requested in the Inspectors Preliminary Conclusions in ID/28. (see attached paper).

Whilst the recognition of the need to release some land from the Green Belt is welcomed, as there are proven exceptional circumstances, it is considered that the Proposed Changes do not address the principle of the Green Belt Review as set out in para 83 of the NPPF. When a Local Plan is reviewed it is at that time that the Green Belt boundaries need to be re-considered having “regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

As the Proposed Changes do not identify specific sites in the Green Belt, only general areas (as the detailed boundaries will be established through the Placemaking Plan) this approach is considered to be contrary to the NPPF. The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt are to be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan; it is considered that this should be undertaken through the Core Strategy as the sites are key to the delivery of the Plan (NPPF para 47) and particularly given the length of time taken to prepare the Core Strategy (since 2007) there is a need to provide certainty and clarity in the strategy and consistent with the NPPF (Para 153).

Change to the policy requested:

The housing provision should be reconsidered in view of the need to produce a SHMA in accordance with para 158 – 159 of the NPPF. The housing provision should be based on an objective assessment of housing needs in accordance with the NPPF and revised figure included in Policy DW1.

The strategic sites which are key to the delivery of the housing strategy in the plan period should be identified in the Core Strategy and where these are located in the Green, the boundary of the Green Belt should be redefined and the sites allocated in the Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis

Respondent Organisation: Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Continues to refer to the priority to steer growth to brown field land in the urban areas and Modification SPC209 refers to 80% of new housing on previously developed land. This is clearly contrary to NPPF Paragraph 17 Core Planning Principles 8th Bullet Point. This suggests Plans should “encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brown field land) provided it is not of high environmental value”. Therefore, the NPPF Policy is to encourage, not to prioritise and protect previously developed land.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 243 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Donna McClelland

Respondent Organisation: Chew Magna Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Chew Magna Parish Council would like B&NES to ensure that brown field sites are put forward for development over green field sites to maintain the conservation area and that all rural development occurs over a long period of time rather than all allocations used in one large development.

Change to the policy requested:
Respondent Number: 263 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Dave Ogborne

Respondent Organisation: Wessex Water
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I refer to the proposals outlined in Table 8 of the Council Report (Locations Recommended for Identification in the Core Strategy), which indicate the additional sites within the BaNES area allocated to meet housing targets over the plan period .

I regret that we have been unable to complete detailed assessments for these sites in the time available. The most significant impact upon water and sewerage services will be focussed upon the existing networks of distribution mains and public sewers.

Where sites are located at the boundaries of developed areas there will be limited capacity available at the extremities of the system. Given that the numbers have been limited and providing the rate of development is controlled over a number of years or a suitable period Wessex Water will be able to prepare

- Detailed appraisals as sites are brought forward through the planning process
- Plan the necessary improvements and establish the thresholds at which capacity is needed
- Improvement schemes necessary with phasing arrangements where possible

We will be seeking planning conditions to secure an agreed drainage strategy for each site together with any relevant contributions.

Change to the policy requested:
Respondent Number: 264 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Brian Huggett

Respondent Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Within our previous submission Englishcombe Parish Council expressed concern at the use of AONB and Green Belt land being used for development of housing. Also the revision of the Green Belt boundary.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Strands of this are contained in a number of SPC's, and rather than burden the Inspector with individual forms, I hope that the following list of objection to policies contained in these SPC's can be taken into consideration: SPC 14, 15, 19, 24, 31, 46, 47, 54, 87, 150, 171, 183 & 184

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC14 (Need for Greenfield sites) I object to the this paragraph as I believe that increasing the density of housing on the brownfield sites would remove the necessity of building on the greenfield sites. Council's assessment has shown to sustain the number of houses required for job creation that only 10,000 hours would be required, this would exclude the greenfield sites

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

By increasing the density of housing in brownfield sites no extra land would be required.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4594 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Robin Daniel

Respondent Organisation: Cotswold-IT

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

"Release of land from the Green Belt because these are the most sustainable locations" does not make sense. No Green Belt land can be claimed as "sustainable" if it has been built upon. In particular, I gather that parts of the Green Belt which you propose to remove from that designation are both within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and are archaeologically important sites (sections of Wansdyke). On both these counts scheduling such land for development is inappropriate.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Replace the changed text in SPC14 and SPC15 referring to release of land from the Green Belt with the previous text which does not so refer.

Respondent Number: 4609 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mark O'Sullivan **Respondent Organisation:** Resource Synergies Ltd

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I believe that the changes proposed to make increased provision for housing development are not justified, nor consistent with national policy.

The draft Plan sets out very summarily the natural, historical and built heritage of the Council's area and the extent to which this has been recognised by national and international authorities in designation of the WHS, AONBs, Green Belt, SSSIs and other protected areas. It then explains the extent to which it seeks to erode this extraordinary and world-renowned natural heritage for the sake of housing provision which the Council itself thought only last year was unnecessary.

Among the factors contributing to this change of mind – along with the force majeure of last year's examination report – is (i) a report on housing supply claiming that Bath and its area constitutes an independent housing market from that of Bristol, and one within which a certain level of demand must be met, and (ii) a belief that household sizes will continue to decrease, raising that level of housing demand in the future.

Household size &c

In relation to (ii) above, the very recent data from the 2011 census shows that the secular decline in household size has now been reversed. In the absence of clear evidence to the contrary this change in the trend should now be projected ahead into the plan period, and the forecasts of housing demand and the consequential housing land provision in the Core Strategy should be revised downward accordingly.

Need for housing provision

However, much bigger issues fall to be addressed in relation to (i), namely the appropriate area to be considered when looking at the local housing market, and the implications of this for the assessment of housing need to be satisfied within the boundaries of B&NES.

Size of the housing market

The county of Avon, including Bath, is an area still used for transport planning through the Joint Local Transport Plan prepared in common by the four unitary councils, and was established in 1974 on the basis of the then recognised Bristol travel-to-work area. Since then, communications have improved and habits of longer-distance commuting have increased, which implies that the extent of the travel-to-work area should have increased. Definitions, however, have been revised, and the current ONS map shows Bath as the centre of its own travel-to-work area: this is supposed to be a collection of wards for which, of the resident economically active population, at least 75% actually work in the area, and for which also, of everyone working in the area, at least 75% actually live in the area (although this figure is unsupported by empirical research and is in effect an arbitrary one).

The identification of strategic housing markets for the present Core Strategy is contained in a report made by ORS in March 2013, which in its primary analysis of the data identifies the city of Bath as insufficiently self-contained to be the centre of an independent housing market (on the grounds that fewer than 65% of employees living in the area also work in the area (Fig 3 in Ch 2) – though this figure is also debateable). It is only as a result of modelling work to reassess certain

commuting flows that it comes to the conclusion that it is legitimate to treat Bath as the focus of the strategic housing market in its own right.

The ORS report relies on a 2010 study by Colin Jones and others, commissioned by the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit, and entitled Geography of Housing Market Areas in England; and a 2007 CLG advice note on Identifying Sub-regional Housing Market Areas. The latter document is no longer available on Government websites, and a fortiori can be assumed no longer to represent active Government policy. The former is evidently correct, as a matter of common sense, in asserting that “the limits to a ... HMA are determined by travel to work patterns” (p.6); and in consequence, while it discusses the role of migration as well as commuting in the derivation of Housing Market Areas, its construction of “strategic” or “framework” HMAs across England was based on a grouping algorithm derived from that used to define TTWAs (p. 28).

That paper discusses at some length the difficulties of its ultimate theoretical base. It details its reliance on false simplifying assumptions (such as that only one type of house exists, that all employment is in the city centre, that all travel is by car along straight roads), and the expedients it resorts to in order to correct for these. It admits that a very wide range of exogenous influences interrupt the operation of a free market within a framework housing market area (one might cite housing size preferences, housing type preferences, school catchment areas, reluctance to abandon social ties, road patterns, traffic issues, rail links). It expresses the aspiration that at least to some extent these can be represented by modelling subordinate local housing areas within it, and submarkets within these (perhaps for smaller areas yet, perhaps for particular types or characteristics of house), though it does not claim itself to attempt to go below the second-tier local HMA level. Moreover, both at the strategic and at the local level it makes the fundamental admission that “a key problem is that there is no theoretical basis for the degree of closure which will be required of the HMAs” (p. 8). This amounts to a massive, one might say heroic, modelling exercise, in which hypothetical assumptions of very varying reliability are piled upon each other like Pelion on Ossa.

Clearly its most fundamental ground assumption must be correct: that a key constraint on a housing market must be the journeys people are prepared to make to travel from home to work. Equally clearly, the conclusions finally drawn from it, after all the adjustments, may be far indeed from a reliable prediction of what will take place. However appealing this edifice of assumptions may be in theory, I am not aware of any evidence that it produces conclusions which can be demonstrated to be reasonably accurate in its actual results – at least at any level lower than that of the broadest strategic travel-to-work area. Moreover, even the data on which the assumptions about travel-to-work areas and strategic housing markets are based derive from the 2001 census, and are now over 12 years old, in a period when commuting has been increasing in volume and distance (for much of that time, at a rapid pace).

These weaknesses do not of course mean that the ORS report is nonsense. It is a plausible interpretation of the information that exists, and may well be the best interpretation available at present. And I have no doubt that it is the orthodox interpretation. However, they do affect the weight which should be given to it in the present context. It is plain, I submit, that the assertion that the city of Bath is the focus of a housing market which is materially separate from that of Bristol is an assertion built on sand: it relies on old data which are likely to have changed; it relies on a series of hypothetical assumptions which may or may not be true, and which depend upon each other to the point where a single error may bring much of the edifice crashing down; and it relies on a model which is untested by reality. It is a fair working hypothesis, but, even at a time when new housing must be one of our very highest priorities, it should not be allowed to stand if other important considerations are inconsistent with it.

Conservation considerations

The whole of the city of Bath is a World Heritage Site and a conservation area, and it is surrounded by the Cotswolds AONB and by Green Belt. §132 of the National Planning Policy Framework says: “When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification... Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably ... World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.” §§115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework says: “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty... Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances.” As set out by the NPPF, one of the core planning principles is protecting the Green Belt (§17), and §84 says

“When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.” This statement requires authorities not only to seek to promote development, but to ensure that it is sustainable – but development which is inconsistent with a major heritage asset is not sustainable: it will constantly be challenged by the need to restore the balance, and it will in the end fail.

If these policies are to be given due weight, then all these protected areas and their settings should be appropriately safeguarded and enhanced. This presents B&NES Council, perhaps even more than its neighbours, with an unenviable problem. Like a number of other local planning authorities (eg Cotswold), a very large part of its greenfield land is in heritage terms of such explicit merit that in the national interest it must be protected from development. But it is faced with a housing demand which needs to be met.

Part of this can be provided for by the reuse of brownfield land within existing settlements, and the Council’s current proposals show considerable ingenuity in finding such sites – though there are clearly limits to what is possible in a city of this character, and as the Council’s Green Infrastructure Plan makes clear the limit has been reached in relation to brownfield land which is green space, such as playing fields. However, some of the present proposals do not meet the test of conformity with Government policy on protected landscapes and heritage sites. It is doubtful, for example, that any of the four urban extension sites around the city of Bath could be developed without harming the Bath skyline, or areas of outstanding protected countryside or historic monuments or their settings. There remains therefore a considerable problem.

Economic considerations

The West of England LEP’s Barriers to Growth survey of regional businesses last July asked respondents about the benefits of being located in the West of England. It found that the "overall attractiveness of the area" was cited by over half of them as the main benefit, and was nearly three times as important as other factors such as communications.

Since the turn of the millennium there has been a growing focus under all colours of national government upon the need to see city-regions as the main poles for the development of economic activity and the built environment. The major report State of the English Cities (Michael Parkinson and 15 others, ODPM 2006, §12.3.13) included a case study of the Bristol city-region including Bath and North East Somerset, and said “... there are concerns about the implications of growth in the [Bristol] City-Region. There is a willingness to accommodate more jobs and population. There is also a consensus that growth would only be possible if there was sufficient transport and community infrastructure to protect one of the key aspects of the region’s prosperity – the quality of life for its skilled potentially mobile workforce. There is no wish to repeat in the City-Region the failings of the unregulated development of the 1980s. There were concerns that such a process would diminish its assets and attractiveness and this emphasises the importance of national investment in infrastructure. This presents a real challenge to government and underlines the need to not only will the ends – but also the means – of sustainable growth.”

Businesses need space for offices and factories; and they need houses their employees can afford to live in. But it is plain from this that there is a strong argument that the economic vitality of the West of England depends just as much on the retention and enhancement of its landscape and heritage advantages. It would be an error for the B&NES Core Strategy to make provision which would might diminish these, and the ill-effects would fall not on B&NES alone but on the wider West of England.

Failure of the duty to co-operate under S110 of the Localism Act

Following the section quoted above, State of the English Cities next takes its argument from the example of the ex-Avon councils further, by lamenting the lack of co-operation between local authorities, and calling for financial incentives to encourage it if exhortation fails.

Incentives are not within the gift of the Inspector, and the duty to co-operate is one to be exercised at the plan-making stage rather than in the examination, but I would urge that the present proceedings consider carefully how better co-operation could be obtained to this end in the West of England. In my view it will not be possible to satisfy the assessed housing demand for B&NES over the plan period by finding within the Authority’s boundaries land which it would be acceptable to develop, in terms of the Government’s policies on the protection of landscape and heritage. Accordingly I believe that there is an obligation on the Council to continue to seek that neighbouring local planning authorities should instead make the appropriate provision, and on those authorities to make such provision accordingly. I ask that the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Inspector find that this approach is needed, thus increasing the pressure on surrounding authorities to take the necessary steps.

Change to the policy requested:

The change I seek above is unsuitable for this mode of response: it would need to be worked through by the Inspector in the light of other consequences of the present exercise.

Respondent Number: 4612	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: The Elms Weston Bath Management Co
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The stated number of homes required – 12,700 and jobs – 10,170 suggest very few homes with more than a single worker.

It has not been shown how or where that correlation has been calculated.

The breakdown of Job Location – table 9 / item 5.30 of Annexe No 1. is disproportionate for the B&NES area – 6,750 for Bath as against 3,420 for the whole of the remainder.

It has not been established that there is scope for the expansion of the retail and services sectors to support the above Job Increase figures. There are no stated aims to encourage manufacturing in Bath, nor where any such employment opportunities may be established.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4642	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: Mrs Deborah Bensley	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC14 (Need for Greenfield sites) I object to the this paragraph as I believe that increasing the density from 35 per hectare of housing on the brownfield sites would remove the necessity of building on the greenfield sites.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4654	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: Professor Sir Michael Gregory	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID: 157	Agent Name: Origin3		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Change Ref: SPC14

The proposed amendment to paragraph 1.26 is supported with regard to the increased provision of new housing development from 11,000 to 12,700 dwellings. The proposed increased provision of development for new jobs is also supported to ensure balanced development growth.

Change SPC14 also identifies the need to release land from the Green Belt in sustainable locations in order to accommodate the increased requirements for growth. Land at Whitchurch is appropriate for Green Belt review in this regard.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down****Respondent Number:** 4524 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Cardinal Close Residents**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC14**Plan Reference:** Para 1.26**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC14 need to build on greenfield sites.

We object to this as an increase in density on brown field sites would remove the necessity to build on green field sites.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4547 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martin Davis**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC14**Plan Reference:** Para 1.26**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

AONB LAND ENJOYS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF PROTECTION AGAINST UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS ONLY ALLOWED IF IT IS IN THE 'LOCAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST'

NO SUCH EVIDENCE HAS BEEN PUT FORWARD.

THE PROPOSED CHAGE AND PLAN IS THEREFORE UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham****Respondent Number:** 275 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd**Agent ID:** 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Council has failed to demonstrate that, insofar as the provision for new homes is concerned, it has met the national planning policy imperatives set out at paragraphs 17, 47, 48, 159 and 182 of the NPPF, namely:

- Base its plan on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues (NPPF Paragraph 17) irrespective of the legal duty to co-operate
- That every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth (NPPF Paragraph 17)
- Use their evidence to ensure their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing (NPPF Paragraph 47)
- Identify a five years supply of specific deliverable site (NPPF Paragraph 47)
- Only make allowance for windfall sites in the first 5 years where there is compelling evidence for doing so (NPPF Paragraph 48)
- Crucially, Local Plans should... be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities (NPPF Paragraph 157)
- Prepare a SHMA to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries (NPPF Paragraph 157)
- The SHMA should identify the scale .. of housing (NPPF Paragraph 159)
- Prepare a SHLAA to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period (NPPF Paragraph 159)
- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. (NPPF Paragraph 182)

There is no clear and transparent objective explanation as to how the Council arrives at its figure of 12,700 dwellings having regard to the SHMA and the SHLAA. It still appears to us that the Plan results in a substantial shortfall in meeting housing needs.

We are still anticipating that the Council will be seeking to address some of the above shortcomings prior to the resumption of the hearing sessions later in the summer, but until it does, participants will not be able to be more specific and consequently more constructive in their analyses at this stage.

For example, the Council says that it has reassessed the small sites windfall allowance in light of paragraph 48 of the NPPF (Ref: BNES/40 paragraph 5.2). However, on its own admission, this assessment is confined to considering historic delivery rates. Paragraph 48 is clear, however, that LPAs may only make such an allowance if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. The Council has indicated that it will publish its evidence in relation to the "rate of replenishment of the stock of permissions" in May, but this is after this round of consultation closes. In the circumstances therefore we cannot conclude that there is compelling evidence in this regard, as required by the NPPF.

Notwithstanding the above, there is nothing in the work undertaken on the SHMA or indeed the Green Belt Review to provide any hint that the Council has engaged in any meaningful joint working and co-operation with adjoining authorities where housing market areas evidently cross the administrative boundary. Clearly the opportunity to rectify that now, so late in the suspension period, is very limited to say the least.

Change to the policy requested:

Requested Change: That the housing figure is based on, and transparently linked to, a NPPF-compliant objective assessment based on joint working and co-operation.

Respondent Number: 275**Comment Number:** 3**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd**Agent ID:** 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Council has failed to demonstrate that, insofar as the provision for new homes is concerned, it has met the national planning policy imperatives set out at paragraphs 17, 47, 48, 159 and 182 of the NPPF, namely:

- Base its plan on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues (NPPF Paragraph 17) irrespective of the legal duty to co-operate
- That every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth (NPPF Paragraph 17)
- Use their evidence to ensure their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing (NPPF Paragraph 47)
- Identify a five years supply of specific deliverable site (NPPF Paragraph 47)
- Only make allowance for windfall sites in the first 5 years where there is compelling evidence for doing so (NPPF Paragraph 48)
- Crucially, Local Plans should... be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities (NPPF Paragraph 157)
- Prepare a SHMA to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries (NPPF Paragraph 157)
- The SHMA should identify the scale .. of housing (NPPF Paragraph 159)
- Prepare a SHLAA to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period (NPPF Paragraph 159)
- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. (NPPF Paragraph 182)

There is no clear and transparent objective explanation as to how the Council arrives at its figure of 12,700 dwellings having regard to the SHMA and the SHLAA. It still appears to us that the Plan results in a substantial shortfall in meeting housing needs.

We are still anticipating that the Council will be seeking to address some of the above shortcomings prior to the resumption of the hearing sessions later in the summer, but until it does, participants will not be able to be more specific and consequently more constructive in their analyses at this stage.

For example, the Council says that it has reassessed the small sites windfall allowance in light of paragraph 48 of the NPPF (Ref: BNES/40 paragraph 5.2). However, on its own admission, this assessment is confined to considering historic delivery rates. Paragraph 48 is clear, however, that LPAs may only make such an allowance if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. The Council has indicated that it will publish its evidence in relation to the "rate of replenishment of the stock of permissions" in May, but this is after this round of consultation closes. In the circumstances therefore we cannot conclude that there is compelling evidence in this regard, as required by the NPPF.

Notwithstanding the above, there is nothing in the work undertaken on the SHMA or indeed the Green Belt Review to provide any hint that the Council has engaged in any meaningful joint working and co-operation with adjoining authorities where housing market areas evidently cross the administrative boundary. Clearly the opportunity to rectify that now, so late in the suspension period, is very limited to say the least.

Change to the policy requested:

Requested Change: That the housing figure is based on, and transparently linked to, a NPPF-compliant objective assessment based on joint working and co-operation.

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This proposed change is not justified by, nor is the prospect of this reflected in the introduction to, the Ove Arup's Stage One Green Belt Review. This Review only foreshadows a second stage that "will focus on the specific areas of land where Green Belt releases or additions are proposed, providing recommendations on detailed boundary changes."

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The NPPF is unequivocal that LPAs should “satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period”. This fundamental flaw to such a crucial element of the Plan is reinforced by what appears more of an after thought at SPC172: and proposed new para 6.63A i.e. that: “the issue of safeguarding land will be considered in the Placemaking Plan”. This is a clear admission of there being an anticipated risk of ad hoc alterations being required during and

beyond the Core Strategy period; the very risk that Ove Arup indicated should be limited and we say should be avoided if at all possible through judicious identification now of safeguarded land. The Council’s approach risks undermining confidence in Green Belt as a strategic long term planning tool.

There is simply no support whatsoever in the NPPF for relegating/postponing the consideration of safeguarded land, which is a long-term issue of strategic importance, to a subsequent DPD.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Change to the policy requested:

That the Council identifies sufficient safeguarded land in order to meet long-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period in accordance with Paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 151 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Dunkerton Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Dunkerton Parish Council strongly believes that brownfield solutions must be fully utilised before Green Belt land is released

Change to the policy requested:

Before this Green Belt land is allocated for development all available brownfield sites must be utilised

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Proposed Change is considered to be unsound as it is not consistent with the NPPF, justified or effective.

The Core Strategy plan period has changed from 2006 – 2026 to 2011 – 2029. The proposed housing requirement is now 12,700 dwellings an increase from 11,500 dwellings (the figure of 11,500 was agreed during the examination for the twenty year period).

Plans should be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. The provision of housing is a larger than local issue and there is no evidence of joint working in terms of the preparation of the SHMA and the assessment of housing and development needs as requested in the Inspectors Preliminary Conclusions in ID/28. (see attached paper).

Whilst the recognition of the need to release some land from the Green Belt is welcomed, as there are proven exceptional circumstances, it is considered that the Proposed Changes do not address the principle of the Green Belt Review as set out in para 83 of the NPPF. When a Local Plan is reviewed it is at that time that the Green Belt boundaries need to be re-considered having “regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

As the Proposed Changes do not identify specific sites in the Green Belt, only general areas (as the detailed boundaries will be established through the Placemaking Plan) this approach is considered to be contrary to the NPPF. The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt are to be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan; it is considered that this should be undertaken through the Core Strategy as the sites are key to the delivery of the Plan (NPPF para 47) and particularly given the length of time taken to prepare the Core Strategy (since 2007) there is a need to provide certainty and clarity in the strategy and consistent with the NPPF (Para 153).

Change to the policy requested:

The housing provision should be reconsidered in view of the need to produce a SHMA in accordance with para 158 – 159 of the NPPF. The housing provision should be based on an objective assessment of housing needs in accordance with the NPPF and revised figure included in Policy DW1.

The strategic sites which are key to the delivery of the housing strategy in the plan period should be identified in the Core Strategy and where these are located in the Green, the boundary of the Green Belt should be redefined and the sites allocated in the Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

So far, there is no evidence that the aims as expressed here will be realized. The ways in which impact on the environment have been measured requires clarification

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 320 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Jolliffe **Respondent Organisation:** Ammerdown Estate

Agent ID: 45 **Agent Name:** Savills Planning and Regeneration

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC14 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We are supportive of this increase in the housing target for BANES as a whole, which is needed in order to fulfil identified need and ensure consistency with the NPPF. We would however suggest that the policy is modified to confirm that housing numbers are minimum figures, rather than limits.

Change to the policy requested:

In paragraph 1.26, where there are references are housing targets, replace the word “around” with the words “at least”. This is consistent with the approach of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, where the Inspector concluded that targets should represent “a floor, not a ceiling”, to accord with the NPPF.

Respondent Number: 2012 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Steven Gourley **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The overall housing development need described in SPC13 includes that for “under provision in previous years” to reflect the Inspector’s concerns in ID/28. This seems to relate to the instruction in p1.39 which seems to be prompted by the need to prevent the creation of a precedent for ignoring past shortfalls that would “[create] a self-fulfilling justification for less housing growth to be planned than is required”.

This number relates to 1169 houses. It is the reason why the planners have had to propose to build homes in AONB and Green Belt around Bath. It is important to justify the inclusion of this shortfall in order to justify building on AONB land. As I understand it, the planners have calculated the housing requirement according to the NPPF and then have increased that requirement to include this past shortfall. There are two points:

- Surely the NPPF planning models are forward looking – and so any past shortfall is already included in the housing need forecasts. So adding this past shortfall after the fact represents double-counting and artificially over-states the housing need at huge cost to the environment and heritage of Bath.
- The Inspector’s comments in 1.39 convey the impression that this addition of the shortfall to the housing requirement is a punishment for future misdeeds. Surely, after reflection on the long-term detriment this penalty imposes on Bath, the Inspector could devise a better, fairer, way of preventing past failures from compromising future planning decisions?

Change to the policy requested:

The bullet “Under provision in previous years” SPC13 should be removed and the total housing numbers set out in SP14 adjusted accordingly – reduced by an overall 1169 dwellings, according to ID/28 p 1.37.

Respondent Number:	2012	Comment Number:	2	Respondent Name:	Steven Gourley	Respondent Organisation:	
---------------------------	------	------------------------	---	-------------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I understand that the overall housing development need described in SPC14 has been determined in accordance with NPPF guidelines. But it has also been inflated, according to briefing papers prepared for B&NES Council.

This inflation of the forecast has made it necessary for the planners to propose homes to be built in AONB and Green Belt land around Bath. This urban extension – particularly around South Stoke (land adjoining Odd Down) – will have a detrimental impact on Bath and our national heritage.

According to the Council papers: “the SHLAA indicates a supply of around only 2,500 affordable units. This is a shortfall of 590 dwellings against the evidenced need of around 3,110 social rented/affordable rented units. NPPF requires that all housing requirements are met. It is therefore necessary to boost the overall supply of housing by around 1,422-1,897 dwellings to facilitate delivery of the additional 569 affordable houses”.

I don’t dispute the need to make up this shortfall of 590 houses. But this inflation of the requirement by about 1600 houses is completely unsustainable in the long run. The plans don’t appear to include study of alternative ways of providing this shortfall affordable housing in Bath.

SPC177 includes “social rented housing: i.e. rented housing owned and managed by local authorities (or Registered Social Landlords for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime)”. This seems to offer a vision of an alternative. The Core Strategy should include a commitment to explore such alternatives.

Change to the policy requested:

The total housing numbers set out in SP14 should be revised down to match the actual requirements for commercial and affordable housing. This will require the development of a proposal to build the 590 dwelling shortfall in affordable housing not built by private-sector developers.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 2564 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins**Respondent Organisation:** Strategic Land Partnerships**Agent ID:** 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We object to the methodology contained within the SHMA and how it has been interpreted by the Council to identify a robust objectively assessed need for housing. While we welcome the attempt to deliver more housing it is important that the figure of 12,700 homes between 2011 and 2029 is seen as an absolute minimum level of housing which merely rolls forward low growth. Such a level largely fails to meet the NPPF requirement to significantly boost supply and deliver sustainable economic development. We would expect the figure to be more like 13,500 homes required if the West of England employment objectives are going to be fulfilled. It is imperative to provide for the needs that exist from the local population and deliver the affordable housing need that exists within BANES.

It is important that any attempt to reduce the housing provision as a result of the recently published 2011 based interim household projections is resisted. The interim projections are not forecasts and in no way purport to illustrate the objectively assessed need for BANES over the plan period as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically we highlight a number of concerns relating to the methodology used, assumptions applied and lack of sensitivity testing that has been undertaken.

These projections are 'interim' and cover the period 2011 to 2021. Consequently they only cover the short term and do not provide a robust basis on which to plan for the medium to long term which is covered by the plan period. As with all projections they are based on trends for the previous 5 years. As the notes to the projections states 'They are not an assessment of housing need or do not take account of future policies, they are an indication of the likely increase in households given the continuation of recent demographic trends'. The projections reflect the period 2006 – 2010 during which the economy has experienced very low rates of economic growth. During this period house building has been at an all time low and migration rates have also been substantially reduced. These circumstances combine to mean that population growth has been low. Given that the population figures are the essential input into the household projections, it follows that the resulting household projections to 2021 represent a low level of growth, which if applied would be totally contrary to the NPPF.

The household projections are based on the 2011 based interim population projections. ONS highlight that caution should be used in the application of the population projections for planning purposes. They are not direct estimates of the actual number of households but rather are a result of a modelling exercise which derives household representative rates and relies on evidence from the labour market survey which demonstrate that household representative rates for some (particularly younger) age groups have fallen markedly since the 2001 Census. Full Census results are not available and have not verified that this assumption is correct. There have been no variant household projections produced to accompany this interim set of projections. This means that it not possible to understand the broad indication of the sensitivity of the projections to different demographic assumptions on fertility, life expectancy and net migration.

While BANES are not seeking to use the 2011 based interim household projections as a robust basis on which to set a housing requirement for their plan period, any attempt to extend or roll forward these projections should be treated with considerable care. A simple doubling of the requirement is entirely inappropriate. It is not a robust approach to multiply the projections by two to get a figure for 2031, because it is not necessarily appropriate to continue the assumptions used beyond 2021.

It is important that the five year land supply does not include any sites which do not have planning permission. In addition it must be calculated using the full housing provision of 12,700 set out in the Core Strategy Policy. This would require the provision of 3,500 units plus 700 as the 20% buffer as required by the NPPF to provide choice and competition, as well as deal with any backlog that might exist.

Change to the policy requested:

The Housing Requirement should be increased to reflect the need to significantly boost housing supply or at the very least expressed as a minimum.

Any sites without planning permission should be removed from the five year land supply. In addition it must be calculated using the full housing provision of 12,700 set out in the Core Strategy Policy. This would require the provision of 3,500

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

units plus 700 as the 20% buffer as required by the NPPF to provide choice and competition.

Respondent Number: 3152	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Cllr Nicholas Coombes	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC14		Plan Reference: Para 1.26	
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.

The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Reverse change and return to original wording

Respondent Number: 4469	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Ralph Wynne-Griffiths	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC14		Plan Reference: Para 1.26	
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

I do not support the proposed change for the following reasons:

The change has been made to accommodate a change in the forecast number of new jobs and new homes that will be required before 2029. This change does not appear to be credible having regard to the other changes made to the forecasts of increased office accommodation and industrial work space in SPC53. This would suggest that the actual numbers of new jobs and the need for new houses is likely to be less than those forecast. The basis for the proposed change is therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The changes made to paragraph 1.26 should be deleted, leaving the figures originally forecast.

Respondent Number: 4469	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Ralph Wynne-Griffiths	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not support the proposed change for the following reasons:

The change has been made to accommodate a change in the forecast number of new jobs and new homes that will be required before 2029. This change does not appear to be credible having regard to the other changes made to the forecasts of increased office accommodation and industrial work space in SPC53. This would suggest that the actual numbers of new jobs and the need for new houses is likely to be less than those forecast. The basis for the proposed change is therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The changes made to paragraph 1.26 should be deleted, leaving the figures originally forecast.

Respondent Number: 4520 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I have serious doubts about the provable data on which the Government bases its figures .

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4620 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Thomas Constantine**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC14

Plan Reference: Para 1.26

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The 11,000 new homes as agreed in the previous draft of the Core Strategy can be assumed to represent an increase in the population of BANES by 14% (based on average occupancy of 2.5 people per home and the 2009 census figures for BANES population). Such an increase in a predominantly rural area with only one major population centre (Bath) is significant, but was achieved in the previous draft of the Core Strategy by utilising predominantly brown field sites.

The additional quantity of new homes in the updated figure of 12,700 is being proposed to be met by releasing land from the green belt; land which is typically in AONB sites and in some instances within the World Heritage setting of Bath. Such a policy will result in the permanent loss of beautiful and historic green spaces which have been used by generations of BANES residents and which frame the world- famous city of Bath. Furthermore, given that a significant proportion of Bath's economy is driven by tourism, we should be doing everything we can to protect the beautiful setting which draws people to visit our city. The preservation of UK heritage and AONBs should be part of national planning policy to protect such sites for future generations.

Additionally the local infrastructure will be stretched to beyond capacity by the proposed increase, with the key routes between Bath and Bristol, and the A46 from the M4 to Bath already highly congested.

Change to the policy requested:

The figure should be reverted back to 11,000 new homes, or additional brown field sites released for development. Land should not be lost from the vital green belt.

Change Ref. SPC15

Plan Ref.: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 98 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Mark O'Sullivan **Respondent Organisation:** Resource Synergies Ltd

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Conservation considerations -

The whole of the city of Bath is a World Heritage Site and a conservation area, and it is surrounded by the Cotswolds AONB and by Green Belt. §132 of the National Planning Policy Framework says: "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification... Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably ... World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional." §§115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework says: "Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty... Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances." As set out by the NPPF, one of the core planning principles is protecting the Green Belt (§17), and §84 says "When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development." This statement requires authorities not only to seek to promote development, but to ensure that it is sustainable – but development which is inconsistent with a major heritage asset is not sustainable: it will constantly be challenged by the need to restore the balance, and it will in the end fail.

If these policies are to be given due weight, then all these protected areas and their settings should be appropriately safeguarded and enhanced. This presents B&NES Council, perhaps even more than its neighbours, with an unenviable problem. Like a number of other local planning authorities (eg Cotswold), a very large part of its greenfield land is in heritage terms of such explicit merit that in the national interest it must be protected from development. But it is faced with a housing demand which needs to be met.

Part of this can be provided for by the reuse of brownfield land within existing settlements, and the Council's current proposals show considerable ingenuity in finding such sites – though there are clearly limits to what is possible in a city of this character, and as the Council's Green Infrastructure Plan makes clear the limit has been reached in relation to brownfield land which is green space, such as playing fields. However, some of the present proposals do not meet the test of conformity with Government policy on protected landscapes and heritage sites. It is doubtful, for example, that any of the four urban extension sites around the city of Bath could be developed without harming the Bath skyline, or areas of outstanding protected countryside or historic monuments or their settings. There remains therefore a considerable problem.

Economic considerations

The West of England LEP's Barriers to Growth survey of regional businesses last July asked respondents about the benefits of being located in the West of England. It found that the "overall attractiveness of the area" was cited by over half of them as the main benefit, and was nearly three times as important as other factors such as communications.

Since the turn of the millennium there has been a growing focus under all colours of national government upon the need to see city-regions as the main poles for the development of economic activity and the built environment. The major report

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

State of the English Cities (Michael Parkinson and 15 others, ODPM 2006, §12.3.13) included a case study of the Bristol city-region including Bath and North East Somerset, and said "... there are concerns about the implications of growth in the [Bristol] City-Region. There is a willingness to accommodate more jobs and population. There is also a consensus that growth would only be only possible if there was sufficient transport and community infrastructure to protect one of the key aspects of the region's prosperity – the quality of life for its skilled potentially mobile workforce. There is no wish to repeat in the City-Region the failings of the unregulated development of the 1980s. There were concerns that such a process would diminish its assets and attractiveness and this emphasises the importance of national investment in infrastructure. This presents a real challenge to government and underlines the need to not only will the ends – but also the means – of sustainable growth."

Businesses need space for offices and factories; and they need houses their employees can afford to live in. But it is plain from this that there is a strong argument that the economic vitality of the West of England depends just as much on the retention and enhancement of its landscape and heritage advantages. It would be an error for the B&NES Core Strategy to make provision which would might diminish these, and the ill-effects would fall not on B&NES alone but on the wider West of England.

Failure of the duty to co-operate under S110 of the Localism Act

Following the section quoted above, State of the English Cities next takes its argument from the example of the ex-Avon councils further, by lamenting the lack of co-operation between local authorities, and calling for financial incentives to encourage it if exhortation fails.

Incentives are not within the gift of the Inspector, and the duty to co-operate is one to be exercised at the plan-making stage rather than in the examination, but I would urge that the present proceedings consider carefully how better co-operation could be obtained to this end in the West of England. In my view it will not be possible to satisfy the assessed housing demand for B&NES over the plan period by finding within the Authority's boundaries land which it would be acceptable to develop, in terms of the Government's policies on the protection of landscape and heritage. Accordingly I believe that there is an obligation on the Council to continue to seek that neighbouring local planning authorities should instead make the appropriate provision, and on those authorities to make such provision accordingly. I ask that the Inspector find that this approach is needed, thus increasing the pressure on surrounding authorities to take the necessary steps.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 224 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Caroline Kay **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Preservation Trust

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

BPT supports the inclusion of an over-arching policy statement on sustainable development and welcomes the Council's decision to base the new policy SD1 (SPC 149 and 150) on NPPF paragraph 14. However we believe that the Council's decision, as recorded in SPC 14 and 15, to release land from the Green Belt in order to make provision for meeting the assessed housing and employment needs in full pre-empts proper consideration of whether the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. The decision is also contrary to a number of specific policies in NPPF, as spelt out in footnote 9 (eg sites protected under the Habitats Directive, SSSIs, Green Belt land, AONBs, designated heritage assets) and detailed further in the NPPF to protect Green Belt (NPPF section 9), AONBs (NPPF (115) and World Heritage Sites (NPPF Section 12). The evidence base published by the Council to accompany the proposed changes to the Core Strategy clearly demonstrates that the Bath Green Belt serves all five purposes set out in NPPF 80. We welcome the decision to reject development to the west of Twerton so as to maintain the separation of Bath from Saltford and Keynsham. However it is not clear that the Council's decision to release Green Belt sites at Odd Down and Weston gave substantial weight to the harm which would

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

result from development in these locations (as required by NPPF paras 87 to 89). Importantly, the Ove Arup First Stage Review of the Green Belt confirms that in addition to meeting the five statutory purposes, the Green Belt assists in directing development towards the regeneration sites within the city, which are expected to deliver the great majority of the housing and employment needs and are by far the most sustainable location for new development. We have not seen any convincing evidence that the benefits to be gained by allocating Green Belt land will significantly outweigh the harm to the setting of the World Heritage Site, to other designated heritage assets such as Beckford's Tower and the Wansdyke, and to the Cotswold AONB. We are particularly concerned that the identification of these Green Belt sites may make it harder to deliver the much-needed regeneration of the brown field sites within the city. The worst possible outcome for Bath would be for the green field sites to be developed early in the plan period and for growth to slow down thereafter, leaving the inner city sites unregenerated.

In our view, the effect of SPC 14 and 15 is to undermine the new policy SD1, which is the key policy underpinning the Core Strategy as a whole. The Strategy is therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

At the very least, the Core Strategy needs to incorporate a mechanism to prevent inappropriate development on the Green Belt sites until

- A specific study to determine the limits of Bath's environmental capacity has been carried out
- A clear policy statement has been drawn up and agreed with DCMS and UNESCO explaining how the setting of the Bath World Heritage Site is to be protected in future before any amendments are made to the Green Belt boundaries around Bath
- all brown field sites within Bath have specific consents which will allow them to be built out
- a detailed review of Green Belt boundaries has taken place in the context of preparing the placemaking plans
- detailed mitigation measures have been established and agreed with statutory consultees including the Cotswold AONB Board for any development sites proposed within the AONB

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Green Belt land is supposed to have statutory protection and although Local Authorities have the ability under the legislation to remove land from Green Belt, it should only be done under exceptional circumstances. This section of the Core Strategy does not identify exceptional circumstances, it merely claims that they are sustainable locations without clarifying exactly what makes them sustainable, or what deficiencies in other land locations outside the Green Belt rule them out. The impression given is that removal of land from Green Belt protection is proposed as a convenience rather than a necessity, and that cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be classed as exceptional circumstances. Whilst the Government may have "wish list" housing targets, the legislation has not been amended and therefore the legislation is more binding on a Local Authority than numerical targets.

It may be that in Bath in order to meet the housing needs (as opposed to arbitrary targets) it is eventually concluded that there is insufficient available land apart from some Green Belt incursions, but these should always be a last resort, not a planned easy option.

Developments are being compartmentalised into employment space and residential space, and this will lead to future inflexibility. There is a risk of unused employment space with an accommodation shortfall, or (if university attendance drops significantly) a shortfall in employment space with a surfeit of single occupier accommodation. What should be being promoted is adaptable buildings that can be either or both, with a design life of two centuries not the current trend for 50-year buildings. An enforceable Design Code is needed. Bath is a World Heritage Site and should not be a perpetual building site.

It should also be noted that building on higher currently open land like Weston and Odd Down will create significant additional flood risks in Lower Weston and Sladebrook, and possibly Southstoke and Midford from water run-off, whereas currently the porous soil absorbs much of the rain that falls there

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

In order to meet development needs, land needs to be used flexibly so that it can be easily be converted between residential, employment or retail functions. The Council has will prepare a suitable Design Code for the World Heritage Site and identified locations visible from it in order to cause the least harm to the City's highly sensitive environment. Land will only be released from the Green Belt if it proves to be unavoidable.

Respondent Number: 278 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cotswolds Conservation Board

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1. The Cotswolds Conservation Board ('the Board') was established by Parliament in 2004.

The Board has two statutory purposes :

- a) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and
- b) To increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.

In fulfilling these roles, the Board has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of people living in the AONB.

2. The Board considers the proposed addition to Paragraph 1.27

"In order to meet development needs, land also needs to be released from the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a careful assessment of the options and has identified locations which cause the least harm to the City's highly sensitive environment and has sought to minimise scale of the impact. Land will therefore be released from the Green Belt at Weston and Odd Down and identified for development."

to be unsound.

3. The sites identified are within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. AONBs are statutorily designated under Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) in order to conserve and enhance their natural beauty.

4. Section 85 (1) of the CROW Act states:

"In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty."

5. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states

"Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.9"

6. Footnote 9 states:

"9 For example, those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion."

7. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

8. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states:

“116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

9. The Board is of the view that in proposing the use of Green Belt land at Weston and Odd Down for residential development the Council has given insufficient weight to

- a) The location of these sites within the Cotswolds AONB
- b) The statutory purpose of the designation of the AONB
- c) Consideration of the restriction of development highlighted by footnote 9 of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.
- D) The “highest status of protection” given to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB compared to sites outside the AONB rejected by the Council; and
- e) The lack of any clear indication as to how the detrimental effect on the environment of the proposed release could be moderated.

10. With respect to point (e) it noted that the Council proposes under paragraph 2.15 of the plan to prepare a “Placemaking Plan” to indicate how development of these sites could occur. The Board submits that in the absence of such a Plan it cannot be demonstrated that the detrimental effect on the environment can be moderated.

11. With respect to paragraph 10, the Board would wish to draw the Inspector’s attention to paragraph 21 of the Secretary of States letter dated 13th February 2013 with respect to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 78) Appeal by Fay & Son Ltd Highfield Farm, Tetbury, Gloucestershire GL8 8SD (Appeal Reference APP/F1610/A/11/2165778) which states:

“The Secretary of State agrees that the primary concern about the impact on the AONB is the loss of fields to housing development (IR14.53). Despite the visual improvements that would result from the landscaping proposals, and to some extent moderate the impact of the new buildings, he agrees that the loss of open fields must inevitably have a detrimental effect on the landscape and environment.”

12. The Board is therefore of the view that the proposed use of AONB sites does not cause “least harm” and “minimise scale of harm” as suggested by the proposed change to paragraph 1.27. In any case these are not the correct tests as required by the CROW Act and the NPPF, which are

- a) does the change conserve and enhance the AONB? And
- b) does the change give the highest status of protection to the landscape and scenic ``beauty of the AONB?.

13. The Board therefore suggests that the amendment to paragraph 1.27 is deleted to make the plan sound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Board therefore suggests that the amendment to paragraph 1.27 is deleted to make the plan sound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 279 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Rohan Torkildsen **Respondent Organisation:** English Heritage

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

A consideration of the individual strategic development sites

I note that, "the Council has undertaken a careful assessment of the options and has identified locations which cause the least harm to the City's highly sensitive environment and has sought to minimise scale of the impact. Land will therefore be released from the Green Belt at Weston and Odd Down and identified for development". Ref SPC15

Without prejudice to the principle of the expansion of the urban area of the city, is there clear evidence to determine the suitability and deliverability of these strategic development sites?

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SP15 (economic growth) The council rightly says that economic growth will be directed along Western Corridor, but then allocates land at the edge of Bath, these areas being the worst possible possible in terms of sustainability in already transport poor areas. A petition is being collected against the cost of First's bus fares, the monopoly supplier of bus services in Bath, meaning it is likely that the developments will be car based. This could have been alleviated by increasing the density of housing in the surrounding areas.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Economic growth will take place along western corridor which has no good transport routes from Odd Down.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4642 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SP15 (economic growth) The council states that economic growth will be directed along Western Corridor, but then allocates land at the edge of Bath, these areas being the worst possible in terms of sustainability in already transport poor areas. This could have been alleviated by increasing the density of housing in the surrounding areas.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down****Respondent Number:** 67 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Trevor John**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Submitted Core Strategy is not legally compliant/sound. The NPPF says that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt land at Odd Down is not needed, as sufficient homes could be built elsewhere by increasing the density on brown field sites and by utilising under occupied properties in central Bath e.g. flats above retail shops. Also, this land is AONB land and exceptional circumstances have not been put forward for its development.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete the reference to land at Odd Down

Respondent Number: 246 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE**Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see Combe Hay Parish Council's detailed comments relating to SPC 88.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete "and Odd Down".

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4547 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martin Davis**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

IT IS DIFFICULT TO COMPREHEND THE COUNCIL'S STATEMENT THAT IT HAS CAREFULLY ASSESSED THAT BY RELEASING AONB/ GREEN BELT LAND FOR DEVELOPEMNT WHICH LIES BETWEEN A LINEAR SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT, LAND OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST AND THE ANCIENT VILLAGE OF SOUTHSTOKE WILL' CAUSE THE LEAST HARM TO THE CITY'S HIGHLY SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENT'. ON THE CONTRARY, THE RELEASE OF THIS LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT WILL HAVE A MAJOR DETRIMENTAL IMPACT ON THE CITY'S WORLD HEITAGE SITE STATUS AND IT IS A MOVE THAT DEFIES LOGIC

THE PROPOSED CHANGE AND PLAN IS THEREFORE UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4621 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Helen Geake**Respondent Organisation:** Portable Antiquities**Agent ID:** 154 **Agent Name:** Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

If this area is removed from the Green Belt, a significant threat to the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Wansdyke will ensue.

Legal problems with the proposed changes

The proposed changes to the Core Strategy are incompatible with the Wansdyke's status as one of the country's most important Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monuments are protected from destruction or disturbance and the impact on the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument by development is also a material consideration in the planning system. In more up-to-date guidance, Scheduled Ancient Monuments are designated 'in order to secure their legal protection in the national interest, and to secure their long-term preservation in situ' (English Heritage guidance from DCMS, March 2010, p. 11). It is not justified to destroy part of this exceptionally important monument to build housing, and BANES's promise to 'protect and enhance the open landscape character of the area' are incompatible with building 300 homes, a school, shops and a road over it.

The only effective way to protect this monument is to leave it within the Green Belt. Any development in this area will have a serious impact on the landscape setting of the site. The current proposals to a change to the Core Strategy to include this area will unavoidably conflict with the protection afforded to the monument by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Monuments Act, and contravene the UK's commitments to the protection of the historic environment set out within the Valletta Convention (1992).

The proposed changes are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. Under the NPPF, development should sustain or enhance the significance of a heritage asset, and these changes to the Core Strategy fail to accomplish this as they will destroy the open landscape context of the Wansdyke and physically destroy part of the monument itself. (NPPF PPS5 Practice Guide, June 2012, section 79.1).

It is also not sustainable development, as once the open landscape of the Wansdyke has been destroyed, it cannot be

recreated. In addition, once the archaeological deposits of the monument itself have been dug away, they cannot be put back, and current understanding of the monument and methodologies to study it are tentative and under-developed (see below).

The proposed development area also lies adjacent to a conservation area and an UNESCO World Heritage Site, both designations which afford protection to the adjacent built environment. The loss of the open land and the impact of 300 new buildings and the associated infrastructure will inevitably diminish the historical context of the southern part of the city of Bath, and bring the UK's commitment to its Heritage Assets into question.

Significance of the Wansdyke

Recent research (Reynolds and Langlands 2006) has suggested a very different origin from the traditional view. Traditionally the Wansdyke has been seen as an immediately post-Roman earthwork, forming a boundary between post-Roman Bath and the Saxon precursor of Wessex. It seems more likely now that it should be dated to the late 8th century, when it could have been constructed by the Kingdom of Wessex, in similar political circumstances to those in contemporary Mercia, which famously constructed Offa's Dyke. Offa's Dyke is a thriving tourist attraction for day trippers and long-distance walkers; it just missed gaining World Heritage Site status itself in 2011, showing the importance of these long-distance boundaries.

The area which runs along the southern boundary of the Bath WHS and apparently ends close to the Cross Keys pub is of exceptional importance in understanding the monument. Beyond this to the east the route of the dyke is shadowy, until the more famous Eastern Wansdyke starts at Morgan's Hill near Calne. It is suggested that the stretch of Wansdyke along Odd Down was constructed by the Men of Somerset, and the eastern part by the Men of Wiltshire, resulting in the different character of the two stretches. But these hypotheses need testing. Topographically this is an important part of the western, Somerset Wansdyke - the last bit clearly visible. The junction between the 'known' and the 'unknown' is crucial and should not be lost to modern development at present, when we have not even formulated the right questions to ask of survey and excavation.

The boundary zone along the Wansdyke, to north and south of the monument, is also of exceptional interest. Its Roman towns (with the singular and remarkable exception of Bath, which may be significant) do not develop into medieval towns. The open landscape character of the dyke is thus particularly important in our appreciation and understanding of it and should be retained.

The Wansdyke therefore represents the creation of Wessex – which did not include Mercian Bath at that point – and shows us how early-medieval societies could come together to construct vast earthworks running over many miles.

Economic implications of the proposed changes

The proposed development would firstly entirely destroy the open landscape context (already gone to the north) and secondly remove one of the most potentially important parts of the dyke.

This neglect and destruction of visible archaeology (as well as the designations of AONB, Conservation Area, WHS and Green Belt) will spoil the 'brand' of Bath as a World Heritage Site and detrimentally affect its tourism economy.

Using the Wansdyke as a tourist attraction in its own right (as with Offa's Dyke) would improve the economy of suburban Bath, as well as other parts of North-East Somerset; destroying part of the monument in this way will not.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like the words 'and Odd Down' removed from SPC15.

The land adjoining Odd Down should be retained within the Green Belt and should stay undeveloped, retaining the identity of South Stoke as a separate village and maintaining the open landscape context of the nationally important Scheduled Ancient Monument – the Wansdyke.

Therefore, the changes referring to the release of land adjoining Odd Down from the Green Belt should be removed, and the changes referring to the 300 homes, the road improvements, primary school, local employment, infrastructure and so on at land adjoining Odd Down should also be removed.

Specifically:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

From SPC15: Remove 'and Odd Down' from last sentence.

From SPC19: Change 'five' to 'four'.

From SPC24: Remove 'Land adjoining Odd Down'.

From SPC54: Remove 'Land adjoining Odd Down – 300' and remove 'Odd Down Green Belt' from section 6e.

From SPC87: Revise to remove land adjoining Odd Down from development on the edge of Bath.

And other minor changes throughout the document, to adjust the numbers of homes to be provided.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Respondent Number: 4721 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:
Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:
Delete reference to "at Weston".
To omit proposals for new housing within this area that is in the green belt, AONB, World Heritage site and its setting, Bath Conservation Area and its setting and setting of listed buildings.
The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:
Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:
Delete reference to "at Weston".
To omit proposals for new housing within this area that is in the green belt, AONB, World Heritage site and its setting, Bath Conservation Area and its setting and setting of listed buildings.
The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Respondent Number: 283 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Prior Park College & Paragon School

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** St Catherine's Court

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I write to you on behalf of my client, Prior Park College and Paragon School, to make representations to the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy of Bath and North East Somerset (B&NES). My client's interest relates to the Prior Park College campus, which is located to the south-west of Bath within a prominent location overlooking the Bath World Heritage Site, and the Paragon School, Lyncombe Vale, Bath. A full plan of the land ownership at Prior Park College is attached.

Prior Park College is set in 20.25 hectares of land, containing a complex of Grade I, II* and II listed buildings, which date back to 1742. The College is one of the largest and highest profile, fully co-educational Catholic independent boarding and day schools in the country. The entire College site lies within a major development area in the Bristol and Bath Green Belt, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the City of Bath Conservation Area. Since 2000, the College has been the subject of a programme of refurbishment and reconfiguration in order to ensure that it remains able to offer the high standard of facilities required to remain one of the leading schools in the country.

The Paragon School, the primary school affiliated with the College, is located off Lyncombe Vale in the Bath Green Belt, it is well-contained and due to the surrounding topography and established woodland, has no visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The property includes a range of buildings including the main listed house. The operation of the primary school in this location is severely restricted by its location within the Green Belt.

My client's predominant concern is that the Core Strategy should allow for the continued upgrade and investment in facilities at the College and Paragon School sites, so that both education institutions are able to maintain and improve its reputation as a leading provider of high-standard education.

We recognise that this public consultation invites comments only on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. However, given that we strongly feel that there remains scope to incorporate further changes to the strategy to ensure it robustly addresses the need to accommodate expanded educational facilities and capacity, our comments do go beyond the limits of discussing these changes in and of themselves.

We are disappointed that B&NES have not taken this opportunity to address extant deficiencies in the Core Strategy in relation to outlining a strategy for the growth of education facilities and capacity across the district, particularly given our previous representations upon the matter. Prior Park College and Paragon School provide the following comments upon the proposed changes to the Core Strategy:

Policy DW1 and Paragraphs 1.27 and .131:

The Council have lost an opportunity here to either revise the Green Belt boundaries or to declare both the college and the school as major developed sites in the Green Belt. We are disappointed that while the Council has clearly seen a need to release land for residential development in the Green Belt, it has not recognised a concurrent need to expand educational facilities, or considered the opportunity to expand existing schools in the Green Belt.

It remains unclear if the Council proposes to retain the College campus as a major developed site within the Green Belt, as per the allocation within the adopted Local Plan. The College would appreciate clarity on this issue, as it is a key designation to allow continued investment in the college to maintain its high standards. A plan of the Local Plan designation is attached for reference.

Secondly, as discussed above, the Paragon School site does not benefit from designation as a 'Major Developed Site' within the Green Belt, and as such, its current location in the Green Belt poses a considerable restriction upon the operational requirements of the school and its role as a custodian to the listed building. The Paragon School requires, as part of its business plan, to undertake limited expansion to improve the education offer on site (for example, new changing rooms and reconfiguration of existing music rooms to meet current educational standards).

This submission urgently presses the Council to designate the Paragon School site as a major developed site within the Green Belt, consistent with the approach at the Prior Park campus. This would ensure that limited and sensitive infilling, respectful of the historic and environmental considerations across the site, can take place over the plan period so that the operational requirements of the Paragon School can be secured. A plan of the site is attached to this submission for consideration.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Prior Park College and Paragon School therefore urge the Council to make the following changes to the Core Strategy in relation to policy DW1, paragraph 1.27, 1.31:

1. Prior Park College Campus, Ralph Allen Drive, remains a major developed site in the Green Belt
2. The Paragon School, Lyncombe Vale, is allocated as a major development site in the Green Belt. The extent of the allocation is set out in the accompanying plan.

Respondent Number: 4691 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: GD Baird Will Trust, Mackay, Mason and

Agent ID: 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

These representations have been prepared by GL Hearn Limited on behalf of our clients, AGD Baird Will Trust, Mackay, Mason and Jenkinson, who are the landowners of two potential development sites on the edge of Bath:

- Land off Minster Way (7 Acres)
- Land off Horseshoe Walk (2.08 Acres)

For ease of reference site plans for both sites are attached to these representations and the location of the two sites relevant to the wider settlement and the two Green Belt sites identified for development on the edge of Bath is illustrated in Appendix 1b of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (March 2013).

The landowners previously submitted representations to the Council's 'Call for Sites' in October 2012 confirming both sites are available, suitable and achievable in accordance with the criteria listed in Footnote 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). However the Council, in preparing and revising its emerging Core Strategy has failed to undertake a meaningful assessment of the sustainability and development potential of the two sites for residential development. This is evidenced in the following extract from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Findings Report, March 2013:

"Other small parcels of land have been promoted around Bath. Land behind Minster Way is regarded as being unsuitable in respect of WHS Setting impacts and 4-5 other parcels have yet to be fully assessed but would likely yield up to 20-30 houses each. Further small sites may come forward during the consultation process on the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy." (Paragraph 2.2)

While the extract states that our clients' site is unsuitable owing to World Heritage Site (WHS) setting impacts, no further explanation has been provided within any of the revised evidence base documentation prepared by the Council. The WHS constraints are not unique to our clients' sites and apply to areas identified for release from the Green Belt with the Core Strategy at Odd Down (Core Strategy Policy B3A) and Weston (Core Policy B3B). The corresponding saved Local Plan policy relating to the World Heritage Site designation, Policy BH.1, does not preclude all development; only development that would harm the inscription of the city as a WHS or which would harm the setting of the WHS. Our clients' sites adjoin the urban edge of the city and would form a contiguous urban form where development can be designed to ensure there are no impacts on the WHS designation.

In addition to the WHS constraints, Table 1.1 below confirms that both sites share almost identical constraints as the areas identified for release from the Green Belt at Odd Down and Weston. However unlike the aforementioned sites, our clients' sites are located within walking distance of the city centre and are therefore closer to key services and facilities.

Table 1.1: Comparative Analysis of Relevant Green Belt Sites at the edge of Bath
 Designation/Constraint: Odd Down, Weston, Horseshoe Walk, Land off Minster Way
 Green Belt
 AONB
 World Heritage Site

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Bath Hot Springs Protection Area
 Conservation Area
 Site of Nature Conservation Interest
 Forest of Avon

While it is acknowledged that both of our clients' sites are constrained by statutory designations, the Core Strategy is a strategic, long-term plan that should be utilised to undertake a robust assessment of development opportunities in the District. The Minster Way and Horseshoe Walk sites are no more constrained than the two other Green Belt sites at the edge of Bath which have been identified for release from the Green Belt and would facilitate a more organic expansion of the city without significantly impinging on open countryside.

Our clients do not object to the identification of the existing sites for release from the Green Belt but contend that the Council should undertake a more comprehensive Green Belt review to support the Core Strategy with a view to releasing smaller, strategically located and sustainable sites from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath for development to meet the housing needs of the city and the wider District. The Minster Way and Horseshoe Walk sites are closer to the city centre and could be delivered without having to rely on strategic infrastructure provision requiring long lead-in times. Therefore new homes can be delivered within 5 years.

It is therefore submitted that the Core Strategy and its supporting evidence base does not meet any of the soundness tests identified in Paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

The Green Belt review needs to be a comprehensive process that reviews the potential release of all available Green Belts sites that are in a sustainable location relative to existing settlements. It is therefore contended that the Council should complete its review of the Green Belt across the district with a view to releasing smaller parcels of land (along with the larger parcels already identified) from the Green Belt that can deliver dwellings in the short-term, thereby ensuring a constant supply of housing. As part of this process, our client's sites should be afforded greater consideration given their proximity to Bath Town Centre, their location adjoining the settlement edge of Bath and the fact that the release of either site from the Green Belt would not significantly affect the 5 Green Belt purposes listed in Paragraph 80 of the NPPF.

This proposed change would also negate the need to review the Green Belt again over the plan period.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4474 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Ediston Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Paragraph 1.27 (page 13): - Summary of Spatial Strategy for BANES - BATH
 We support this clarified expression of Bath as a sub-regional economic centre. We feel that this lends recognition to important role that the city-centre plays, not only in Bath and its immediate hinterland, but also in within the administrative boundary and wider cross boundary relationships (West of England/former Avon County). It also underscores the importance of ensuring that the central area is able to accommodate traffic from visitors across the district.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4520 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I have serious doubts about the objectivity of the assessment and therefore of the soundness of these statements .

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4541 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Stephen and Pam Chamberlain**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Bath may currently be the economic driver in the district, but it has many other attributes that should count against concentration of new housing development there. The whole city is a World Heritage Site, and geographically it is tightly constrained by the topography, which is reflected in the traffic congestion (how many towns of comparable size have no external ring road at any point?).

In any case, the proposal is not mainly to satisfy existing housing demand, but to create new demand (almost as many jobs as houses). There is no reason why Bath should remain the economic driver for large-scale new employment which can better be located elsewhere, without the constraints that are unique to Bath.

Further, there is a tendency the Council's decisions to be unreasonably skewed by the tension between Bath and NES, which have little in common. I believe this has resulted in allocation of an unreasonable proportion of the required housing to Bath, rather than surrounding areas which do not have the above constraints. Bath is already contributing a large area of brownfield; its green belt should be left alone.

Change to the policy requested:

The reference to removing land from the Green Belt at Weston should be removed.

Respondent Number: 4605 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Ian Wilton**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC15

Plan Reference: Para 1.27

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

"The sustainable community strategy is the over-arching strategy for BANES..." is the the wise and welcome introduction to the ' core strategy'.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1. Building on its green belt land is, by definition, unsustainable. If the building is 'necessary', the strategy would need and endless supply of land to build on in order to make any sense.

2. A key quality of life in the area, not identified in the core strategy or the changes being considered, is its urban size. A major appeal of life in Bath is its scale; the visible and accessible balance of urban and rural. Because suburban growth is slow in relation to human lifespan, the effect goes little noticed but if the plan is genuinely and honestly sustainable, the concept of 'big enough' must be addressed.

The strategy of allowing further building on the green belt makes sense if the policy is to allow growth to create, say, a Bristol but with a unique Georgian town centre.

To get a real feel for the effect, visit Downend.

Building on the green belt has a major effect: to make the town less like Bath and a bit more like Downend. Doing so bit-by-bit is hiding our heads, from future generations, in the sand .

It unquestionably would make Bath a worse place to live, and a place less worth visiting.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove all statements of 'removing land from the green belt'.

Respondent Number: 4650	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name: Mr Geoff Davis & Ms Tania Rodrigues	Respondent Organisation:
--------------------------------	--------------------------	---	---------------------------------

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC15 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.27

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The amendment states:-

'In order to meet development needs, land also needs to be released from the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a careful assessment of the options and has identified locations which cause the least harm to the City's highly sensitive environment and has sought to minimise scale of the impact. Land will therefore be released from the Green Belt at Weston and Odd Down and identified for development.'

And other similar amendments refer to other revisions to the Green Belt.

I quote from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):-

'79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

80. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.'

Green Belt is meant to be permanent, it was carefully devised and planned by the District Council at the time, and now for expediency, the current Council seek to completely re-draw it. If accepted, then why then, in a few years time should we not re-draw it again and again. The reason is that unless there is a permanence, Green Belt is meaningless, it can be re-drawn whenever expedient and circumvents the five purposes above, all of which apply in this case. The more so because Bath is not just ANY Historic Town it is a World Heritage City, surrounded by distinct Cotswold Villages and Countryside of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and as a city has plenty of derelict and urban land in need of regeneration.

Change to the policy requested:

No Green Belt Land should be identified for development and all such amendments and references removed.

Variation of Green Belt Boundaries is in conflict with the NPPF and places at risk the World Heritage Status of Bath, promotes sprawl and coalescence of distinct communities, encroaches and endangers the countryside, and encourages developers to focus on Greenfield sites, all of which makes the Core Strategy UNSOUND.

Change Ref. SPC16**Plan Ref.: Para 1.28****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas **Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC16 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.28

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We support the need to release land from the Green Belt in East Keynsham, especially those development sites that provide a mix of employment floor space and housing to mitigate the mismatch of resident workforce and available jobs. We believe that any mixed use sustainable development like that proposed by our project, must clearly account for local jobs alongside housing need. It should ideally include live/work opportunities and food production for households in allotments and/or market gardens. Our project plan includes a marina and associated boat and boating services, a water ecology park to diversify rural income to the farm and an early learning aquatic centre to increase the number of visitors and schools to the area. This will provide a definite increase in a diverse range of affordable and private housing, jobs and skills for local people and provide educational attainment for all.

Our proposals include an additional 8 full time (FT) park jobs, 30 FT craft and retail unit jobs, 30 FT live/work jobs, 30+ FT micro business jobs, 14 FT marina and boatyard jobs and 2 FT education jobs, in addition to around 25+ part time / summer vacation jobs in peak seasons.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 4600 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Margaret Williams **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: 28 **Agent Name:** Nash Partnership

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC16 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.28

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1. Overview

1.1. SPC16 states that 'In addition changes to the Green Belt are proposed to the south west and east of the town in order to provide additional employment floor space and housing. These changes do not undermine the Core Strategy objective to maintain the town's separate identity'.

1.2. It is our belief that the decision to change the green belt boundary to the South West and East of the town ahead of land to the West of Keynsham at Lays Farm is unsound because it is not effective or consistent with national policy.

1.3. It does not offer the best approach to maintaining the separate identity of the town and is therefore in conflict with this ambition of the Core Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol. In this regard it should also be regarded as not legal.

1.4. Evidence demonstrates it is a less sustainable location for development than Lay's farm to the West of Keynsham, which should be named in SPC16 instead as a location for green belt land release.

1.5. The two areas covered in SPC16 which would have sites released from the Green Belt – the boundaries to the South West and East of the town - are discussed in turn below and in comparison to the alternative for releasing land to the West of Keynsham, specifically at Lays farm.

2. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the South West of Keynsham

2.1. All Green Belt sites considered for release in light of the revisions to the Core Strategy have been analysed as part of Arup's Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013). Within the conclusions and recommendations of this report, land to the South West of Keynsham is listed as a 'worst performing' development option. The report states that 'Land adjoining South West Keynsham has similar transport characteristics to the west of Keynsham. The development area is further from Keynsham town centre making it less accessible on foot and the east-west alignment of the area could make it difficult to integrate buses into the development so travel patterns are likely to be car dependent'.

2.2. Further to this assessment, the Arup Development Concept Options Report for this area – considered as part of the land south of K2 parcel – notes that 'The area is remote from the town and has limited vehicle and pedestrian connections to the neighbouring residential area....a regular bus service runs through the residential area to the north (Cedar Drive/Newland Road) though this is some distance from the site. No regular services run directly through or past the study area. Extension of these routes to serve the area may prove difficult due to limited access opportunities. The study area lies around 2km from Keynsham railway station'. It goes on to state that 'The study area lies around 1.7km from the town centre and has few tangible connections in this direction due to the layout of the existing residential area. Though adjacent to a primary school, the study area is over 500m from the neighbourhood centre on Queens Road. This poses issues regarding the social and environmental sustainability of future development and could lead to the creation of an isolated and car-dominated environment.[...] The peripheral location means that additional bus services are less likely to come forward.

2.3. This is evidence that releasing green belt land at the South West of Keynsham ahead of land at the West of Keynsham (incorporating Lay's Farm) is a less sustainable option and should be considered contrary to paragraph 34 of the NPPF which states 'Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised'. In this regard the changes to the Core Strategy are unsound.

2.4. Further to these poor sustainable transport credentials, the Development Concept Options Report goes on to state that 'The study area is very constrained in terms of vehicle access opportunities. Access relies on the suitability of Charlton Road as there is insufficient capacity on Redlynch Lane (south/east) and no suitable access points from the north (the K2B scheme does not allow for a vehicle connection). If Parkhouse Lane is to be used as an access there will be a need to improve its capacity though through access to Keynsham centre would be unsuitable. The limitations on access and connectivity indicate that it may not be feasible or desirable to develop the entire area.' Given that the viability of access to the site has not been established, it is not sound plan-making practice to release the site from the Green Belt for housing development ahead of Lay's Farm, which is located in a more sustainable location for transport and has access arrangements already established through the trading estate.

2.5. Releasing land from the Green belt to the South West of Keynsham, as identified in the Green Belt Stage 1 report threatens encroachment into the gap between Queen Charlton and Keynsham which is essential in maintaining separate identities for each of these settlements. The green belt review stage 1 report notes that 'The Green Belt in this land parcel 'protects the individual character and strong urban edge of Keynsham and prevents the merger of Queen Charlton with Keynsham. It is noted that the western part of the land cell bounds provides the setting for the Queen Charlton Conservation Area'.

2.6. In a similar regard to heritage, the green belt review states that Green belt allocation here also 'protects the setting of Parkhouse Farmhouse, which is a Grade II listed building.' In this regard green belt which does not serve the function of protecting the setting of listed buildings should be developed ahead of Green Belt which does serve this function.

2.7. The green belt review identifies this parcel as serving a strong agricultural purpose which would be lost as a result of being released from the green belt for housing. Releasing land at the South West of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is

demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality’.

2.8. The green belt review notes that ‘The stream that passes to the east of Queen Charlton is designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. It is reasonable to assume that Abbots Wood would have relatively high biodiversity value, although it is not currently designated’. The allocation of green belt land for housing development within the South West of Keynsham study area ahead of other areas with lower biodiversity constraints is not in pursuit of sustainable development, as is a requirement of paragraph 9 of the NPPF. This states that ‘Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life, including (but not limited to): [...] moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature’. In this regard the changes to the core strategy should be considered unsound.

2.9. Further to the Green Belt review, B&NES commissioned Arup to produce a ‘Development Concept Options Report’ in light of the inspectors’ requirement to make more housing land allocations which adds further evidence that land to the South West of Keynsham (assessed as part of the ‘South of K2’ parcel) is a more unsustainable location for release of green belt land than at Lay’s Farm.

2.10. Firstly the report notes that ‘the study area lies on the mid-slope of a gently sloping plateau falling towards Keynsham from the southwest. Within the boundary there is a change in level of around 30m from south-west to north-east, making the southern and western parts more exposed and visible.’ This exposure and visibility renders the site unsuitable for release from the Green Belt due to notable potential impact of any development here on views and the local open countryside character. The report states that ‘Development could have a significant impact on landscape character and views from surrounding areas from the east and south east, particularly across the Chew Valley’. These landscape character impacts are not present in potential development of Lay’s Farm which should therefore be considered as a preferable location for release of green belt land for housing development.

3. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the East of Keynsham

3.1. Paragraph 6.6 of BNES/40 (‘B&NES response to Inspector’s note on proposed changes to the Submitted Core Strategy’) states that ‘At Keynsham the Council considers that at the location on the eastern side of the town there is no capacity for longer term development and therefore, the Placemaking Plan will not consider the identification of safeguarded land. This is because land in this location is of significant importance to the Green Belt. As set out in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review undertaken by Arup (available as part of the supporting evidence throughout the consultation period) land in this area is of high importance in Green belt terms as it lies directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt) and it prevents the merger of Bristol, Bath and Keynsham’. The parts of the green belt proposed for release for housing development serves the same function as this land and therefore, by extension of the council’s own logic, should not be released for development and an alternative approach sought.

3.2. The potential locations for green belt release for housing development to the East of Keynsham fall within two areas analysed as part of the Green Belt stage 1 report – Land South East of Keynsham and Land North East of Keynsham. Both of these sites are described in the green belt review as being ‘of high importance on the basis that [they] lie directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt). It prevents the merger of Bath and Keynsham, while acknowledging that the area of land remaining open between Bath and Keynsham (and Bath and Saltford) is wider than that remaining open between Bristol and Keynsham’. Maintaining a separation and separate identities between Bath and Keynsham is a key aim of the Core Strategy and therefore releasing green belt in this area is contrary to these aims and should be considered unsound. To the same end it notes that ‘It is considered that the Green Belt does play a role in constraining the potential urban sprawl of Bristol (Oldland and Willsbridge) in a southerly direction towards Keynsham’. Therefore losing this Green Belt to housing would threaten the separate identities of Bristol and Keynsham secured by this designation. In this regard the removal of green belt designation here would have more significant adverse impact than removal at Lays Farm, where sprawl is more naturally restricted by the adjacent topography and proximity to other settlements.

3.3. The area to the East of Keynsham is identified in Arup’s Development Concept Options Report as Agricultural Land Class 2 ‘very good agricultural land’ and is therefore ill suited to release from the green belt ahead of other sites available which are likely to be of lesser agricultural quality. Releasing land at the East of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states ‘Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other

benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality’.

3.4. The site is also constrained by incorporating, or being near to a number of landscape and biodiversity designations which are not present at Lays Farm. The presence of Broad Mead Farm SNCI and the site’s proximity to Stidham Farm SSSI/ Conservation Areas (Keynsham and Saltford) and the Cotswold AONB should all be considered as reasons for developing Lays Farm ahead of East of Keynsham. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF lists 12 key principles that plan making should adhere to, one of which is to ‘contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework’. The release of land from the green belt at the East of Keynsham ahead of sites with lesser environmental value and designations such as Lays Farm should be considered contrary to the NPPF and therefore unsound plan-making practice.

3.5. The impact on the existing road network resultant from releasing land to the East of Keynsham is especially significant and certainly moreso than allocating land at Lays Fam. The Development Concept options Report states that ‘Any development in this area would have a significant impact on the A4 which already has issues with its capacity. This would necessitate road and junction improvements, particularly at the roundabout. Manor Road to the south is particularly narrow leading towards Saltford and it would not be desirable to introduce high volumes of traffic onto this road. Access from the west is possible via the existing residential development though capacity is limited’.

3.6. Within Arup’s Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013), land to the East of Keynsham is classified as an averagely performing site for the location of development. In this sense it should not be considered suitable for development ahead of better performing sites.

4. Proposed Location – Lay’s Farm, West of Keynsham

4.1. The main advantages of releasing land from the Green Belt to the West of Keynsham and specifically at Lays Farm have been discussed in contrast to the council’s preferred sites for release above.

4.2. In addition to these comparative advantages, Arup’s Development Concept Options Report dismisses development on a large part of Lay’s Farm, which it suggests is the location of a large underground gas pipe ‘protected by an HSE-regulated buffer zone which permits residential development within only the outer zone (beyond 70m either side of pipeline)’. This constraint is discussed as the primary issue with the site. However this assertion is incorrect. The pipeline is in a different location and according to its operators only has a 5m buffer zone. The pipeline is also of an aged nature and the operator would be willing to accept its re-location and replacement with a modern efficient structure. The pipeline does therefore not represent an issue of constraint against development.

4.3. The evidence base upon which the Core Strategy base is therefore unsound and as such the Core Strategy should also be considered unsound by default.

4.4. The Development Concept Options Report identifies a number of significant strengths in the Lays Farm site which are not identified at Land to the South West and East of Keynsham. It notes that the area ‘has an existing vehicle access to Lays Farm which could be utilised and expanded for development. The southern part is directly adjacent to Charlton Road which gives opportunity for a new connection’. Similarly the study area is within walking distance of existing facilities in the Keynsham area including retail, primary schools and bus routes. Development has the opportunity to connect to these facilities via existing pedestrian routes.

4.5. There has been no visual impact assessment carried out on the impact development on the site would have on views towards Keynsham. Although the Development Concept Otions Report states ‘The area itself is visible from across the valley meaning development could have a strong visual impact’ there is no evidence of this. The only areas of public road the site would be visible from outside of immediately adjacent neighbourhoods is Stockwood Vale and Stockwood Road. Due to the topography of the valley between these roads and the presence of a tree screen at the brow of the valley slope, it is likely that the impact of development at land to the West of Keynsham on views across Charlton Valley would be negligible or nil. The evidence presented as part of the base supporting the council’s proposed changes to the Core Strategy should be considered unreliable, rendering the Core Strategy unsound.

5. Conclusions

5.1. In summary, in comparison to the Land to the South West and East of Keynsham, releasing Lays Farm from the Green Belt for development would:

- Have less of a threat on development encroachment towards, and impact on, the individual identities of Keynsham, Bristol, Bath and Queen Charlton
- Have lesser impact on heritage assets
- Have a lesser visual impact on the natural landscape
- Have a lesser impact on biodiversity
- Use poorer quality agricultural land for development
- Be easier to accommodate sustainable transport and bus services; especially over land South West of Keynsham which is particularly isolated and suffering severe access issues.

5.2. As a result of these outcomes the Core Strategy could be considered compliant with national policy, consistent with the wider aims of the Core Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol, effective at delivering these and therefore be considered sound and legal. In its current form the Core Strategy should not be considered to be either of these.

5.3. Furthermore, as demonstrated above, the evidence base reports produced for the council as a means to making decisions on the release of green belt following the Inspector’s Report on the Core Strategy is factually incorrect and cannot therefore be considered as a reliable source of information for sound plan-making.

Change to the policy requested:

‘In addition changes to the Green Belt are proposed to the south west and east west of the town in order to provide additional employment floor space and housing. These changes do not undermine the Core Strategy objective to maintain the town's separate identity’.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180	Comment Number: 6	Respondent Name: Mike Kerton	Respondent Organisation: J S Bloor Ltd
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC16 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.28

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Although the recognition of the need to change the extent of the Green Belt to the south west of Keynsham is supported, it is considered that the site should be identified in the Core Strategy in order to be consistent with the NPPF para 47 ie sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy in the plan period should be identified in the Local Plan.

Exceptional circumstances have necessitated the review of the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF as such it is considered that land at south west Keynsham which is identified to be removed from the Green Belt should be specifically allocated in the Core Strategy.

In addition further changes can and should be made to the Green Belt in this area in order to comply with para 85 of the NPPF, which states that “when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:....Where necessary identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet the longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period.

The Inspector in his Preliminary Conclusions stated in para 3.36 of ID/28 additional housing would require land to be released from the Green Belt. ID/28 in para 4.2 also went on to state that “Whether or not there are the exceptional circumstances to justify amending the Green Belt and the scale of any such change that might need to be accommodated cannot be determined in the absence of an objective assessment of housing need and demand, including the likely requirements beyond the plan period.” (my emphasis) . This is also reflected in ID/28 para 4.3.

An objection is made to methodology of the Green Belt Review – as it is a two stage process and only Stage 1 is applied to the Core Strategy i.e. the completion of a high level, district wide Green Belt Review which ascertains the extent to which different parcels of land serve the national Green Belt purposes. The Second Stage is where a detailed area based studies

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

are undertaken to determine the alteration to the boundaries of the Green Belt, the Council envisage that this would be done to inform the detailed boundary changes that may be consulted upon through the Placemaking Plan. It is considered that Stage 2 should inform the Core Strategy in order to be consistent with national guidance para 83 -85. As mentioned in our previous submissions to the Core Strategy and Hearing Statements, land at South West Keynsham has capacity to meet both the housing requirement in this plan period and beyond. The Arup Concept Options Report – March 2013 has also identified scope for further development. It is noted that the Concept Options are not planning policy and by publishing these reports the Council are not agreeing to the development capacities in the report. “The planning policy relating to any locations taken forward will need to be formulated in the first instance through the Core Strategy and sites will then be allocated with detailed site requirements in the Placemaking Plan.” It is considered that this approach is contrary to the NPPF para 47, para 83 – 38 and para 153. The Green Belt Review needs to look to the end of the Core Strategy period and beyond with the aim of ensuring permanence of any revised boundaries.

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy should be amended and the site at South West Keynsham identified for development in the plan period, at the same time the general extent of the Green Belt should be redefined and safeguarded land also identified through the Core Strategy (for suggested policy wording please see reps in response to SPC 114 and 120).

Change Ref. SPC17

Plan Ref.: Para 1.29

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 821 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Porter **Respondent Organisation:** Cam Valley Wildlife Group
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC17

Plan Reference: Para 1.29

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change to the policy requested:

SPC17 says that the strategy recognises the position set out and seeks to ensure facilitate economic-led regeneration enabling job growth in the area. I would like to see added after "job growth in the area", "within a sustainable framework that reflects the NPPF principle of seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life (NPPF policy 9).

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC17

Plan Reference: Para 1.29

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The level of complacency in this section reveals absolutely no commitment to regeneration in the Somer Valley. The bland statement that there is no rail link underlines this lack of commitment. Addressing the regeneration needs of the Somer Valley cannot be undertaken without a serious proposal to look at the rail link. A feasibility study undertaken was a gesture. Whilst it might be argued that the deletion of this sentence has been addressed in the inclusion of the other amendments in Para 1.29, this would be entirely misleading. We note the retreat from ensuring that there will be facilitation of economic-led regeneration enabling job growth in the area. We also regard the statement that there is limited scope to 'provide infrastructure improvements in the Plan period'. We do not accept this irresponsible decision to entirely disassociate the unitary authority from its responsibilities. Even if they only adhered to their own plans to build houses

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

without any employment or community benefit, they would still need to provide infrastructure. This whole section reveals the lack of commitment of the Authority to anything other than protecting Bath, no matter what the cost to the rest of the settlements and communities in the authority, including Radstock. We recall, yet again, that Radstock, the 'best preserved mining town centre in the country' (English Heritage) is being threatened with inappropriate development and encroachment into the conservation areas, as well as the neglect of the surrounding natural environment which can only suffer further if the authority is permitted to pursue the lack of infrastructure and regeneration activities that are required.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 320 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Jolliffe **Respondent Organisation:** Ammerdown Estate

Agent ID: 45 **Agent Name:** Savills Planning and Regeneration

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC17 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.29

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We support this change because it recognises that a brownfield-only strategy will not deliver an adequate supply of housing, and nor does it necessarily bring forward the most sustainable sites.

However the plan would benefit from additional text to clarify the role of the proposed 'Placemaking Plan'.

Change to the policy requested:

Add additional words to paragraph 1.29:

"The Housing Development Boundary will therefore be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan, in order to formally identify and allocate the most suitable and deliverable sites for new homes, which will include green field locations."

Respondent Number: 2564 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins **Respondent Organisation:** Strategic Land Partnerships

Agent ID: 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC17 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.29

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The change is not effective because it delegates the consideration of development boundaries to a future review in the placemaking plan. This is not appropriate because the plan relies on identified greenfield sites as a key element of their deliverable five year land supply, and as such there should be more explicit recognition of their role and importance in achieving a robust five year supply of housing.

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy should ensure that any reference to development boundaries and their future review in a placemaking plan takes full account of all existing and committed housing sites, as well as those identified in the SHLAA, that offer the potential to meet the housing needs required to deliver a five year land supply.

Respondent Number: 3152 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change Reference: SPC17

Plan Reference: Para 1.29

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Somer Valley settlements have been neglected in sub-regional planning because of their poor infrastructure links. This should be seen as a requirement to improve infrastructure and self sufficiency, not a reason for managed decline. If the towns of Radstock and Midsomer Norton are not considered viable sustainable centres, then they should be permitted to grow into such, not restricted from development. Previously developed land should be allocated for employment and residential at densities capable of supporting a sufficient sustainable community. If the market does not consider such a proposition viable, public sector agencies should lead development.

Change to the policy requested:

Previously developed land should be allocated for employment and residential at densities capable of supporting a sufficient sustainable community. If the market does not consider such a proposition viable, public sector agencies should lead development.

Change Ref. SPC18

Plan Ref.: Add new Para 1.30A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick

Respondent Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC18

Plan Reference: Add new Para 1.30A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Although the recognition of the need to change the extent of the Green Belt in the Whitchurch area, is supported, it is considered that the site should be identified in the Core Strategy in order to be consistent with the NPPF para 47 ie sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy in the plan period should be identified in the Local Plan. Exceptional circumstances have necessitated the review of the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF as such it is considered that land at Whitchurch, which is identified to be removed from the Green Belt should be specifically allocated in the Core Strategy.

In addition further changes can and should be made to the Green Belt in this area in order to comply with para 85 of the NPPF, which states that “when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:....Where necessary identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet the longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period”.

The Inspector in his Preliminary Conclusions stated in para 3.36 of ID/28 additional housing would require land to be released from the Green Belt. ID/28 in para 4.2 also went on to state that “Whether or not there are the exceptional circumstances to justify amending the Green Belt and the scale of any such change that might need to be accommodated cannot be determined in the absence of an objective assessment of housing need and demand, including the likely requirements beyond the plan period.” This is also reflected in ID/28 para 4.3.

An objection is made to methodology of the Green Belt Review –it is a two stage process and only Stage 1 appears to have been completed and applied to the Core Strategy i.e. the completion of a high level, district wide Green Belt Review which ascertains the extent to which different parcels of land serve the national Green Belt purposes. The Second Stage is where a detailed area based studies are undertaken to determine the alteration to the boundaries of the Green Belt, the Council envisage that this will be done to inform the detailed boundary changes that may be consulted upon through the Placemaking Plan. It is considered that Stage 2 should inform the Core Strategy in order to be consistent with national guidance para 83 -85 and sites allocated in the Core Strategy as they are critical to the delivery of the housing provision in the plan period. If the allocation of sites is delayed to the Placemaking Plan this creates uncertainty in the delivery, particularly as the drafting of the Placemaking Plan has not commenced.

The Draft Green Belt Review (February 2013) was produced to accompany the start of the consultation, however a revised Green Belt Assessment dated April 2013 was published at some point during the consultation, with no obvious notification. This has made it extremely difficult to keep up to date with the consultation and has made it even harder for participants

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

to engage in the process effectively. The consultation should not have started until all finalised evidence base documents were available, or if revised documents did need to be published participants should have been notified, changes flagged up on the Core Strategy webpage, and the consultation period extended.

The Arup Concept Options Report – March 2013 have identified the scope for development. It is noted that the Concept Options are not planning policy and by publishing these reports the Council are not agreeing to the development capacities in the report. “The planning policy relating to any locations taken forward will need to be formulated in the first instance through the Core Strategy and sites will then be allocated with detailed site requirements in the Placemaking Plan.” It is considered that this approach is contrary to the NPPF para 47, para 83 – 38 and para 153. The Green Belt Review needs to look to the end of the Core Strategy period and beyond with the aim of ensuring permanence of any revised boundaries.

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy should be amended and the site off Stockwood Lane (as submitted by planning application 12/04597/OUT) identified for development in the plan period, at the same time the general extent of the Green Belt should be redefined and safeguarded land should also be identified through the Core Strategy. Policy wording is proposed in response to SPC 146.

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell

Respondent Organisation: South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC18

Plan Reference: Add new Para 1.30A

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The development site at Whitchurch and Stockwood is not big enough and could take further development with good quality urban design and good buffers between them and improved bus links to Bristol Temple Meads, City Centre, Wells, Keynsham station with a Park and Ride bus link at Whitchurch. The site at Whitchurch does not provide enough affordable housing and employment opportunities .

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a proper development plan for Brislington, Hicks Gate, Whitchurch, and Stockwood protecting the “Green lungs” and providing affordable housing including a public transport plan for the area improving bus links to the City Centre, Keynsham Station, South Bristol Hospital (Whitchurch), Stockwood and Brislington with its protected public transport corridor between Brislington Callington Road and Bristol Temple Meads and the City Centre (Policy SPC23 and SPC24) are not strong enough in providing housing and employment growth.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 3152 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC18

Plan Reference: Add new Para 1.30A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.

The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Reverse change and return to original wording

Change Ref. SPC19**Plan Ref.: Para 1.31****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick

Respondent Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Proposed Change is considered to be unsound as it is not justified. The development of the spatial strategy has sought to minimise the impact of the Green Belt review as far as possible, be seeking to make the minimum amount of changes to the Green Belt. When reviewing and defining the Green Belt, the advice for local planning authorities in the NPPF is clear that “where necessary, identify in their plan areas of “safeguarded land” between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period.” Local Planning Authorities should also satisfy themselves “that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the Plan period.” (NPPF para 85)

Change to the policy requested:

In order to make the Plan sound the new detailed boundary of the Green Belt should be established through the Core Strategy and not the Placemaking Plan. The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt should also be reviewed through the Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;” The allocations at Odd Down and Weston will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4522 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Barbara Fiedor**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I agree to the statement that reads 'The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt will also be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan in order to address anomalies or other necessary adjustments.'

I believe such an anomaly exists at K14, I would like to see K14 removed from the Greenbelt in the Placemaking Plan. This will address the anomaly which sees the Greenbelt boundary cut across the middle of the gardens of 50-56 St Francis Road, Keynsham. The site which incorporates the extensive gardens of 50-56 St Francis Road Keynsham has been promoted via the SHLAA as a potential development site.

K14 is a site that has the potential to help to address the need for the extra housing that is required to make the Core Strategy sound.

K14 is assessed by BANES as being within walking distance of Keynsham town centre with public transport links. Banes also have found the carriageway and footpath provision to be adequate and estimate some 10 homes could be built here. (Although on the previous SHLAA the site was assessed by Banes as having the potential for some 40 dwellings). Banes add that whilst development would have some visual impact master planning could mitigate this impact.

As the existing dwellings would be left in place the street scene will be unchanged except for an access road to the site.

This site is very sustainable. Broadlands Academy lies to the east of the site and has plenty of capacity to accommodate (much needed) extra pupils the site may generate.

The site has open countryside on two sides including a public footpath and farmland to the north.

Banes state in their Green Infrastructure Strategy (03/13) P41 'access to green spaces is associated with a reduction in health complaints such as high blood pressure and cholesterol, improved mental health and reduced stress levels. The importance of Green Infrastructure is also firmly embedded in the new NPPF.'

The site on two sides has a treelined wildlife corridor in place.

K14 lies well above the flood plain and has the advantage of having an existing storm water drain already in situ.

Any further development beyond its boundary will not be possible because of the topography of the land. Land to the north and the west falls away steeply. Broadlands Academy lies to the east and St Francis Road borders the site to the south.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4547 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martin Davis**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

THE 20% INCREASE IN THE NUMBVER OF HOUSES PLANNED AND THE REQUIRED RATE OF DLIVERY HAS FORCED THE COUNCIL TO OPT FOR DEVOPMENT ON AONB/ GREEN FIELD SITES WHICH OTHERWISE WOULD HAVE BEEN LEFT INVIOALATE. THE NUMBERS ARE QUESTIONABLE

THE PROPOSED CHANGE AND PLAN IS THEREFORE UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Respondent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The green belt policy is there fundamentally to prevent urban sprawl. The site allocated will present urban sprawl and expand the City into the countryside and create urban sprawl.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Respondent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;” The allocation at Odd Down will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Respondent Number: 4524 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:**
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Cardinal Close Residents

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC19 the allocation of land at Odd Down would add to urban sprawl on land of outstanding natural beauty.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4621 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Dr Helen Geake**Respondent Organisation:** Portable Antiquities**Agent ID:** 154 **Agent Name:** Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

If this area is removed from the Green Belt, a significant threat to the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Wansdyke will ensue.

Legal problems to the proposed changes

The proposed changes to the Core Strategy are incompatible with the Wansdyke's status as one of the country's most important Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monuments are protected from destruction or disturbance and the impact on the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument by development is also a material consideration in the planning system. In more up-to-date guidance, Scheduled Ancient Monuments are designated 'in order to secure their legal protection in the national interest, and to secure their long-term preservation in situ' (English Heritage guidance from DCMS, March 2010, p. 11). It is not justified to destroy part of this exceptionally important monument to build housing, and BANES's promise to 'protect and enhance the open landscape character of the area' are incompatible with building 300 homes, a school, shops and a road over it.

The only effective way to protect this monument is to leave it within the Green Belt. Any development in this area will have a serious impact on the landscape setting of the site. The current proposals to a change to the Core Strategy to include this area will unavoidably conflict with the protection afforded to the monument by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Monuments Act, and contravene the UK's commitments to the protection of the historic environment set out within the Valletta Convention (1992).

The proposed changes are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. Under the NPPF, development should sustain or enhance the significance of a heritage asset, and these changes to the Core Strategy fail to accomplish this as they will destroy the open landscape context of the Wansdyke and physically destroy part of the monument itself. (NPPF PPS5 Practice Guide, June 2012, section 79.1).

It is also not sustainable development, as once the open landscape of the Wansdyke has been destroyed, it cannot be recreated. In addition, once the archaeological deposits of the monument itself have been dug away, they cannot be put back, and current understanding of the monument and methodologies to study it are tentative and under-developed (see below).

The proposed development area also lies adjacent to a conservation area and an UNESCO World Heritage Site, both designations which afford protection to the adjacent built environment. The loss of the open land and the impact of 300 new buildings and the associated infrastructure will inevitably diminish the historical context of the southern part of the city of Bath, and bring the UK's commitment to its Heritage Assets into question.

Significance of the Wansdyke

Recent research (Reynolds and Langlands 2006) has suggested a very different origin from the traditional view.

Traditionally the Wansdyke has been seen as an immediately post-Roman earthwork, forming a boundary between post-

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Roman Bath and the Saxon precursor of Wessex. It seems more likely now that it should be dated to the late 8th century, when it could have been constructed by the Kingdom of Wessex, in similar political circumstances to those in contemporary Mercia, which famously constructed Offa's Dyke. Offa's Dyke is a thriving tourist attraction for day trippers and long-distance walkers; it just missed gaining World Heritage Site status itself in 2011, showing the importance of these long-distance boundaries.

The area which runs along the southern boundary of the Bath WHS and apparently ends close to the Cross Keys pub is of exceptional importance in understanding the monument. Beyond this to the east the route of the dyke is shadowy, until the more famous Eastern Wansdyke starts at Morgan's Hill near Calne. It is suggested that the stretch of Wansdyke along Odd Down was constructed by the Men of Somerset, and the eastern part by the Men of Wiltshire, resulting in the different character of the two stretches. But these hypotheses need testing. Topographically this is an important part of the western, Somerset Wansdyke - the last bit clearly visible. The junction between the 'known' and the 'unknown' is crucial and should not be lost to modern development at present, when we have not even formulated the right questions to ask of survey and excavation.

The boundary zone along the Wansdyke, to north and south of the monument, is also of exceptional interest. Its Roman towns (with the singular and remarkable exception of Bath, which may be significant) do not develop into medieval towns. The open landscape character of the dyke is thus particularly important in our appreciation and understanding of it and should be retained.

The Wansdyke therefore represents the creation of Wessex – which did not include Mercian Bath at that point – and shows us how early-medieval societies could come together to construct vast earthworks running over many miles.

Economic implications of the proposed changes

The proposed development would firstly entirely destroy the open landscape context (already gone to the north) and secondly remove one of the most potentially important parts of the dyke.

This neglect and destruction of visible archaeology (as well as the designations of AONB, Conservation Area, WHS and Green Belt) will spoil the 'brand' of Bath as a World Heritage Site and detrimentally affect its tourism economy.

Using the Wansdyke as a tourist attraction in its own right (as with Offa's Dyke) would improve the economy of suburban Bath, as well as other parts of North-East Somerset; destroying part of the monument in this way will not.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like the part-sentence 'five strategic changes' to be revised to 'four strategic changes'. This will also require a number of other minor changes throughout the document, to adjust the numbers of homes to be provided and to adjust the accompanying diagrams.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Insofar as Stage One of the Ove Arup Green Belt Review is concerned, we see nothing in its scope and methodology which takes it much beyond the (Buchanan Study and West of England Green Belt Reviews – Core Strategy Examination CD3/16 &17).

The limitations of the Stage One Study are therefore self-evident in that it does not consider the primary driving force behind undertaking the review in the first place i.e. promoting sustainable patterns of development.

Indeed, this is made clear in Section 7: What the Green Belt Review does not seek to do is balance Green Belt purposes with sustainability objectives and therefore reach conclusions on whether there should be amendments to the Green Belt

boundaries.

Accordingly, we consider the approach to this review to be fundamentally flawed in that, on its own admission, it has been undertaken independently of the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence-based work assessing potential development options and therefore it does not set out recommendations on the extent to which some development in the Green Belt would promote sustainable development.

We also consider the partial/piecemeal and pragmatic approach to the Review, in combination with the partial/piecemeal approach to the SHMA to be fundamentally flawed in not having been undertaken at a strategic level, covering all parts of the Bristol and Bath Green Belt and the wider West of England strategic housing market area. Certainly, there has been no evidence of any meaningful joint working and co-operation with adjoining authorities and clearly the opportunity to rectify that now, before the resumption of the hearing sessions, has now been missed.

So called "consultation" with other WoE Planning Authorities on the methodology hardly corresponds to a proper strategic approach to this issue in the spirit of the duty to co-operate (NPPF Paragraph 182), in lieu of any formal arrangement for regional or sub regional strategic planning.

It is self evident, from examining the Review of Green Belt undertaken by Ove Arup, that no new work has been undertaken that could 'satisfy the Council' that there would be no need to adjust Green Belt boundaries during the remainder of the plan-period or for a reasonable period beyond, consistent with the requirements set out at paragraphs 83 to 85 of the NPPF. Indeed, proposed change SPC27 (and associated proposed change SP134 Paragraph 7.05 – Monitoring) which inserts an additional clause in Policy DW1, raises the prospect of just that happening in response to a 5 year review. The NPPF is unequivocal that LPAs should "satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period". This fundamental flaw to such a crucial element of the Plan is reinforced by what appears more of an after thought at SPC172: and proposed new para 6.63A i.e. that: "the issue of safeguarding land will be considered in the Placemaking Plan". This is a clear admission of there being an anticipated risk of ad hoc alterations being required during and

beyond the Core Strategy period; the very risk that Ove Arup indicated should be limited and we say should be avoided if at all possible through judicious identification now of safeguarded land. The Council's approach risks undermining confidence in Green Belt as a strategic long term planning tool.

There is simply no support whatsoever in the NPPF for relegating/postponing the consideration of safeguarded land, which is a long-term issue of strategic importance, to a subsequent DPD.

It is clear from the NPPF that central to any review of Green Belt, indeed the whole purpose of reviewing Green Belt is "the need to promote sustainable patterns of development". In BANES the Council, quite rightly in our view, has largely ruled out channelling development towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Moreover, given the obvious constraints on Bath as a World Heritage Site, the Somer Valley, Midsomer Norton, Radstock and the Rural Areas, the town of Keynsham is an obvious choice for consideration, for a variety of reasons which the Council has set out, even though it is 'inset' within the Green Belt.

The rejection of Redrow's land at Lays Farm (See attached Site Location Plan and Site Analysis) on the grounds that a gas pipeline runs through the central southern part of the site and that the "HSE buffer zone severely limits development" or "effectively limits development to a very minor area to the north west of the site" is simply wrong and wholly misleading (Ref: BANES Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2013).

We are clear that an old high pressure (steel) gas main runs across the site at a depth of approximately 1.2m. However, the route of this pipeline as shown on the (unnumbered) plan attached to the SHLAA, does not accord with the records held by the company who own and operate the pipeline, namely Wales and West Utilities Ltd (see attached W&WU Pipeline Plan). Moreover, the existing easement is only 7m and Wales and West has confirmed that it would require a no-build zone of 16m although a highway may be constructed across the main.

The impact of the existing pipeline on the development potential of the site is consequently minimal and certainly not such that would warrant disregarding it completely as a sustainable option. Moreover, it is feasible to divert the main, and Redrow have recently done just that elsewhere in Bristol, and by using modern materials it would further reduce any no-build easement to 6m.

The site, south of Lays Farm (Ref: Area 10 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L) is bound on two side by development and forms a far more logical addition to the built-up area of Keynsham than that proposed to be released from the Green Belt to the south (Ref: Area 13 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L). Development would project no further west than the existing Lays Farm Business Centre. Moreover, the submitted site analysis shows that the distance and the intervening topography ensure that the role of the remaining Green Belt separating Keynsham from Stockwood (identified as Stockwood Vale) would not be unacceptably eroded. In no sense would the release of this site result in the coalescence of Keynsham with Bristol.

It appears to us, from close examination of the SHLAA and the Green Belt Review, that the Council's primary reason for not also identifying the land at Lays Farm for release from the Green Belt was based on incorrect information about the route and scale of any safeguarding associated with the gas pipeline.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Change to the policy requested:

Requested Change: Land at Lays Farm is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing (150 dwellings)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Respondent Number:** 4611 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Sheila Sparrow**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 153 **Agent Name:** ST8 Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC19**Plan Reference:** Para 1.31**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The change is supported to the extent that it acknowledges the need to make strategic changes to the Green Belt boundary in order to accommodate the District's requirements for development. However, the change is currently unsound in that it gives insufficient strategic direction regarding the approach to reviewing Green Belt boundaries through the Place-Making Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

The Plan should acknowledge the guidance in the NPPF that local planning authorities should consider setting Green Belt boundaries that will endure beyond the Plan period. It also needs to allow for a comprehensive review of Green Belt boundaries through the Place-Making Plan, and to allow for local adjustments to permit the release of appropriate non-strategic sites for development in sustainable locations, in particular on the fringes of Bath.

Incorporate the clarification suggested above.

Respondent Number: 4721 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemiak**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC19**Plan Reference:** Para 1.31**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

SPC19 Change to read:

However, as described above, the proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Strategic changes are required to the inner Green Belt boundary to release land to meet the need for new development.

Delete:

The new detailed boundary will be established through the Placemaking Plan The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt will also be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan in order to address minor anomalies or other necessary minor adjustments.

Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed.

And replace with:

The new detailed boundary of the Green Belt is shown in the updated Proposals Map and in an indicative manner on the Key Diagram.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4723 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

SPC19 Change to read:

However, as described above, four The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound. Strategic changes are required to the inner Green Belt boundary to release land to meet the need for new development.

Delete:

The new detailed boundary will be established through the Placemaking Plan The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt will also be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan in order to address minor anomalies or other necessary minor adjustments.

Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed.

And replace with:

The new detailed boundary of the Green Belt is shown in the updated Proposals Map and in an indicative manner on the Key Diagram.

Respondent Number: 4763 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Terrence Hiskens **Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC 19 (Green Belt Boundaries) Object

The five fundamental aims of the Green Belt should be preserved. The NPPF keeps the requirement to retain the fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The allocation of land at Weston is fundamentally opposed to this with development proposed in the open countryside.

Change to the policy requested:

Retain the existing boundary.

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Respondent Number:** 251 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Bovis Homes**Agent ID:** 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

GREEN BELT – SPC19 AND SPC145

6.1 The Council has already acknowledged within its proposed changes to the Core Strategy, that some areas need to be removed from the Green Belt in Policy DW1 (Proposed Change SPC 24), i.e. there is no more capacity on brownfield land or sustainable Greenfield sites. However, our objective assessment of housing need demonstrates that the level of housing that the Core Strategy should be planning for is significantly higher than the Proposed Changes Core Strategy proposes.

6.2 The consequence is therefore that there is a need to identify additional land to be removed from the Green Belt in order to meet this increased need for housing.

6.3 Once again, it is considered that the Council have misdirected their efforts in response to the issues raised by the Inspector (and required through the NPPF) in relation to the Green Belt Review. Paragraph 4.4 of the ID/28 stated, "The NPPF (83) makes clear that any review of Green Belt boundaries should have regard to their intended permanence in the long term so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. It is therefore essential that there is a proper assessment of long term needs."

6.4 However, the Council have chosen only to undertake a high level Green Belt Review that does not identify the impacts on the Green Belt from removing the parcels of land required to enable development at the scale of growth identified for each location; but rather to assess the role and function of large swathes of the Green Belt that are significantly larger than any potential allocation for the level of housing being proposed.

6.5 We do not object to this high level assessment, but we would normally expect the high level Review to make recommendations for Green Belt release or clearly order the sites in terms of their suitability for Green Belt release.

6.6 Following this, we would expect to see a more detailed landscape and visual appraisal to determine the ability of the preferred areas for release to accommodate strategic – scale development from a landscape and visual perspective and to identify robust and logical to form the revised green belt boundary.

6.7 Because the Green Belt review is not sufficiently detailed to properly assess the impact of removing parts of the Green Belt to accommodate development, the result is that the Core Strategy does not actually propose to remove any land from the Green Belt, deferring this decision instead to a Placemaking Plan, to be prepared at a later date.

6.8 Paragraph 1.31 of the Proposed Changes (Proposed Change SPC19) states:

"The Green Belt is shown on the Key Diagram. The spatial strategy has sought to minimise the impact on the Green Belt as far as possible. However, as described above, five strategic changes are required to the inner Green Belt boundary to release land to meet the need for new development. The new detailed boundary will be established through the Placemaking Plan. The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt will also be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan in order to address minor anomalies or other necessary minor adjustments. Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed." (BW emphasis).

6.9 Proposed Change SPC145 repeats the broad principles of the above, specifically in relation to Whitchurch, but also suggests that the Placemaking Plan will consider whether there is any scope to identify safeguarded land.

6.10 We object to these proposed changes on a number of counts. Firstly, we consider that the appropriate place to redefine the boundaries of the Green Belt is through the Core Strategy and not through a subsequent Placemaking DPD. It is the Core Strategy that should define the quantum of development required and the spatial strategy for delivering this development, particularly as it is explicitly acknowledged by the Council that some areas will need to be removed from Green Belt. It is surely therefore more appropriate for the detailed new boundaries of the Green Belt to be included within the Core Strategy, rather than deferred to a subsequent DPD; which itself conflicts with the Government's aspiration for Council's to prepare a single Local Plan.

6.11 Further, deferring the detailed review of the Green Belt does not accord with the requirements of Paragraph 83 of the NPPF, which stresses the importance of Green Belt boundaries being permanent and able to endure beyond the plan

period; neither does it provide the “practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability” required through the first objective of the NPPF ‘Core Planning Principle’ (p.17).

6.12 Furthermore, Policy CP8 currently states that the general extent of the Green Belt is set out on the Core Strategy key diagram. However, the key diagram does not itself identify this in any detail and fails to identify the extent of the Green Belt in a way that could extend beyond the Plan Period.

6.13 The Proposed Change SPC19 also suggests that it has not been definitively decided that the Green Belt will be amended to accommodate these additional developments in these locations, but that exceptional circumstances will still need to be demonstrated at the Placemaking Plan stage in order to justify the release of Green Belt in these locations.

6.14 Instead, it seems to be a strategy for delaying the review of the detailed boundaries of the Green Belt; and reviewing whether the Council still consider exceptional circumstances to exist at that stage to potentially seek to avoid the release of Green Belt land altogether.

6.15 However, the Inspector should note that there is also a time imperative on the release of land from the Green Belt. Even on the Proposed Changes housing requirement, which we have demonstrated to be wholly inadequate, the Council’s own housing trajectory relies on first completions on all of the Green Belt sites in 2015/16. We question whether this is achievable, as there is no assurance that the Placemaking Plan would be adopted by this time, let alone the Council having granted planning permission and reserved matters consent, and the developers having discharged conditions, completed infrastructure works, show homes complexes etc; all of which will be needed before completions can be expected.

6.16 We urge the Inspector to make changes to the Green Belt through the Main Modifications to provide certainty and enable development in these areas to come forward in a timely manner to address housing needs. We do not believe the Plan can be made sound without a Green Belt review and identification of new strategic housing allocations.

6.17 The Inspector should have comfort that his decision whether to release additional land from the Green Belt is not unique to B&NES. In order to meet the objectively assessed housing requirements for the West of England, there will be a need to release land from the Green Belt at a number of locations around Bristol.

6.18 Whilst the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy has already made limited releases of land from the Green Belt, the other adjoining authorities have resisted doing so. However, our objective assessment of housing needs demonstrates the extent of the housing shortfall in the West of England area required in order to meet economic projections.

6.19 As a result of the failure of the Council to undertake a robust and detailed Green Belt review to inform the suitability of releasing land from the Green Belt for development, Barton Willmore has undertaken a detailed Green Belt Review to inform the Inspector’s findings.

6.20 We have undertaken this to provide an overview of the opportunities for Green Belt release around the Bristol Urban area (within North Somerset, South Gloucestershire and B&NES) in order to provide the Inspector with the comparative merits of releasing land from the Green Belt within B&NES compared with the neighbouring authority areas. This has demonstrated that Whitchurch is a suitable site to be released from the Green Belt; not only in the context of land available in B&NES, but in the Green Belt around the whole of Bristol.

6.21 We have then sought to provide the Inspector with detailed evidence to demonstrate the physical boundaries that would be appropriate to use in order to establish the new Green Belt Boundary relating to Whitchurch. Our comprehensive Green Belt Review is attached at Appendix 3.

Change to the policy requested:

Changes Sought:

6.22 To enable the Green Belt to be properly defined, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (para 85), its boundaries should be defined in a detailed plan as part of the Core Strategy.

6.23 For Whitchurch, we have prepared a detailed Green Belt Review which identifies the appropriate new boundaries that should be used to define the new extent of the Green Belt. We therefore request that the Inspector makes Main Modifications to remove land at Whitchurch from the Green Belt in accordance with the plan attached at Appendix 4.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 151 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Dunkerton Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Dunkerton Parish Council has concerns about the process involved in the allocation of housing leading to these planned changes to the Green Belt. Dunkerton Parish Council would prefer the full use of brownfield sites before development takes place on the Green Belt.

Change to the policy requested:

The Placemaking Plan process must ensure that priority is allocated to development on brownfield sites before land is released from the Green Belt.

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

The Proposed Change is considered to be unsound as it is not justified. The development of the spatial strategy has sought to minimise the impact of the Green Belt review as far as possible, be seeking to make the minimum amount of changes to the Green Belt. When reviewing and defining the Green Belt, the advice in the NPPF is clear that “where necessary, identify in their plan areas of “safeguarded land” between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period.” Local Planning Authorities should also satisfy themselves “that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the Plan period.” (NPPF para 85)

Change to the policy requested:

The new detailed boundary should be established through the Core Strategy and not the Placemaking Plan. The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt should also be reviewed through the Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 3152 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.
The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Reverse change and return to original wording

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Withies Farm Landowners' Group,
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The change is supported to the extent that it acknowledges the need to make strategic changes to the Green Belt boundary in order to accommodate the District's requirements for development. However, the change is currently unsound in that it gives insufficient strategic direction regarding the approach to reviewing Green Belt boundaries through the Place-Making Plan.

There is an inference in the supporting documents, in particular Annex 1 to the report to Council on 4 March 2013, that detailed Green Belt boundaries will be adjusted to accommodate the development requirements that are to be identified in the emerging Plan. If that implies adjusting Green Belt boundaries to accommodate only the immediate requirements, that would be inconsistent with national guidance set out in the NPPF and therefore render the Plan unsound in accordance with the terms set out in para. 182 of the NPPF. Moreover, it could render the Plan unsound for not having been positively prepared or properly justified.

It is clear from the supporting documents, in particular the SHMA, that there needs to be flexibility at Keynsham since it has a housing market that has a Bristol focus. Therefore, there needs to be flexibility to accommodate future housing needs identified through a joint SHMA undertaken with Bristol and North Somerset Councils, and to allow for the accommodation of future unmet requirements arising from within the HMA from neighbouring authorities. Furthermore, in view of the environmental constraints affecting the City of Bath, there must be flexibility at Keynsham to accommodate development requirements that cannot be accommodated in a sustainable manner in, or through, urban extensions at the City. For reasons that are set out in representations to other parts of the Plan, these 'displaced' requirements may well increase once detailed environmental assessment work is undertaken on the strategic options that are being suggested for Bath, and which may lead to a consequential reduction in the capacity to accommodate development at the city. All of these considerations must be taken into account when reviewing Green Belt boundaries through the forthcoming Place-Making Plan.

The Plan therefore needs to be give more strategic guidance on the review and re-setting of Green Belt boundaries through the future Place-Making Plan. The guidance in the NPPF is quite clear that, at the time of preparing Local Plans, "... authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they are capable of enduring beyond the plan period" (para. 85). When reviewing Green Belt boundaries, local planning authorities are required to take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development, including channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary (para. 84). The criteria to be taken into account when defining boundaries are clearly set out at para. 85. Those criteria include not including land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open, and satisfying themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the Development Plan period.

The Plan needs to acknowledge this guidance and confirm that it will be taken into account when reviewing the Green Belt boundaries through the future Place-Making Plan, and will set boundaries accordingly to allow for flexibility to accommodate development requirements during both the current Plan period and beyond.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The proper application of this guidance is likely to have particular implications for setting Green Belt boundaries that will endure at Keynsham when adjusting them to allow for the urban extensions that are necessary to accommodate development requirements. The environmental constraints on accommodating development at the City of Bath are likely to endure beyond the current Plan period, and detailed assessment of the strategic growth options that are currently identified at the City may result in reduced capacity at the City during the current Plan period. These factors, together with the necessary flexibility to accommodate development requirements arising within the Bristol HMA upon review of DPDs in neighbouring authorities, must have a particular bearing on the re-setting of Green Belt boundaries at Keynsham, which it is acknowledged is a sustainable location for accommodating development needs associated with both Bristol and Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

The text needs to be amended to provide strategic guidance on the expected approach to the adjustment of Green Belt boundaries through the place-Making Plan, and in particular:

- Acknowledgment of the guidance set out in the NPPF, in particular paras. 83-85, and confirmation that the adjustment of Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the strategic urban extensions identified in the Plan will be carried out accordingly.
- Acknowledgement that this is likely to have particular implications for the re-setting of Green Belt boundaries at Keynsham owing to its capacity to accommodate development requirements arising in association with both Bristol and Bath, and likely need to accommodate development displaced from Bath owing to environmental constraints during both the current and future plan periods.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19

Plan Reference: Para 1.31

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC19

1.45 No changes are proposed to the Green Belt in the form of either extensions or deletions. The changes confirm that the detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green belt will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan. Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed.

1.46 This approach is considered not justified and is therefore unsound. The strategy as currently proposed seeks to reduce the minimum amount of changes to the Green Belt. When reviewing and defining the Green Belt, the advice in the NPPF is clear that “where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’” between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period.

1.47 In addition, LPAs need to satisfy themselves “that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the Plan period” (NPPF para 85).

1.48 Given that Saltford is surrounded by Green Belt, and as a result of the way that the strategy is currently worded, development can only come forward if exceptional circumstances are generated. These special circumstances will not be linked to need (as BANES argue that the Core Strategy meets need), and therefore the housing needs of Saltford will not be met through the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

The Green Belt boundary should be amended through the Core Strategy process, and not left to be amended through the Placemaking Plan, to be in conformity with NPPF para 83.

The needs of Saltford need to be considered objectively and not left to the Placemaking Plan.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4712 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC19 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.31

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Support in principle of Change reference SPC19 (Page No. 19 of the Draft Core Strategy) ‘...five strategic changes are required to the inner Green Belt boundary to release land to meet the need for new development. The new detailed boundary will be established through the Placemaking Plan. The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt will also be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan in order to address minor anomalies or other necessary adjustments. Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed. Therefore we request our site to be considered as part of this document .

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC20**Plan Ref.: Para 1.33****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC20 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.33

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Proposed Change SPC 20 regarding delivery is considered to be unjustified. It purports that there is an increase in housing delivery to 700 dwellings per annum and that this is a significant uplift from around 380 per annum. However, it should be noted that the housing delivery was particular low against the adopted Local Plan, ID/28 concluded in para 2.19 that there was convincing evidence that the Council has a record of persistent under delivery in housing. A 20% buffer is therefore required”. The backlog from the Local Plan needs to be addressed in the first five years of the Core Strategy, so in reality the target of 700 per annum only applies to the first five years to make up the significant shortfall accrued against the adopted Local Plan target. See our objection to the overall housing requirement in SPC 14 and SPC 23

Change to the policy requested:

Changes should be made to para 1.33 which reflect a change in the overall housing provision derived from an objective assessment of housing needs.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC20 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.33

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC20

1.45 The change proposed by SPC20 implies that the annual scale of housing growth sought by the Core Strategy has increased significantly to 700 per annum over the plan period, compared to 380 per annum during the last plan period.

1.46 In reality, the target of 700 per annum only applies in the first five years because of the need for BANES to make up the significant shortfall it accrued against the previous Local Plan target.

1.47 This proposed change is therefore misleading. As set out by paragraph

3.31 of Annex 1 to the 4th March 2013 BANES Committee Report, the housing target for this plan period, excluding the Local Plan shortfall is 7,470, equivalent to only 415 per annum.

1.48 SPC20 should therefore state that over the next 18 years, the scale of new homes delivered will remain broadly the same as seen over the past 20 years.

Change to the policy requested:

The scale of new homes planned for the next 18 years is not significantly different from that delivered over the last Plan Period. This must be recognised the Core Strategy.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton

Respondent Organisation: J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC20

Plan Reference: Para 1.33

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Proposed Change SPC 20 regarding delivery is considered to be unjustified. It purports that there is an increase in housing delivery to 700 dwellings per annum and that this is a significant uplift from around 380 per annum. However, it should be noted that the housing delivery was particular low against the adopted Local Plan, ID/28 concluded in para 2.19 that there was convincing evidence that the Council has a record of persistent under delivery in housing. A 20% buffer is therefore required". The backlog from the Local Plan needs to be addressed in the first five years of the Core Strategy, so in reality the target of 700 per annum only applies to the first five years to make up the significant shortfall accrued against the adopted Local Plan target. See our objection to the overall housing requirement in SPC 14 and SPC 23

Change to the policy requested:

Changes should be made to para 1.33 which reflect a change in the overall housing provision derived from an objective assessment of housing needs.

Respondent Number: 320 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Jolliffe

Respondent Organisation: Ammerdown Estate

Agent ID: 45 **Agent Name:** Savills Planning and Regeneration

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC20

Plan Reference: Para 1.33

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support this change as it reflects the overall increase in housing targets, which is needed to meet identified needs.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

None.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd**Agent ID:** 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC20

Plan Reference: Para 1.33

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC20

1.49 The change proposed by SPC20 implies that the annual scale of housing growth sought by the Core Strategy has increased significantly to 700 per annum over the plan period, compared to 380 per annum during the last plan period.

1.50 In reality, the target of 700 per annum only applies in the first five years because of the need for BANES to make up the significant shortfall it accrued against the previous Local Plan target.

1.51 This proposed change is therefore misleading. As set out by paragraph.

3.31 of Annex 1 to the 4th March 2013 BANES Committee Report, the housing target for this plan period, excluding the Local Plan shortfall is 7,470, equivalent to only 415 per annum.

1.52 SPC20 should therefore state that over the next 18 years, the scale of new homes delivered will remain broadly the same as seen over the past 20 years.

Change to the policy requested:

The scale of new homes planned for the next 18 years is not significantly different from that delivered over the last Plan Period. This must be recognised the Core Strategy.

Change Ref. SPC21**Plan Ref.:** Para 1.34**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 300 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson **Respondent Organisation:** Curo**Agent ID:** 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC21

Plan Reference: Para 1.34

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

4.1 Curo support the principle of boosting the overall housing figure to increase the provision of affordable housing, as set out in SPC21. However, the proposed increase in the overall affordable housing target from 3,000 to 3,110 is modest. It remains unclear as previously how this target will be achieved and how it links in with the individual site targets. No affordable housing implementation strategy has been set out as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 301 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South West HARP Planning Consortium
Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC21 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.34

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

SPC21, SPC23 & SPC184: Affordable Housing Target

We are very concerned that the proposed changes do not take into account the significant affordable housing shortfall that has accumulated under the adopted Local Plan together with the likely shortfall under the first two years' operation of the emerging Core Strategy (2011 to 2013). The previous 2009 SHMA showed a backlog of 2608 affordable dwellings over the Local Plan period which have not been added into the new housing target. The proposed increase of the affordable housing target from 3,000 to 3,110 homes is very modest considering the past backlog of affordable housing delivery. There is no indication of how this District wide target is correlated to the varying needs across the District, especially given that the affordable housing needs are concentrated at Bath, or to the site-specific targets. We are also concerned the Council has not demonstrated its deliverability via an affordable housing implementation strategy for the plan period, as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 2563 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Guinness Trust
Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC21 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.34

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

SPC21: Implications for the Affordable Housing Target

We obviously support the principle of increasing the housing figure to increase affordable housing delivery. However, the proposed increase in the affordable housing target from 3,000 to 3,110 is very modest.

There is no indication of how this District wide target is correlated to the varying needs across the District, especially given that the affordable housing needs are concentrated at Bath, or to the site-specific targets.

Furthermore, the achievability of this overall target is not clearly demonstrated via an affordable housing implementation strategy, as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC22 **Plan Ref.:** Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 170 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick**Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst the recognition of a need for a 20% buffer is supported, the fact remains that the Core Strategy does not identify sites which are key to the delivery of housing in the plan period in accordance with the NPPF. The Core Strategy does not include a table which sets out the overall housing requirement for the plan period, the number of completions to date, the current supply and what the residual requirement is, in order that provision may be made against the residual housing requirement. The SHLAA only identifies 10,852 dwellings, but this is an assessment of those sites submitted, it has not been prepared in accordance with the SHLAA guidance which states in para 21 that “the scope of the Assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development.” (DCLG 2007). It is considered that the suitability of sites has still been strongly influenced by the emerging strategy rather than being an objective assessment of opportunities and capacity to inform the strategy. (ID/28 para 2.1 identified this as an issue with the May 2011 SHLAA). The SHLAA acknowledges in the March 2013 Report of Findings (para 1.9) that there has been no stakeholder involvement or panel convened during the preparation of the SHLAA. As a result it appears that the Council’s assessment of capacity on suitable, available and deliverable sites has been constrained by the level of overall housing provision needed to be planned for.

Given that the Council have assessed the SHLAA sites, there still remains “very little headroom, within the SHLAA and little or no choice between SHLAA sites to be made in the Placemaking Plan.” (ID/28 para 2.2). Indeed in terms of the land to be released from the Green Belt the minimum has been identified (this also conflicts with the NPPF para 83 – 85).

Pegasus objects to the statement, that the level of housing planned for also provides significant flexibility and choice of sites. There is no evidence of the flexibility, particularly in terms of the mechanisms that will be triggered in order to bring sites forward apart from monitoring delivery rates. There are mixed messages throughout the Plan in terms of a review – eg para 1.36 refers to a review of the Core Strategy Programmed for around 2016, whereas in other paragraphs the review is to commence 2- 3 years before required and then in Policy DW1 the Core Strategy will be reviewed around every five years (see representations on Policy SPC 27)

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy should be amended as follows:

1. A table which sets out the overall housing requirement for the plan period, completions to date, and the supply to date, leaving a residual housing requirement should be included.
2. The Core Strategy should then set out how the residual housing requirement is to be met (ie by setting out the sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy in the plan period)
3. The Core Strategy should allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide more detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate. (par 157 of the NPPF)

Respondent Number: 222 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nicholas Pollock**Respondent Organisation:** Duchy of Cornwall**Agent ID:** 126 **Agent Name:** Woolf Bond Planning LLP**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

4.0. Flexibility: SPC22, SPC203 Introduction

4.1. We are of the view SPC22 and SPC203 fail to provide the flexible Plan required by the NPPF.Lack of Flexibility

4.2. There is no flexibility in the Core Strategy, which matter would have been addressed, albeit only in part, had the Council

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

endorsed the officer's proposal to consult upon contingency allocations which matter was considered at Full Council in September 2011 where it was clearly identified that the housing need is at Bath.

4.3. A review of the CS after five years post adoption, as a way of supposedly introducing a degree of flexibility, will not result in an expedient response to any shortfall in the supply of housing land. As set out in the Examining LDFs document prepared by PINS, this fails to provide for the required certainty in the plan making process and avoids making the difficult decisions which matter is addressed.

4.4. Whilst we question the soundness of the Council's approach in identifying the additional proposed housing allocations, we also consider that the CS fails to provide for a contingency in the event that any of the identified components of supply fail to come forward at the point envisaged.

4.5. Guidance in relation to the need to plan for contingency and provide for a flexible strategy to deal with changing circumstances is set out in the NPPF (para 23, bullet point 3 and paras 157 and 182) and Examining LDFs (paras 11 and 13). We will refer to these requirements at the Examination.

4.6. For the reasons set out above, a spatial contingency should be an explicit part of the CS. This could include the identification of the west of Twerton urban extension as a reserve site to come forward in the event that it is needed to meet identified housing needs. Moreover, and in accordance with our representations set out at section 3.0 above, the site should be inset from the Green Belt.

4.7. We question whether the CS is not sufficiently flexible to accommodate even the planned scale of growth at 12,700 dwellings, particularly if the brownfield first strategy (focusing upon the Western Riverside) fails to deliver housing numbers at the envisaged rate and/or if they have less housing capacity than planned due to, inter alia, flood constraints (which matters we addressed in our Issue 2 Statement at the January 2012 Examination).

Change to the policy requested:

Summary: Suggested Changes

4.8. To conclude, land west of Twerton provides an opportunity to provide for a mixed use sustainable urban extension to provide for up to 2,000 dwellings together with associated employment provision, open space and sustainable linkages to the city centre without serious conflict with the overall purpose of the Green Belt.

4.9. In accordance with Part 6 (112) of the Localism Act, modifications, requiring further technical work to be carried out, to include a Green Belt review followed by a further round of public consultation would be necessary before the plan could be found sound.

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas

Respondent Organisation: Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support the 'Flexibility' arrangements for the 5 year land supply and 20% buffer to meet the level of housing need identified by the SHLAA. We are especially pleased with the flexibility arrangements that allow development on some sites earlier than anticipated where other sites are delayed in coming forward or growth is greater than anticipated. This is a sound and reasonable approach to meeting housing and employment need which may be different to that projected by the SHLAA.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.49 An objection is made to the assertion that the spatial strategy enables the identification of a five year housing land supply with a 20% buffer.

1.50 This is based on BANES method of calculating their housing land supply which is seriously flawed.

1.51 For reasons set out in the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update' (at Appendix 2) submitted to the consultation on behalf of Barratt Homes Bristol, we profoundly object to 12,700 homes as an overall target.

1.52 Understanding this proposed change requires an understanding of how BANES has calculated its 5 year supply.

1.53 Paragraph 3.31 of Annex 1 of the 4th March Report to Council states that the "five year land supply position should be calculated [against] the figure of 8,637 homes" rather than the overall target of 12,700.

1.54 BANES claim that the figure of 8,647 (comprised of the 5,300 market need and 3,000 affordable need identified in the SHMA plus the Local Plan backlog of 1,167) represents their objectively assessed need. Accordingly BANES suggest that the additional 4,063 market homes delivered on top of this (to arrive at a total figure of 12,700) are only added in as a mechanism to deliver the affordable housing. Any market homes delivered over and above the objectively assessed need of 5,300 (taken from the SHMA) are therefore discounted by BANES from their housing target for the purpose of calculating a five year supply.

1.55 By assessing its 5 years supply against the 5,300 market target and 3000 affordable target, rather than the 12,700 total the implication is that BANES can refuse planning permission for market schemes in excess of the 5,300. Given that these additional market homes are required to meet affordable housing targets, the effect would be that BANES would not deliver enough affordable homes.

1.56 The approach taken by BANES would appear to be a clear attempt to try and avoid the fact that they cannot demonstrate a five year supply against their overall housing requirement of 12,700 and avoid identifying any further sites for development within the Core Strategy.

1.57 In addition, contrary to proposed change to paragraph 1.3 the BANES SHLAA (March 2013) identifies a limited number of sites, leaving little flexibility for sites which fail to deliver as anticipated.

1.58 The SHLAA acknowledges in the March 2013 Report of Findings (paragraph 1.9) that there has been no stakeholder involvement or panel convened during preparation of the SHLAA. As a result it appears that the council's assessment of capacity on suitable, available and deliverable sites has been directed by the level of overall housing need being planned for, rather than a genuine attempt to establish available supply.

1.59 To be found sound, BANES must be able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply against its overall housing target, which must be based on an objective and NPPF compliant assessment of need.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must be able to demonstrate a five year land supply against its overall housing requirement. The overall housing requirement must be based on a realistic and objective assessment of need.

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett

Respondent Organisation: Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

2.11 Five year land supply

2.11.1 The Framework at para. 47 sets out the requirement on local planning authorities to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements.

2.11.2 The Council's position for the five year supply is that the requirement is 8,637 made up of the chosen SHMA scenario plus the backlog, with the backlog delivered within the first five years and a 20% buffer only applied to market housing, giving a five year supply as follows:

- 7470/18 = 415 per year
- 1167 backlog = 233 per year in first five years
- 20% buffer = 307 only on the market housing element (ie 5527/5 in table 4)
- Five year supply (2011 – 2016): 415+233 = 648 per year x 5 = 3240 + 307 = 3,547

2.11.3 However, there is no justification for the use of this five year land supply figure. It is different to the provision figure which is the SHLAA supply plus additional requirement to provide affordable housing. The Council is now proposing to provide for 12,722 dwellings in the plan, but is seeking a different target of 8,637 for the plan period against which there five year land supply can be judged. This is perverse and illogical. Although we do not necessarily agree with the figures, the five year supply has to be calculated by taking the provision figure ie 12,722, dividing this by 18 years and multiplying by 5. This gives 706 per year and 3,533 as the five year supply added to this should be a 20% buffer bought forward which means that there should be sites to deliver 4,239 dwellings between 2011-2016.

2.11.4 The Wigan Core Strategy Inspector set out clearly in his note of 14 March 2013 what is required. 'In order for the Core Strategy to be found sound it must at least set out a policy framework which allows for an adequate supply of housing land over the plan period as a whole and a five year supply of deliverable sites to be identified.'

2.11.5 Consequently, the Core Strategy should include and explain how the five year land supply is calculated and what is included. This is necessary to ensure a consistent and transparent approach to the delivery of sites to achieve the provision required in the plan.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We also note proposed change SPC27 (and associated proposed change SP134 Paragraph 7.05 – Monitoring) which inserts an additional clause in Policy DW1 to the effect that the Core Strategy will be reviewed around every five years and changes made to ensure inter alia delivery of housing targets and the appropriateness of growth rates. However, we do not see how any meaningful response could be made prior to 2029 without the Council having identified any safeguarded land as it is clearly required to do under Paragraphs 83 to 85 of the NPPF.

Nowhere has the Council provided any evidence to 'satisfy itself that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period'. Indeed the 5 yearly reviews could very well justify alteration much earlier.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

That the Council identifies sufficient safeguarded land in order to meet long-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period in accordance with Paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Respondent Number: 251 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Bovis Homes

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

PROPOSED CHANGE SPC 22 - 5 YEAR LAND SUPPLY

5.1 Paragraph 1.36 (Proposed Change SPC22) of the Proposed Changes Core Strategy suggests that the Core Strategy provides a 20% buffer to its land supply to reflect previous under delivery. However we question whether this is reflected by the housing trajectory as set out in the SHLAA and whether it is indeed deliverable. If not, this would render the housing policies within the Plan unsound.

5.2 We also note that the 2013 SHLAA and related housing trajectory provides and assesses the delivery of housing against a requirement of just 8,637 dwellings, rather than against the Proposed Changes Core Strategy requirement of 12,700 over the Plan Period. The reduced target which the housing trajectory has been prepared to address appears to be based on the requirement of 415 dwellings per annum derived from the SHMAA; plus the shortfall from 2006-2011 (addressed within years 2011-2016). This approach is flawed and Unsound. It is not appropriate for a Plan to propose one level of housing (12,700) and for the delivery to be monitored on a reduced figure (8,637). Moreover, such an approach does not reflect the requirement of the NPPF to 'Plan Positively' and provides no incentive to meet the housing requirements of the Plan.

5.3 Furthermore, this is inconsistent with stated aim of paragraph 7.05a (Proposed Change SPC 202), which suggests that, "if, after the first 5 years following adoption, monitoring demonstrates that the planned housing provision, including affordable housing, is not being delivered at the levels expected and there would be no reasonable prospect of the delivery of 12,700 homes to 2029, then the review of the Core Strategy will entail changes to rectify the housing shortfall taking account of the impact of the performance of the economy on the need for and delivery of housing".

5.4 The deficit in the five year land supply (plus 20% buffer) illustrates the limited number of sites that the Council are proposing for development and further, by deferring the detail of the large allocations to a Placemaking Plan, avoiding a Green Belt review and not encouraging early applications in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the housing trajectory and shortfall against the 5 year land supply requirement will only be exacerbated in the coming years. The need to establish the revised Green Belt boundaries is set out in more detail in our representations relating to SPC19 and SPC145.

Change to the policy requested:

Changes Sought

5.5 In order to ensure consistency across the evidence base and plan, the housing trajectory should be based on a requirement of 12,700 dwellings, or any such higher requirement that the Inspector finds to be Sound.

5.6 In order to rectify the potential shortfall in five year housing land supply, the housing trajectory and supply of sites should be revised to enable a greater number of dwellings to be delivered early in the Plan Period. Because of the urgency to deliver housing quickly to address this shortfall and the uncertainty and possible delay to the preparation and adoption of the Placemaking Plan, this will necessitate the removal of the requirement for Placemaking Plans to be prepared ahead of approval of planning applications for the strategic allocations.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.36

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Whilst the recognition of a need for a 20% buffer is supported, the fact remains that the Core Strategy does not identify sites which are key to the delivery of housing in the plan period in accordance with the NPPF. The Core Strategy does not include a table which sets out the overall housing requirement for the plan period, the number of completions to date, the currently supply and what the residual requirement is, in order that provision may be made against the residual housing requirement. The SHLAA only identifies 10,852 dwellings but this is an assessment of those sites submitted, it has not been prepared in accordance with the SHLAA guidance which states in para 21 that "the scope of the Assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development." (DCLG 2007). It is considered that the suitability of sites has still been strongly influenced by the emerging strategy rather than being an objective assessment of opportunities and capacity to inform the strategy. (ID/28 para 2.1 identified this as an issue with the May 2011 SHLAA). The SHLAA acknowledges in the March 2013 Report of Findings (para 1.9) that there has been no stakeholder involvement or panel convened during the preparation of the SHLAA. Given that the Council have assessed the SHLAA sites there still remains the "very little headroom, within the SHLAA and little or no choice between SHLAA sites to be made in the Placemaking Plan." (ID/28 para 2.2). Indeed in terms of the land to be released from the Green Belt the minimum has been identified (this also conflicts with the NPPF para 83 – 85) Pegasus objects to the statement that the level of housing planned for also provides significant flexibility and choice of sites. There is no evidence of the flexibility, particularly in terms of the mechanisms that will be triggered in order to bring sites forward apart from monitoring delivery rates. There are mixed messages throughout the Plan in terms of a review – eg para 1.36 refers to a review of the Core Strategy Programmed for around 2016, whereas in other paragraphs the review is to commence 2- 3 years before required and then in Policy DW1 the Core Strategy will be reviewed around every five years (see representations on Policy SPC27)

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy should be amended as follows:

1. A housing table which sets out the overall requirement for the plan period, completions to date, and the supply to date, leaving a residual housing requirement should be included.
2. It should then set out how the residual housing requirement is to be met (ie by setting out the sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy in the plan period)
3. Allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide more detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate. (par 157 of the NPPF)

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.36

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Whilst there is clearly a need to identify land for new builds, this should not be the sole objective. There are opportunities to bring back into use the residential accommodation above central area retail and office businesses, and there are opportunities to convert current and future empty buildings into residential accommodation. Reuse is always a more sustainable option to demolition and replacement construction, because it has a much smaller carbon footprint. It is also under the council's control because there are a range of planning reasons to refuse conservation area consent for demolition.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Less easy to control is the delivery rate once permission is granted, and it is important to ensure that reluctance to develop brownfield sites after permission is granted does not result in an increased number of greenfield land permissions just to meet a monitoring requirement. In an area where tourism is important to the local economy, the losses from social networks reporting ruined views and thus discouraging visitors can be far in excess of any benefits arising from the buildings that ruin a view.

For the reasons detailed in the comments on SPC15, including:

“Green Belt land is supposed to have statutory protection and although Local Authorities have the ability under the legislation to remove land from Green Belt, it should only be done under exceptional circumstances.”

“It may be that in Bath in order to meet the housing needs (as opposed to arbitrary targets) it is eventually concluded that there is insufficient available land apart from some Green Belt incursions, but these should always be a last resort, not a planned easy option.”

“It should also be noted that building on higher currently open land like Weston and Odd Down will create significant additional flood risks in Lower Weston and Sladebrook, and possibly Southstoke and Midford from water run-off, whereas currently the porous soil absorbs much of the rain that falls there.”

... the inclusion of Weston and Odd Down as specific intentions is unacceptable.

Change to the policy requested:

The spatial strategy therefore enables the identification of a 5 year land supply plus expectations for sites to become available for reuse, with a 20% buffer to reflect previous under delivery. The level of housing being planned for also provides significant flexibility and choice of sites in the event that some sites are delayed in coming forward or growth is greater than anticipated. The Council will encourage delivery rates in the plan period ...

Delete:

- Land adjoining Odd Down
- Land adjoining Weston

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson

Respondent Organisation: Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22

Plan Reference: Para 1.36

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Housing Land Supply

3.1 It is essential that the Council provides a robust and credible housing land supply. This needs to be based on the suitability, deliverability and availability of sites as well as being assessed against the appropriate housing target i.e. not one that is set artificially low to “show” compliance with the requirement of the NPPF that councils are able to demonstrate a rolling 5 year housing supply plus an appropriate buffer (20% in the case of B&NES).

3.2 Curo are concerned that the Council has inadequately assessed this matter and sites contained within their calculations may in fact not be available or deliverable. Whilst it is not appropriate to rehearse these concerns for the purposes of the Core Strategy it is important to recognise the importance of allocating sufficient sites both within the Core Strategy and in the forthcoming Place Making DPD.

3.3 As previously mentioned Curo have a number of land interests within and adjoining the urban area of Bath, as well as at the other towns and in several villages. These sites are being promoted through the Plan process, including the SHLAA, with an explicit recognition that these sites are suitable, available and ready for development.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC22 **Plan Reference:** Para 1.36

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC22

1.53 An objection is made to the assertion that the spatial strategy enables the identification of a five year housing land supply with a 20% buffer.

1.54 This is based on BANES method of calculating their housing land supply which is seriously flawed.

1.55 For reasons set out in the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update' submitted to the consultation on behalf of Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd, we profoundly object to 12,700 homes as an overall target.

1.56 Understanding this proposed change requires an understanding of how BANES has calculated its 5 year supply.

1.57 Paragraph 3.31 of Annex 1 of the 4th March Report to Council states that the "five year land supply position should be calculated [against] the figure of 8,637 homes" rather than the overall target of 12,700.

1.58 BANES claim that the figure of 8,647 (comprised of the 5,300 market need and 3,000 affordable need identified in the SHMA plus the Local Plan backlog of 1,167) represents their objectively assessed need. Accordingly BANES suggest that the additional 4,063 market homes delivered on top of this (to arrive at a total figure of 12,700) are only added in as a mechanism to deliver the affordable housing. Any market homes delivered over and above the objectively assessed need of 5,300 (taken from the SHMA) are therefore discounted by BANES from their housing target for the purpose of calculating a five year supply.

1.59 By assessing its 5 years supply against the 5,300 market target and 300 affordable target rather than the 12,700 total the implication is that BANES can refuse planning permission for market schemes in excess of the 5,300. Given that these additional market homes are required to meet affordable housing targets, the effect would be that BANES would not deliver enough affordable homes.

1.60 The approach taken by BANES would appear to be a clear attempt to try and avoid the fact that they cannot demonstrate a five year supply against their overall housing requirement of 12,700 and avoid identifying any further sites for development within the Core Strategy.

1.61 In addition, contrary to proposed change to paragraph 1.3 the BANES SHLAA (March 2013) identifies a limited number of sites, leaving little flexibility for sites which fail to deliver as anticipated.

1.62 The SHLAA acknowledges in the March 2013 Report of Findings (paragraph 1.9) that there has been no stakeholder involvement or panel convened during preparation of the SHLAA. As a result it appears that the council's assessment of capacity on suitable, available and deliverable sites has been directed by the level of overall housing need being planned for, rather than a genuine attempt to establish available supply.

1.63 To be found sound, BANES must be able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply against its overall housing target, which must be based on an objective and NPPF compliant assessment of need.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must be able to demonstrate a five year land supply against its overall housing requirement. The overall housing requirement must be based on a realistic and objective assessment of need.

Change Ref. SPC23**Plan Ref.:** Policy DW1, clause 2:**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 50	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Ms Tricia Golinski	Respondent Organisation: Saltford Parish Council
------------------------------	--------------------------	--	---

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Saltford Parish Council notes that the draft Core Strategy has been amended to enable an increase of around 10,200 jobs and 12,700 homes in the B&NES area during the period of the plan. We understand that these figures are now based on the latest Census data and projections for growth.

Saltford Parish Council welcomes the maintenance of the existing housing development boundary at Saltford and the protection of the Green Belt surrounding the village which are considered vital for preserving the identity and character of Saltford.

The main A4 road at Saltford suffers from long traffic queues at peak times, creating access problems for residents and pollution levels in excess of targets. Saltford Parish Council wishes that any housing and industrial development at Keynsham or on the outskirts of Bath be planned with a view to reducing Saltford's traffic volumes and flow. Policies should be adopted at these proposed housing and industrial development sites that encourage vehicles away from the A4 corridor through Saltford and include the promotion of sustainable, public transport solutions.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 98	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mr Mark O'Sullivan	Respondent Organisation: Resource Synergies Ltd
------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I believe that the changes proposed to make increased provision for housing development are not justified, nor consistent with national policy.

The draft Plan sets out very summarily the natural, historical and built heritage of the Council's area and the extent to which this has been recognised by national and international authorities in designation of the WHS, AONBs, Green Belt, SSSIs and other protected areas. It then explains the extent to which it seeks to erode this extraordinary and world-renowned natural heritage for the sake of housing provision which the Council itself thought only last year was unnecessary.

Among the factors contributing to this change of mind – along with the force majeure of last year's examination report – is (i) a report on housing supply claiming that Bath and its area constitutes an independent housing market from that of Bristol, and one within which a certain level of demand must be met, and (ii) a belief that household sizes will continue to decrease, raising that level of housing demand in the future.

Household size &c - In relation to (ii) above, the very recent data from the 2011 census shows that the secular decline in household size has now been reversed. In the absence of clear evidence to the contrary this change in the trend should now be projected ahead into the plan period, and the forecasts of housing demand and the consequential housing land

provision in the Core Strategy should be revised downward accordingly.

Need for housing provision

However, much bigger issues fall to be addressed in relation to (i), namely the appropriate area to be considered when looking at the local housing market, and the implications of this for the assessment of housing need to be satisfied within the boundaries of B&NES.

Size of the housing market

The county of Avon, including Bath, is an area still used for transport planning through the Joint Local Transport Plan prepared in common by the four unitary councils, and was established in 1974 on the basis of the then recognised Bristol travel-to-work area. Since then, communications have improved and habits of longer-distance commuting have increased, which implies that the extent of the travel-to-work area should have increased. Definitions, however, have been revised, and the current ONS map shows Bath as the centre of its own travel-to-work area: this is supposed to be a collection of wards for which, of the resident economically active population, at least 75% actually work in the area, and for which also, of everyone working in the area, at least 75% actually live in the area (although this figure is unsupported by empirical research and is in effect an arbitrary one).

The identification of strategic housing markets for the present Core Strategy is contained in a report made by ORS in March 2013, which in its primary analysis of the data identifies the city of Bath as insufficiently self-contained to be the centre of an independent housing market (on the grounds that fewer than 65% of employees living in the area also work in the area (Fig 3 in Ch 2) – though this figure is also debateable). It is only as a result of modelling work to reassign certain commuting flows that it comes to the conclusion that it is legitimate to treat Bath as the focus of the strategic housing market in its own right.

The ORS report relies on a 2010 study by Colin Jones and others, commissioned by the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit, and entitled Geography of Housing Market Areas in England; and a 2007 CLG advice note on Identifying Sub-regional Housing Market Areas. The latter document is no longer available on Government websites, and a fortiori can be assumed no longer to represent active Government policy. The former is evidently correct, as a matter of common sense, in asserting that “the limits to a ... HMA are determined by travel to work patterns” (p.6); and in consequence, while it discusses the role of migration as well as commuting in the derivation of Housing Market Areas, its construction of “strategic” or “framework” HMAs across England was based on a grouping algorithm derived from that used to define TTWAs (p. 28).

That paper discusses at some length the difficulties of its ultimate theoretical base. It details its reliance on false simplifying assumptions (such as that only one type of house exists, that all employment is in the city centre, that all travel is by car along straight roads), and the expedients it resorts to in order to correct for these. It admits that a very wide range of exogenous influences interrupt the operation of a free market within a framework housing market area (one might cite housing size preferences, housing type preferences, school catchment areas, reluctance to abandon social ties, road patterns, traffic issues, rail links). It expresses the aspiration that at least to some extent these can be represented by modelling subordinate local housing areas within it, and submarkets within these (perhaps for smaller areas yet, perhaps for particular types or characteristics of house), though it does not claim itself to attempt to go below the second-tier local HMA level. Moreover, both at the strategic and at the local level it makes the fundamental admission that “a key problem is that there is no theoretical basis for the degree of closure which will be required of the HMAs” (p. 8). This amounts to a massive, one might say heroic, modelling exercise, in which hypothetical assumptions of very varying reliability are piled upon each other like Pelion on Ossa.

Clearly its most fundamental ground assumption must be correct: that a key constraint on a housing market must be the journeys people are prepared to make to travel from home to work. Equally clearly, the conclusions finally drawn from it, after all the adjustments, may be far indeed from a reliable prediction of what will take place. However appealing this edifice of assumptions may be in theory, I am not aware of any evidence that it produces conclusions which can be demonstrated to be reasonably accurate in its actual results – at least at any level lower than that of the broadest strategic travel-to-work area. Moreover, even the data on which the assumptions about travel-to-work areas and strategic housing markets are based derive from the 2001 census, and are now over 12 years old, in a period when commuting has been increasing in volume and distance (for much of that time, at a rapid pace).

These weaknesses do not of course mean that the ORS report is nonsense. It is a plausible interpretation of the information that exists, and may well be the best interpretation available at present. And I have no doubt that it is the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

orthodox interpretation. However, they do affect the weight which should be given to it in the present context. It is plain, I submit, that the assertion that the city of Bath is the focus of a housing market which is materially separate from that of Bristol is an assertion built on sand: it relies on old data which are likely to have changed; it relies on a series of hypothetical assumptions which may or may not be true, and which depend upon each other to the point where a single error may bring much of the edifice crashing down; and it relies on a model which is untested by reality. It is a fair working hypothesis, but, even at a time when new housing must be one of our very highest priorities, it should not be allowed to stand if other important considerations are inconsistent with it.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 102 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Federation of Bath Residents' Associations
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Because of the strictures of the recently introduced National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), FoBRA is mindful of the absolute necessity for B&NES to have an approved Local Plan in place as soon as possible. Accordingly, FoBRA supports the current proposals for change to the draft Core Strategy. This includes the increase in housing numbers (though the build rate to meet it would be well above historic figures for several decades, and therefore actual achievement must be in doubt). However, FoBRA feels strongly that:

- The consequential green belt sacrifices are highly undesirable and should not set a precedent;
- Quite plainly, Bath is due to become even more intensely built-up (and some might say full-up). The Planning Minister has recently suggested that in such circumstances neighbouring conurbations should take the strain and that consultations along these lines should take place in accordance with the Localism Act;
- Brownfield sites must be used before green;
- The necessary infrastructure to go with the new sites (particularly the greenfield) must be provided at the same time as the housing, including arrangements to cope with any associated increase in traffic;

Change to the policy requested:

• Although the changes in wording on the subject of the Rec which took place at the Council meeting on 4th March seem helpful, eternal vigilance will be required to ensure that excessive development does not take place there and that the Rec's original purpose is kept in mind.

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited
Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Pegasus objects to the Council's assessment for development need within the district for the plan period. The SHMA does not address the issues identified in the Inspectors Preliminary Conclusions (ID/28). The assessment is not in accordance with the NPPF eg para 159 there is no evidence of a joint SHMA being produced, the NPPF states that the SHMA should be prepared collaboratively where the HMA crosses administrative boundaries. Paragraph 2.15 and 2.16 state that the west of BANES falls within a Bristol focussed housing market, while the city of Bath, its environs and the south of BANES form a housing market which extends into Wiltshire and into Mendip. The Proposed Changes do not constitute a sound plan as the assessment of housing need cannot be justified in accordance

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

with the NPPF. The SHMA produced does not fulfil the comprehensive role required by the NPPF – see supporting paper to accompany these representations.

Change to the policy requested:

A revised SHMA should be produced in order to assist in the objective assessment of housing needs and amendments should then be made to Policy DW1.

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Core Strategy Proposed Change to Policy DW1 clause 2 is not compliant with national policy. Whilst the SHMA has been updated, this only covers the BANES area, yet there are two housing market areas that extend beyond the district boundary. The complete and comprehensive SHMA has not been prepared as requested in ID/28 the Inspector’s Preliminary conclusions. (see our representations on SPC 14)

Change to the policy requested:

(see representations on SPC 14)

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 22 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

“This is a summary of the comments made by Pegasus Planning in respect of the B&NES SHMA – please note that the full comments are available as a hard copy report (Pegasus Planning, Respondent number 170: ‘Pegasus Planning Critique of The ORS B&NES SHMA Update 2013’)

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 This critique of the SHMA has been prepared by Pegasus Planning Group to consider whether the ORS BANES SHMA Update 2013 satisfactorily addresses the Core Strategy Inspector’s concerns raised in ID/28 and ID/29 and is now NPPF compliant.

1.2 It should be noted from the outset that two versions of the BANES SHMA Update Report have been published since the consultation on the Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Core Strategy began on 26th March 2013. The first version of the draft SHMA published is dated 21st February 2013 and the second version published is dated 18th March 2013, and notably still marked as draft. The difference between the two reports is largely textual.

1.3 Having reviewed both versions of the ORS SHMA in detail Pegasus Planning Group makes the following key observations:

1.3.1 The methodology used by the ORS SHMA update is not transparent.

The report does not provide enough detail on the modelled inputs and outputs to allow a full understanding of how BANES housing requirement has been established. A request has been made to BANES Planning Policy Officers to organise a meeting between ORS and development industry representatives, so as to facilitate a statement of Common Ground on the SHMA prior to the Examination in Public resumes;

1.3.2 The ORS SHMA report contains a number of basic errors, even following its revision on the 18th March 2013 e.g. International migration for the year 2009/10 in Figure 42 does not match the ONS estimates (as discussed at pages 14-16 of this report) and the summed totals of table columns are in places incorrect, such as Figure 55;

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1.3.3 The SHMA is an assessment for BANES only and does not take account of housing need within the wider Housing Market Area. The first version of the SHMA, published 21st February explicitly admits such at paragraph 6.4;

1.3.4 The housing target being promoted by BANES Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy is equivalent to the low-migration scenario modelled within the SHMA. It assumes that low economic growth and household formation rates, as seen during the last 5 years, continue. Furthermore, as a consequence of an error in Figure 42 of the SHMA, the level of net migration per annum fed into this model is short of 660 persons (see pages 14-16 of this report) and is well below averages seen historically, including the past four recessionary years. The low-migration scenario does not therefore satisfactorily take account of migration and demographic change;

1.3.5 The housing target being promoted by BANES is also equivalent to the 11,000 jobs led scenario modelled within the SHMA. This model assumes that the existing female population of BANES working longer (due to increased pension age) will provide sufficient labour to fill a significant proportion of the new jobs proposed by the Core Strategy. It would appear to be an entirely novel proposition that an increase in female pension age has an effect on housing requirements. No detail is provided on this assumption (e.g. assumed growth of female residents aged 16-67 and economic activity rates by age) however, given that DCLG household projections show a decrease in BANES female population aged 16- 67, it appears highly unrealistic. Without an increase in females in employment, the proposed housing target will not support the level of jobs growth planned;

1.3.6 In calculating the need for affordable homes the SHMA model assumes that the private rented sector will meet a significant proportion of the need by accommodating tenants with housing benefits. This assumption is too simplistic and fails to recognise that tenants receiving housing benefit are often excluded from the private rented sector by legal restrictions on buy-to-let mortgages. It also fails to consider other drivers of the private rented sector such as concealed households and students who compete more effectively in this market than households receiving housing benefit. Furthermore, if you are going to assess market and affordable need separately then you have to treat the supply for them separately. To assume the private sector stock is to be occupied by households in affordable need reduces the stock available to meet market need;

1.3.7 The SHMA takes no account of existing affordable need as quantified by the housing register and other sources. It simply ignores the evidence of existing need and backlog;

1.3.8 The SHMA does not take account of currently suppressed needs within the existing population, such as concealed, shared and overcrowded households. Such demand will be unlocked as the market recovers and general needs households compete more effectively in the market than households in affordable need. BANES must be realistic about migration and recognise that it cannot stop people moving into the district;

1.3.9 The SHMA does not take account of the fact that BANES will always attract a number of affluent households from the South East and London who have second homes in the area or choose to live in the area for lifestyle aspirations rather than economically driven reasons.

1.4 It is therefore concluded that the BANES SHMA update report is based on a one-size-fits-all model which fails to take account of how the housing market in BANES operates in the real world. Despite recognising that two separate Housing Market Areas existing within BANES (Bath and Bristol centric HMAs) the SHMA fails to grapple with the implications of this for the overall housing target, particularly the influence of Bristol upon the 'Bristol HMA'.

1.5 The SHMA is therefore still not NPPF compliant and fails to address the Inspector's concerns raised in ID/28 (as set out by Table 1 of this report).

1.6 A joint West of England SHMA is already being commissioned by the four West of England Authorities, including BANES. First results will be available in 2014. It is therefore suggested that BANES await the results of the joint SHMA before moving forward with its Core Strategy housing target.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 184	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name: Mr Paul Davis	Respondent Organisation: Persimmon Special Projects
-------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

SPC14 Housing Need

PHSV note that the Council have proposed increasing housing provision from 11,000 to 12,700 new homes. However, in our view there is insufficient evidence that this is based on an objective assessment of market and affordable housing needs, as required by Paragraphs 50, 158 and 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The SHMA Update Report identifies 2 housing market areas (West and East), but focuses on BANES on its own. In addition, the Assessment of Housing Need does not take proper account of Household Projections on the basis that they are National Figures which is precisely the reason why they should be taken into account as part of an objective assessment of BANES in the National context.

The SHMA Update Report identifies 8 alternative scenarios. However, neither the SHMA nor the Local Plan Modifications set out any justification for the level of growth selected. Indeed the only justification is set out in Paragraph 3.21 of the Council Report for the meeting on the 4th March 2013 where the Council justifies its decision to choose the low trend migration scenario on the basis of the ONS 2011 to 2021 Population Projections. However, these are interim projections for a considerably shorter period than that of the Local Plan Period and come on the back of a period of deep recession. They do not provide the basis for assessing housing need going forward and do not meet the Government Objective to boost housing supply and Paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 219	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: 22 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

Our principal concern relates to the overall housing target of 12,700 now proposed by the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy (SPC14). For the Core Strategy to be found 'sound' it must seek to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the area. However, an objective NPPF compliant assessment of housing need in BANES has not been undertaken.

As demonstrated by the Pegasus Critique of the ORS SHMA (submitted with this letter), the BANES SHMA Update Report 2013 prepared by ORS is significantly flawed and is not an objective, NPPF compliant assessment of housing needs. It does not therefore address the Core Strategy Inspectors concerns as set out in ID/28.

As currently proposed, the housing target for BANES is too low to respond to existing demand and affordable need. This will result in an increase in concealed households (e.g. young adults living with their parents), overcrowding, worsened affordability for all sectors, a decreasing labour force, restricted economic growth, and local people being forced to move away from the District.

Change to the policy requested:

In order to be made 'sound' BANES must prepare a new genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA working with its neighbouring authorities.

Respondent Number: 219	Comment Number: 4	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: 22 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Proposed Changes SPC14, SPC20 and SPC23 relate to the increase of the housing requirement from 11,000 dwellings to 12,700 dwellings. While we support the decision to increase the housing requirement the proposed level of increase is not sufficient to meet housing needs in Bath & North East Somerset (BANES).

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that LPA's must "use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area". We consider that the proposed housing requirement does not accord with paragraph 47 as:

1. The Bath and North East Somerset Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013 assesses a number of migration scenarios (low migration, moderate migration and high migration). The proposed housing requirement is based on the moderate migration scenario. However, it is not clear as to why the high migration scenario was dismissed.
2. The proposed housing requirement of 12,700 dwellings between 2011 and 2029 results in an annual housing requirement of around 705 dwellings. This is still significantly below the 1,065 dwellings per annum requirement set out in the Proposed Changes to the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West (July 2008). While it is acknowledged that the RSS was never adopted the evidence base remains a material consideration. BANES has not provided sufficient justification for proposing a much lower housing requirement than the RSS evidence base suggests is necessary. On the basis of the above it is considered that the proposed housing requirement is unsound as it has not been 'positively prepared', is not 'justified' and is not 'consistent with national policy'.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 222 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nicholas Pollock

Respondent Organisation: Duchy of Cornwall

Agent ID: 126 **Agent Name:** Woolf Bond Planning LLP

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

2.0.Housing Need: SPC13, SPC14, SPC15, SPC23 and SPC54 - Introduction

2.1.The Examination into the 'soundness' of the Core Strategy took place in January 2012 and we appeared at the Examination on behalf of the Duchy of Cornwall in order to request an increase in the overall housing requirement to be met during the plan period and for the Inspector to recommend a review of the Green Belt to provide for the allocation of West of Twerton in helping to meet the identified housing needs.

2.2.Our Statements submitted to the Examination referred to the various housing requirement figures to be met during plan period (2006 to 2026) and these may be summarised as follows:

SoS Proposed SWRSS Changes 21,300 (1,065dpa)

SWRSS Panel's Report 18,800 (940dpa) BANES SHMA (affordable need only) 16,940 (847dpa)

Draft South West RSS 15,500 (775dpa)

BANES Spatial Options 2009 15,500 (775dpa)

Baker Associates 14,500 (725dpa)

IPPR Trading 14,400 (720dpa)

ID/7, paragraph 2.8 12,100 (605dpa)

Woodhead Report 11,600 (580dpa)

Submission Draft CS 11,000 (550dpa)

2.3. ID/28 set out the need for the Council to identify a housing requirement in a manner consistent with the NPPF.

The Proposed Changes

2.4. SPC13 identifies that the plan period will be extended to 2029 and SPC14 states that the revised housing requirement will be for 12,700 dwellings.

2.5. It is not until one considers the content at Annex 1 to the Committee Papers reported to Full Council on 4 March 2013

that it becomes clear that the plan period now has a 2011 start date and thus covers the 18yr period 2011 to 2029, whereas the submitted Core Strategy covered the period 2006 to 2026.

2.6. The 12,700 dwelling requirement to be met in the period 2011 to 2029 is equivalent to 705 dwellings per annum. This contrasts with the 11,000 dwellings proposed to be met in the submission Core Strategy, which was equivalent to 550dpa.

2.7. The various technical papers referenced at paragraph 2.2 above identified varying levels of housing growth with the IPPR research paper and that prepared by Baker Associates recommending a requirement of 720 and 725 dwellings per annum respectively. The Council's revised figure is broadly in line with this requirement.

2.8. Against the above background, we are broadly in agreement that the 705dpa requirement appears to be sufficient to meet locally derived needs. However, and what is not clear is how the figure reflects the growth scenarios in the SHMA and how it meets the duty to cooperate and therefore the housing needs in relation to adjoining authorities. This is particularly relevant, including in relation to the suggested Green Belt releases, given that para 2.10 of the SHMA confirms that, inter alia "The reason that Bath does not show higher levels of self-containment at this stage is because it has many workers coming from elsewhere to work in the city".

2.9. Section 3 to Annex 1 sets out the LPA's consideration of the various growth scenarios.

Para 3.10 refers to the 'yet to be published' household projections which should be made available prior to the re-opening of the hearings and which will need to be taken into account.

2.10. In the context of paragraph 2.9 above, the 2011-based interim household projections were published in 9 April 2013 and have not been considered in preparation of the housing requirement figure set out in the Core Strategy. Table 406 identifies that the number of households in Banes will rise for 73,000 in 2011 to 78,000 in 2021. Table 427 forecasts that household size in 2021 will remain as per than in 2011, which is 2.31 persons.

2.11. By means of background, the 2011-based Sub National Population Projections were published in September 2012 and Table 5 identifies a population growth of 10,200 persons between 2011 to 2021 (population rising from 175,500 to 185,700). This provides a useful baseline and is one of the inputs into the model for assessing housing need.

2.12. The Examination session in June provides the opportunity to explore the above figures in the context of the various growth scenarios set out in the SHMA and therefore the robustness of the revised housing requirement.

2.13. Annex 1, Table 4 is also of relevance in revising the robustness of the Council's approach to identifying the housing requirement, the content of which will need to be explored t the examination.

2.14. The Table identifies a requirement for 7,470 dwellings during the 18yr period. It then adds the pre 2011 backlog of 1,167 dwellings (see also BNES/32) resulting in a requirement for 8,637 dwellings. This figure is then subtracted from a SHLAA supply of 10,852 dwellings with the difference (2,215) added to the 8,637 requirement to produce a figure of 10,852. A figure for affordable housing of between 1,400 to 1,900 dwellings is then added which results in a requirement figure of between 12,274 and 12,749 dwellings. This appears to represent the 12,700 figure carried forward in the Core Strategy. However, the Council has not explained how it translates a SHLAA (supply figure) into a requirement figure. Moreover, the 12,700 requirement figure fails to reflect any of the requirement figures set out in Figure 59 of the SHMA.

Summary: Suggested Changes

2.15. We wish to explore the soundness of the Council's locally derived housing requirement at the Examination.

Change to the policy requested:

--

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** D2 Planning Limited **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Whilst the principle of the District Wide Spatial Strategy is supported, objections are lodged to a number of criteria namely 1(d), 2 and the monitoring timescales.

With regards criterion 1d, support is given to the principle of development being located in the rural areas at settlements with a good range of local facilities. This is in line with the advice in NPPF Paragraph 55 which states:

“To promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities. For example where there are groups of smaller settlements development in one village may support services in villages nearby...”

Objections are lodged on the basis that there is no definition of ‘good access to public transport’, neither is there any acknowledgement that development will sustain and improve existing services, facilities and public transport. The criterion needs to be amended to recognise that new development can sustain and improve public transport and other facilities within settlements in the Rural Areas.

With regards to criterion 2, objections are lodged to the proposed net housing increase of 12,700 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029

The NPPF makes it clear in paragraph 47 that Local Plan should meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Even if it cannot do so because of the exception in NPPF unmet needs must be objectively assessed so as to identify any unmet needs that should be sought in adjoining areas.

One of the main reasons for RSS abolition was to remove top down imposition of housing requirements. However, this needs to be considered in the context of a clear parallel message for Government that it expects to see an acceleration in house building through a planning system which proactively supports growth and views housing development positively as set out in the NPPF. Increasing house building is a frequently stated Government priority and the Ministerial Statement dated 6th September 2012 on “Housing and Growth” which stated:

“The Localism Act has put the power back in the hands of communities but with this power comes responsibilities: a responsibility to meet their needs for development and growth and to deal quickly and effectively with proposals that will deliver homes, jobs and facilities.”

The move towards abolition of the RSS has not been made to facilitate reduced housing provision solely on the basis of community consultation which is what this Local Plan is seeking to do.

Indeed it should be remembered that in June 2012 the Core Strategy inspector published his preliminary conclusions on strategic matters in respect of the submitted Core Strategy. With specific regard to housing land the inspector concluded that: -

“There is a lack of National Planning Policy Framework compliant assessment of the housing requirements given the unsuitability of the Council’s methodology.”

The inspector concluded that there was a: -

- i. Need to make up the shortfall of 850 dwellings and 2,006 under the existing adopted Local Plan;
- ii. Need for a 20% buffer to be applied to the 5 year housing land supply and calculation;

iii. Lack of flexibility to accommodate any delay in bringing forward proposals.

iv. Student accommodation should not form part of the Council's supply or completion figures unless the future requirement for such accommodation is also taken into account.

Indeed the issue of housing land provision in the District together with a 5 year land supply position was the subject of considerable debate at the Sleep Lane, Whitchurch appeal in October 2012. Of particular relevance are the following conclusions of the appeal inspector:-

"There are a series of other considerations that require analysis. The first is that as that, as it readily accepts, the Council is nowhere near being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Moreover, there is an acknowledgement that there has been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing. All this is laid bare in the preliminary conclusions of the inspector dealing with the draft Core Strategy Examination, which have led to the suspension of proceedings. It is evident that the failure in terms of the delivery of affordable housing is especially acute with 565 units having been supplied between 2001 and the latest Annual Monitoring Report, against a requirement of 5,047 units between 2002 and 2009.

The inspector went on to conclude in Paragraph 24 that: -

"... it is very clear that the draft CS will have been subject to radical changes. In particular, there may be a need to identify land for up to 16,000 houses. According to the Council, this will require a number of major urban extensions and Whitchurch is a likely option that, it is suggested, could be prejudiced if planning permission was given for housing on the appeal site."

At the Whitchurch appeal the Council led with evidence that the housing provision would be increased to some 16,000 new dwellings. This however is clearly not what has resulted in the now published Core Strategy with a suggested new housing provision of 12,700 new dwellings between 2011 and 2029. It is considered that the Council's methodology is still significantly flawed. They have not adequately addressed the failings identified by the Core Strategy inspector. In view of the above, the Core Strategy is not sound in that it is not backed up by evidence rather the actual evidence indicates that a substantially higher housing provision should be adopted in excess of 16,000 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029. It is considered that the actual housing provision is in the region of 21,500 new dwellings.

Turning to the delivery of housing, objections are lodged to the lack of identified housing sites in the Local Plan. It appears that the identification of potential sites for housing and employment is being left to either the Site Allocations DPD or the production of Neighbourhood Plans. It is considered that the lack of site identification is contrary to guidance in NPPF which seeks to boost the supply of housing and provide certainty to developers and landowner on the release of land for housing. This is especially important in this District where the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing has been evident for a number of years and recognised at appeals in Farmborough and Whitchurch where both inspectors recognised the chronic shortfall in the Council's 5 year supply of housing. The preparation of Site Allocations DPD or Neighbourhood Plan will take some time to complete which consequently will produce a 'lag' in the delivery of housing sites. Indeed there is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will be produced in a realistic timescale. It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan be amended to specifically identify a number of strategic sites for both housing and employment. The objectors control land at Clutton the site is immediately available and suitable for development. Furthermore there are no technical or environmental constraints which would prohibit their release. Accordingly, this land should be identified within the Local Plan.

It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan specifically identify a number of strategic housing and employment sites which includes amongst others land at Clutton.

Finally we object to the suggested monitoring timetable level the Core Strategy will be reviewed around five yearly intervals. We consider that this timetable is too long in that given the consistent poor delivery performance of housing in the area. Accordingly we consider that a more realistic period would be say 2 years.

It is therefore recommended that: -

- a) Additional growth in rural areas can help sustain existing services and facilities;
- b) Clarify certain terminology such as good access to public transport.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

C)The level of housing provision is too low and should be increased to at least 23,500 new dwellings and take account of the actual need for development and the poor historic performance.

D)That the monitoring period be amended to say 2 years;

e)That additional sites be identified for housing in the rural areas e.g. land at Clutton.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.37 Proposed change SPC13 states that the Council has assessed the likely requirement for new housing, both market and affordable, over the plan period through the BANES SHMA. It states that the BANES SHMA has taken account of various factors, including economic growth, but notably deletes reference to net migration, likely future growth rates and productivity.

1.38 The assessment of the housing requirement in the BANES SHMA is seriously flawed and is not compliant with the requirements of the NPPF. It is based on novel and unrealistic assumptions about changing rates of female economic activity and the role of the private rented sector in meeting affordable needs (see Appendix 2).

1.39 The housing requirement does not take full account of the need for housing generated by economic growth, the need to provide for non- economically active migrants or existing affordable housing need. No assumptions about future economic growth rates or productivity appear to have been fed into the SHMA.

1.40 Please see the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS BANES SHMA' update (at Appendix 2) submitted on behalf of Barratt Homes Bristol for full details of the grounds behind this objection.

1.41 In order to proceed BANES should prepare a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA by working with its neighbouring West of England authorities. Such a SHMA is already planned, as demonstrated by the Pre-Production brief published jointly by the four authorities on the West of England LEP website. BANES should await the results of this work before moving forward with the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, existing demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC14

1.42 Proposed change SPC14 introduces the revised housing target of 12,700 and jobs target of 10,170 between 2011 and 2029.

1.43 The overall housing target is based upon the ORS BANES SHMA Update 2013 low migration trend, which is seriously flawed and will not support the delivery of the proposed jobs target. Please see the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update' (at Appendix 2) submitted to the consultation on behalf of Barratt Homes Bristol for full details of the grounds behind this objection.

1.44 In order to be found sound BANES housing target must be based upon a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA, prepared jointly with its neighbouring authorities. The SHMA must realistically forecast levels of migration and housing demand, and reflect government objectives for growth.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.60 SPC23 makes reference again to the proposed homes target of 12,700 and jobs target of 10,170.

1.61 The overall housing target is based upon the ORS BANES SHMA Update 2013, low migration trend which is seriously flawed and will not support the delivery of the proposed jobs target. Please see the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update' (at Appendix 2) submitted to the consultation on behalf of Barratt Homes Bristol for full details of the grounds behind this objection.

1.62 In order to be found sound BANES housing target must be based upon a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA, prepared jointly with its neighbouring authorities. The SHMA must realistically forecast levels of migration and housing demand, and reflect government objectives for growth.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Respondent Number: 270 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Blue Cedar Homes

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

With regards to criterion 2, objections are lodged to the proposed net housing increase of 12,700 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029

The NPPF makes it clear in paragraph 47 that Local Plan should meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Even if it cannot do so because of the exception in NPPF unmet needs must be objectively assessed so as to identify any unmet needs that should be sought in adjoining areas.

One of the main reasons for RSS abolition was to remove top down imposition of housing requirements. However, this needs to be considered in the context of a clear parallel message for Government that it expects to see an acceleration in house building through a planning system which proactively supports growth and views housing development positively as set out in the NPPF. Increasing house building is a frequently stated Government priority and the Ministerial Statement dated 6th September 2012 on "Housing and Growth" which stated:

"The Localism Act has put the power back in the hands of communities but with this power comes responsibilities: a responsibility to meet their needs for development and growth and to deal quickly and effectively with proposals that will deliver homes, jobs and facilities."

The move towards abolition of the RSS has not been made to facilitate reduced housing provision solely on the basis of community consultation which is what this Local Plan is seeking to do.

Indeed it should be remembered that in June 2012 the Core Strategy inspector published his preliminary conclusions on strategic matters in respect of the submitted Core Strategy. With specific regard to housing land the inspector concluded that: -

"There is a lack of National Planning Policy Framework compliant assessment of the housing requirements given the unsuitability of the Council's methodology."

The inspector concluded that there was a: -

- i. Need to make up the shortfall of 850 dwellings up to 2006 under the existing adopted Local Plan;
- ii. Need for a 20% buffer to be applied to the 5 year housing land supply and calculation;
- iii. Lack of flexibility to accommodate any delay in bringing forward proposals.
- iv. Student accommodation should not form part of the Council's supply or completion figures unless the future requirement for such accommodation is also taken into account.

Indeed the issue of housing land provision in the District together with a 5 year land supply position was the subject of considerable debate at the Sleep Lane, Whitchurch appeal in October 2012. Of particular relevance are the following conclusions of the appeal inspector:-

"There are a series of other considerations that require analysis. The first is that as that, as it readily accepts, the Council is nowhere near being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Moreover, there is an acknowledgement that there has been a record of persistent under- delivery of housing. All this is laid bare in the preliminary conclusions of the inspector dealing with the draft Core Strategy Examination, which have led to the suspension of proceedings. It is evident that the failure in terms of the delivery of affordable housing is especially acute with 565 units having been supplied between 2001 and the latest Annual Monitoring Report, against a requirement of 5,047 units between 2002 and 2009.

The inspector went on to conclude in Paragraph 24 that: -

"... it is very clear that the draft CS will have been subject to radical changes. In particular, there may be a need to identify land for up to 16,000 houses. According to the Council, this will require a number of major urban extensions and Whitchurch is a likely option that, it is suggested, could be prejudiced if planning permission was given for housing on the appeal site."

At the Whitchurch appeal the Council led with evidence that the housing provision would be increased to some 16,000 new dwellings. This however is clearly not what has resulted in the now published Core Strategy with a suggested new housing

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

provision of 12,700 new dwellings between 2011 and 2029. It is considered that the Council's methodology is still significantly flawed. They have not adequately addressed the failings identified by the Core Strategy inspector. In view of the above, the Core Strategy is not sound in that it is not backed up by evidence rather the actual evidence indicates that a substantially higher housing provision should be adopted in excess of 16,000 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029. It is considered that the actual housing provision is in the region of 21,500 new dwellings.

Turning to the delivery of housing, objections are lodged to the lack of identified housing sites in the Local Plan. It appears that the identification of potential sites for housing and employment is being left to either the Site Allocations DPD or the production of Neighbourhood Plans. It is considered that the lack of site identification is contrary to guidance in NPPF which seeks to boost the supply of housing and provide certainty to developers and landowner on the release of land for housing. This is especially important in this District where the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing has been evident for a number of years and recognised at appeals in Farmborough and Whitchurch where both inspectors recognised the chronic shortfall in the Council's 5 year supply of housing. The preparation of Site Allocations DPD or Neighbourhood Plan will take some time to complete which consequently will produce a 'lag' in the delivery of housing sites. Indeed there is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will be produced in a realistic timescale. It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan be amended to specifically identify a number of strategic sites for both housing and employment. The objectors control land at Church Lane, East Harptree which lies within the defined settlement limits and the site is immediately available and suitable for development. Furthermore there are no technical or environmental constraints which would prohibit their release. Accordingly, this land should be identified within the Local Plan to enable much needed housing to be built.

The objectors are a specialist retirement home developer and they object to the lack of recognition within the policy for this form of development. The NPPF requires that all forms of housing needs are met.

The District has an elderly population profile and this will increasingly be an issue. Frequently older residents are keen to stay in the towns and villages that they have grown up in/currently live in. However as people age they can become less mobile and less able to run the house (often change houses) that they live in. There can be a need for people to move into new homes in some cases supported and other cases more suited to their mobility lifestyle. Accordingly there is presently drafted the policy exclusions references to the specialist market housing for the elderly and this should be amended.

It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan specifically identify a number of strategic housing and employment sites which includes amongst others land at Church Lane, East Harptree.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The level of housing provision made is not based on a proper assessment and statement of the requirement, the level of housing requirement is considerably higher when properly assessed, and the spatial strategy does not sufficiently reflect the right vision for the area. When these matters are properly addressed, it is evident that more development should be proposed at Bath than is currently the case.

2.2 Assessment of the housing provision figure

2.2.1 Key elements of the core strategy are to set out the number of homes that will be required and provided over the plan period. These issues are some of the most important parts of the plan making process and given the increasing gap

between what housing is being built and what is needed in the UK, it is being given increased emphasis by the Government. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires local authorities to plan for and deliver homes that are needed, using a proportionate evidence base which ensures an understanding of the local area in order to decide on the number and type of homes that should be planned for. Paragraph 47 of the Framework requires local authorities to 'use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area.'

2.2.2 The Framework goes on to say at paragraph 159 that local planning authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), and that among other things, the SHMA: 'should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which: - meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change.'

2.2.3 The delivery of housing is set within the context of achieving sustainable development and promoting economic growth. Paragraph 7 makes clear that:

'Planning should... deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth.'

2.2.4 With the abolition of Regional Strategies BANES is now required to develop its own housing figures and undertake an objective assessment of need, although this actually means the requirement. To be robust the evidence base must:

- Consider what the demographic information is saying about BANES
- Understand the components of change and drivers of population change which are; births, deaths, people arriving from or leaving for the rest of the UK (internal migration) and people arriving from or leaving for other countries (international migration)
- Identify the likely change in household composition and implications for the mix of houses
- Understand the current housing stock and its occupation.

2.2.5 While it is useful to consider employment led scenarios because there is a link between jobs and homes, it is important to understand that not all demand is created from new jobs. Considerable demand coming from existing population. The Inspector was very clear in his preliminary conclusions ID29 at para 1.11 that 'The relationship of the housing requirement to economic growth and local jobs is clearly an important one, not least to ensure that there are sufficient workers to fill planned jobs or to achieve other objectives, such as to reduce commuting. But the Council is, in effect, using this link to determine a cap on the housing requirement. In an area such as Bath and NES, which is such an attractive place to live and attracts people who are not economically active, the link between homes and jobs cannot be the primary determinant of the housing requirement.'

2.2.6 This was a key issue in the recent North Somerset High Court challenge; whether the housing requirement figure made sufficient allowance for demand unrelated to the creation of new jobs. It is more important that any jobs based calculations properly factor in the needs of the existing population. They should be used to cross check and corroborate demographic information and ensure the lack of housing doesn't constrain growth. It can also be useful to understand and influence the distribution of jobs and homes, and this is already so in BANES where there are different economic relationships to consider.

2.2.7 Once an objectively assessed requirement is established, the Council must consider how it will deliver this requirement and what supply of housing is available through the evidence in its SHLAA. BANES must consider its objectives, vision and aspirations for economic growth through the delivery of the LEP objectives and whether the demographic profile of the population fits and if not, how it should be addressed. In addition it is necessary to consider the environmental constraints, market capacity, delivery, infrastructure and viability issues to ensure sites are deliverable. All these consideration will influence the figure which is included in the plan. The translation of the objectively assessed requirement into a local plan provision figure must be transparent and justified.

2.3 The SHMA Update 2013

2.3.1 The Council has rightly commissioned further work on its housing figures to understand the needs that exist and the relationship with jobs. ORS have produced a SHMA update which considers a range of issues relating to housing need, but

also the requirement. It uses up to date information from the 2011 Census, recent projections, and develops some trend based migration scenarios and two different job growth scenarios based on the West of England projections. This report is useful and provides considerable detail on the implications for the types, tenures and sizes of houses that will be required between 2011 and 2031.

2.3.2 However, there are a number of difficulties raised by this SHMA as follows:

- The data covers a period longer than the plan period
- It tests a net nil migration projection which is not achievable
- The methodology for identifying the requirement and setting the housing mix model is not transparent
- The calculation used to translate households into dwellings is not explained and appears to give different results than the Council has used
- There is no discussion about how the change in average household size is likely to affect the number of dwellings
- The job growth of 11,000 jobs is not an accurate reflection of the West of England ambitions nor of the part BANES is to play
- The employment led scenarios use assumptions relating to unemployment, economic activity rates and commuting levels which are not explicit
- The assumption relating to changes in retirement age accounting for a significant increase in economic activity is not justified.

2.3.3 The SHMA demonstrates a housing requirement within the range of 5100 and 15,300 dwellings. It does not conclude on which level is likely to be the most appropriate for the plan to use. However, it is implied that the low trend migration is preferred because this is then used to identify size and mix within the conclusions. That said, the text qualifies the use of this scenario at paragraph 6.20 which states; 'In practice, the lowest net migration to BANES occurred in the period 2007 – 2010. This period coincides with a general slowdown in migration within the UK as economic growth has slowed and transactions in the housing market have been reduced.' The report goes on to say clearly that 'this is unlikely to be realistic if the LEP aspirations for the economic growth are well founded and there is no behavioural change in respect of state retirement age'.

2.3.4 This sentence is clear that the two scenarios, low migration and high employment are incompatible. From the different requirements generated by the scenarios, there appears to be some corroboration between the 'low migration' and 'higher jobs with changed female requirement pattern' scenarios which lead to the same number of dwellings (8300) for the period. The Council is certainly seeking this corroboration to justify its choice of figure. However as the last sentence of para 6.21 set out above makes clear, the two are mutually exclusive. This is a fundamental point which the Council is ignoring as it seeks endorsement for the level of 8300 new dwellings.

2.4 Projecting the local population requirement

2.4.1 The general approach taken in the ORS report of setting up a number of scenarios and testing the implications of the population generated into new homes is useful. As set out above a methodology which considers past trends and seeks to vary assumptions with justification can be appropriate. However, we have a number of significant reservations about how this information has been used, and how the scenarios have been set up, as well as the lack of transparency of assumptions.

2.4.2 The net nil migration projection is never going to be achieved and serves no useful basis on which a requirement can be set. This is acknowledged in paragraph 6.15 of the report and it is surprising that this scenario has been included.

2.4.3 The projecting forward of past trends is a well established method and can be informative. In particular it is helpful to consider the different rates of migration and how variable these have been. All the scenarios recognise the extreme variability of net international migration and have applied a consistent level of 470 per year for each scenario.

2.4.4 However, as highlighted above, the use of three year average is astonishing. It is not a robust timeframe on which to project 20 years forward and its use in this way can only serve to continue past trends of low growth. The low trend migration scenario makes no allowance for an increase in the housing market or economy over the plan period, which is what the 11,000 jobs scenario relies on.

2.4.5 The most robust projections-based scenario would be the mid range migration trend, because it is based on a longer time series of data which reflects short term trends being balanced with different phases of the economic cycle. The claim

that a 'three year period was chosen to provide a long enough time period that shorter term variability was eliminated' is misguided. Using a three year average as the basis for an 18 year trend will not provide statistically robust results. At the very least it is more robust to use the longer term mid range trend of 530 dwellings a year. This would translate into a need for 9,540 dwellings over the plan period (2011-2029) of which 3,060 are required for social/affordable rent.

2.4.6 However, we would suggest that it is much more robust to use a longer term trend such as the full eight year average (2002 – 2010) of 865 people per year migration plus the 280 natural change. These are shown in figure 42 and 43 of the SHMA. This would result in a slightly higher growth rate than is shown in the mid trend scenario, and set out in the paragraph above.

2.4.7 The higher growth trend is merely an exercise at the other end of the scale to the low trend rates and demonstrates nothing more than what would happen if a return to the situation seen in the early 2000s occurred. It should be dismissed in the same way as the low trend scenario.

2.4.8 Nowhere within the SHMA report is there an explanation of the translation from population to additional households, and on to the dwelling requirement, as set out in the last three rows of figure 43. It is not possible to understand what assumptions are used. Specifically we are concerned to understand:

- exactly what assumptions are made
- If household representative rates are used from the projections up to 2021 what method is applied after this to 2031?
- what average household size is used and whether any decline been factored in?
- how does this fit with the likely size mix?

2.5 Employment led projections

2.5.1 It is agreed that the WoE economic baseline forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are useful to test. However, considerable reliance is placed on boosting overall participation rates and on jobs being taken up by changes in retirement age. The whole of the assessment is predicated on the second sentence in paragraph

6.27. These assumptions are considerable and are not evidenced. It is not clear how the figure of 8100 more employed people in BANES by 2031 is calculated. The proportion of working age (16-67) is set to decline over the period 2011 to 2021 as shown by the 2011 based interim population projections. Therefore maintaining the economic activity rates is going to be challenging enough without seeking to increase them. Unemployment rates are unlikely to be reduced any further than they currently are and changes in retirement age are unlikely to account for a significant take up in new jobs. However, the assumptions are not transparent in the methodology. The assumed scale in the change in the proportion of working age would rely on significant intervention in reducing the number of people who are economically inactive for reasons such as long term sickness. While these trends are apparent in the previous Census data there is not much flexibility within the figures to reduce them further.

2.5.2 The assumptions relating to retirement age and the likelihood of new jobs being filled by women from BANES working to 67 are not justified. While this may make some contribution to the maintenance of the economic activity rates, there is no evidence to suggest that such change in behaviour will occur and will make such a significant impact on the economy. There will need to be monitoring across the country and within BANES to assess the extent to which this change in retirement age and in the behaviour of women in working longer or taking early retirement has on economic activity rates and economic migration.

2.5.3 Figure 45 Summary of Employment Led Projections, contains no reference to any of these important aspects in order to demonstrate how the use of the model leads to the net population change. Specifically it is necessary to understand:

- Exactly what assumptions are made on unemployment rates, commuting levels and economic activity
- Has a discount for double jobbing been applied?
- How is the population translated into households and then to dwelling requirement?

2.5.4 We are also concerned to ensure that the methodology appropriately includes an element for the needs of the existing population. This is a fundamental issue and one which the Inspector identified in his Preliminary Conclusions as needing to be specifically addressed. It is not possible from Figure 45 to understand the calculations made and to what extent 'latent demand' has been adequately included.

2.5.5 There is a rather basic point in relation to the use of an economic led projection. The Council rightly seeks to maintain the District’s proportion of the jobs in the West of England – at 15% of the total. The LEP target with which the plan is aligned is 95,000 jobs by 2031. However the Council reduces its target by 2800 on the basis of the jobs to be lost from MOD sites in the District. The Council’s report to the 4 March Council meeting claims this approach is condoned by the Inspector’s Preliminary Conclusions but this is not the case. The Inspector refers to the 2800 MOD jobs transferring from BANES to Bristol (and hence still being in the West of England) and says at para. 1.27 says that ‘gross job growth in Bath has to overcome this loss’.

2.5.6 An economic led projection for BANES therefore which provides for the housing requirement to be consistent with what the plan is saying about job growth (and hence providing a coherent and integrated plan which can be found sound) should be based on 12,825 jobs (ie 15% of 95,000 but only for 18 years) and not the 11,000 jobs used in the SHMA.

2.6 The Housing Mix Model

2.6.1 This stage of the process uses the population information generated by the different scenarios. While the model does appear to be rather opaque, the core modelling assumptions are helpfully set out at paragraph 8.43. It provides a very interesting and comprehensive housing market and affordability assessment of the different types and tenures which make up the requirement, and explores the impact of changes since 2001 specifically in terms of the increase in the private rented sector and the conversion of dwellings.

2.7 Alternative Demographic and Employment led Approaches

2.7.1 The SHMA in general is limited by the scenarios it has tested. The migration trend projections are not robust and do not provide a realistic assessment of need taking into account the long term trends. The economic projections while based on the appropriate job numbers are predicated on assumptions that are not justified. It is therefore suggested that alternative approaches should be considered to represent a more robust assessment of the objective requirement.

2.7.2 In terms of demographic scenarios the use of a long term trend is more robust. This could be calculated as set out below, although this is not consistent with the ORS model because the assumptions are not made clear in the SHMA.

2.7.3 Long term trend of 865 migration +280 natural change = 1145 persons per year. This gives a population growth of 20,610 to 2029 which translates into 9600 new dwellings, (assuming average household size of 2.29 at 2029 and that 3.4% of population are in communal establishments). For comparison this would lead to 9861 new dwellings using the same calculations as in figure 43, as far as it can be worked out from what is provided.

Table 3.1: Long Term Growth Trend Projection

BANES Long Term Growth Scenario	
population 2011	176,020
household 2011	73,341
total population 2029 (1145x18)	20,610
private household population 3.4%	189,945
Households at 2029 AHS 2.29	82,945
Additional households	9,604

2.7.4 In relation to an employment led scenario ORS used 11,000 jobs. We do not agree with ORS that this would create the need for between 6,400 and 8,300 new homes. In our assessment we would expect 11,000 new jobs to be translated into a population of 196,244 which would lead to the need for 12,426 new dwellings. This provides for a proper incorporation of the needs of the existing population and is based on the same assumptions as above and including discounts for double jobbing, retention of economic activity rate and maintenance of unemployment levels.

2.7.5 However we do not agree that 11,000 jobs is the right figure. The figure to be consistent with what the Council takes it objectives to be is 12,825 jobs to be translated into a population of 199,760 which leads to a requirement for 13,961 homes.

2.7.6 This method which translates jobs growth into the requirement for new homes uses the change in jobs identified over the period 2011 – 2029 to identify the new economically active people required to support these jobs. These new people would generally require accommodation, however, this is constrained by the levels of unemployment and also the economic activity rate. Using appropriate assumptions in relation to these factors, ie retaining the level of economically active and using the proportion of working age population identified in the population projections, it is possible to calculate the population that would be required to deliver these new jobs. By calculating the total population this properly allows for the needs of the population and ensures that the need for housing created over and above those linked directly with job creation is fully factored into the method. This is particularly important in places such as Bath which as the Inspector recognised in paragraph 1.11 ‘is such and attractive place to live and attracts people who are not economically active, the link between homes and jobs cannot be the primary determinant of the housing requirement’.

2.8 Household projections

2.8.1 The 2011 based interim household projections were released by DCLG on 9 April 2013 and are an important material consideration for authorities. They represent the most recent post Census figures and are based on the 2011 interim population projections produced by ONS and released in September 2012. All projections have limitations because they are based on past trends, and the last five years have generally seen low house building rates. As the projections qualify “They are not an assessment of housing need or do not take account of future policies, they are an indication of the likely increase in households given the continuation of recent demographic trends.”

2.8.2 In addition these projections only go to 2021, because they follow the population projections, and are therefore limited. This is not helpful for those seeking to set the requirement for a longer plan period. However, these post census figures have been calibrated by the census data and as such represent the most up to date and robust data set and are a material consideration.

2.8.3 The 2011 interim household projections indicate that BANES will see a growth of household population from 169,571 to 179,609 (10,038) between 2011 and 2021 (table 426). This information is used to calculate the household growth and also the average household size change for districts. For BANES the projections show a rise of 4,390 households between 2011 and 2021. The average household size set out in table 427 is expected to rise from 2.31 in 2011 to 2.33 in 2016 and then reduce back to current levels in 2021.

2.8.4 The projections also provide a considerable amount of information relating to the projected households in relation to type, age and number of dependent children. In BANES it is projected that there is almost equal growth of each of the household types. In relation to households with dependent children there is proportionally more growth in the category ‘with no dependent children’ compared to the others. In terms of age of the head of the household the greatest actual increase of 1122 households is projected within the age group 75-84. It should be noted that there is a decrease of 938 households projected within the age group 35- 44.

2.8.5 This information is very useful in the short term and demonstrates that there is a need to provide for 4,400 households to 2021. Translating this into projections for the longer plan period is not straightforward and a mere doubling of the growth is not an appropriate response. The Council recognise this in its report at Annex 1 of the 4 March Committee at paragraph 3.11 which says ‘this is considered too simple an approach’.

2.8.6 Any use of these projections over the longer term should be treated with care and if done, should be on the basis of the household population. It must take account of changes to household formation rates and also factor in any changes in average household size. For example if the low trend growth of 10,038 people is extended to 2029 this would give a population growth of 18,068 over the plan period. Comparing this against the scenarios set out within the SHMA it would indicate a dwelling requirement of around 9,000. The assumptions would need regular review.

2.8.7 Consequently the household projections would appear to largely corroborate the low to mid trend growth projections that are set out within the SHMA. More importantly they are likely to represent a similar level of growth as a long term trend which is what we advocate above as the most reliable way to set up a demographic projections based scenario.

2.8.8 While the projections represent the most up to date information and are to be accorded considerable weight, there are number of concerns about them in terms of the methodology used, assumptions applied and lack of sensitivity testing that has been undertaken.

2.8.9 The following comments are made:

- These projections are 'interim' and cover the period 2011 to 2021. Consequently they only cover the short term and do not provide a robust basis on which to plan for the medium to long term which is covered by the plan period.
- As with all projections they are based on trends for the previous 5 years. As the notes to the projections states 'They are not an assessment of housing need or do not take account of future policies, they are an indication of the likely increase in households given the continuation of recent demographic trends'.
- They are based on the 2011 based interim population projections. ONS highlight that caution should be used in the application of the population projections for planning purposes.
- They are not direct estimates of the actual number of households but rather are a result of a modelling exercise which derives household representative rates and relies on evidence from the labour market survey which demonstrate that household representative rates for some (particularly younger) age groups have fallen markedly since the 2001 Census. Full Census results are not available and have not verified that this assumption is correct.
- There have been no variant household projections produced to accompany this interim set of projections. This means that it not possible to understand the broad indication of the sensitivity of the projections to different demographic assumptions on fertility, life expectancy and net migration.

2.8.10 The projections reflect the period 2006 – 2010 during which the economy has experienced very low rates of economic growth. During this period house building has been at an all time low and migration rates have also been substantially reduced. These circumstances combine to mean that population growth has been low. Given that the population figures are the essential input into the household projections, it follows that the resulting household projections to 2021 represent a low level of growth.

2.9 The unmet requirement arising from Bristol City administrative area

2.9.1 The work done for and by the Council as evidence for the Proposed Changes deals only with changes in the demographic and economic situation for the population of the District. It is part of the plan's role however to deal in addition with needs arising from its place within the West of England functional area. This is clear from the Framework and the soundness test as set out in the earlier part of these representations. The greater urban area in the WoE is Bristol, and Bristol's capacity to accommodate development is less than the requirement arising from the demographic and economic changes that will take place with its population in the period covered by the BANES Local Plan.

2.9.2 The immediate periphery of major urban areas is the most sustainable location in which to address development needs that cannot be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing urban area, and this is the case for Bristol. Parts of the edge of Bristol lie within BANES and BANES has a responsibility therefore to address some of the unmet requirement from Bristol. This requirement from the Framework is not dependent on the local planning authority with the unmet requirement 'asking the neighbouring authority for help', and neither is it negated by the two authorities agreeing to avoid anything that might be uncomfortable – it is simply a case of planning authorities in an evidence-based plan led system having a responsibility to tackle strategic issues.

2.9.3 Whilst Bristol City Council never set out the requirement in its Core Strategy, and has dealt only in estimates of capacity, there are various estimates of what the housing requirement is for the Bristol administrative area. These all suggest that the objectively assessed requirement is considerably in excess of the provision made through the Bristol Core Strategy. Unless this is addressed through the plans of the three other local authorities that administer the WoE functional area, the four planning authorities in combination are effectively planning to restrain the growth of the WoE economy and decrease access to decent housing for large parts of the population.

2.9.4 The 2011 based interim household projections issued on 9 April 2013 indicate that Bristol will grow by 20,498 households between 2011 and 2021. While we would caution against a straightforward rolling forward of these figures, they demonstrate that a considerable number of houses will be needed for Bristol in the short terms and even if growth continues only in line with this trend, which is a low growth trend, there will be a requirement for additional new homes to meet Bristol's needs at the edge of Bristol outside the Bristol administrative area over the Plan period. This is in addition to

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

that element of need from BANES required to be delivered in the Bristol HMA. Bristol's needs should be met as close to Bristol as possible, just as Bath's needs need to be met at Bath.

2.9.5 Other participants in the Examination of the Core Strategy may present an argument that more residential provision should be made to the south east of Bristol. HFT wishes it to be clear that the provision made to the south east of Bristol should be the provision related to Bristol and to that part of BANES. Development in this part of the District is not to be seen as a means of dealing with development that is part of the requirement for Bath and which should be made at Bath.

2.9.6 HFT's submission is that the increased provision made at Keynsham in the Core Strategy by the Proposed Changes is disproportionate to the circumstances in this location. However the excessive provision at Keynsham cannot be dealt with at south east Bristol because of the amount already directed to that location and because there is far more that should be dealt with at south east Bristol to address part of Bristol's unmet requirement. Instead it should be dealt with at Bath, where the provision is already too low, and where development can be provided in the most sustainable way.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

2.10 Translation of the objectively assessed requirement into the housing provision within the Core Strategy

2.10.1 The role of the plan is to make provision for housing, seeking to meet the objectively assessed requirement as well as using the development over which the plan has influence to fulfill the plan's objectives generally.

2.10.2 It is not clear from the Core Strategy and the proposed changes how the provision figure of 12,722 dwellings has been set. There is only very little reference within the revised core strategy of the SHMA and no discussion of what the objectively assessed need is thought to be, how this is made up and how it relates to the supply as well as the relationship with the economic and affordable housing need objectives of the Council. Consequently the provision figure of 12,722 is difficult to reconcile with the evidence within the SHMA update. In particular it is not clear how the provision has been established, what the objectively assessed need is and whether this provision figure meets or exceeds that. There is no discussion of how the figure is arrived at, what assumptions it includes, what sources of land are included and how the five year land supply will work. There is only brief reference to the need for a 20% buffer bought forward from later in the plan period, and no inclusion of a table for ease of reference. This lack of transparency about how the figure has been decided and how it will be delivered is contrary to the objectives of the NPPF.

2.10.3 The document which seeks to explain how the SHMA evidence, SHLAA and other information has been used to set the provision figure of 12,722 is Annex 1 of the 4 March Committee report. It is obvious from reading the SHMA and the Annex 1 report that there has been considerable misunderstanding of the evidence. In many respects they do not seem to be related to the same information. Certainly the Core Strategy changes do not appear to be based on the evidence.

2.10.4 The Annex 1 report says at paragraph 3.11 that ORS have 'converted this estimate to 2031 based upon net migration and natural change patterns observable within the ONS projections'. They go on to explain how scenarios are postulated on whether population change reflect high, mid or low levels of migration shown within 2011-21 projections. This is not what ORS have done. It is clear that ORS have looked at low, mid and high levels of migration 'based on published ONS estimates for the period 2002 – 2010' (para 6.16). They therefore do not take the components of change in the projections and roll them forward, rather they use historical information.

2.10.5 It is also interesting to read in Annex 1 at paragraph 3.14 that a crucial technique has been to remove the student

population from the calculations. Nowhere in the SHMA report is this assumption set out. There is concern therefore that the Council are either misinterpreting the data or that the SHMA does not set out adequately all the assumptions and calculations used, or perhaps both. This needs to be cleared up. Domestic and international students attending the two Universities in Bath account for a very significant and rapidly growing part of the population of Bath in particular. The concern from what is said by the Council is that this group is not being identified as part of the requirement for housing but is taking up a considerable proportion of the housing supply. If so this represents a critical mismatch and means that the Council on this matter alone is planning for an inadequate supply of housing.

2.10.6 Due to the different periods covered by the SHMA and the plan, it has been necessary for the Council to calculate the 18 year requirement. This has been done using a straight 18/20 ratio.

2.10.7 This Annex 1 report explains that the starting point for the requirement is the provision of 11,000 jobs in line with the WoE aspirations and the maintenance of the share of jobs for BANES. This is set out in the SHMA as an 'employment led high jobs change scenario' of which identifies the need for 8,300 new dwellings between 2011 and 2031. As explained above there are severe doubts about this scenario and the assumptions behind it. The Council is predicating its approach on an increase in working age population over the years 2011-2021. While this is correct in actual numbers, the percentage of working age (16-67) as a proportion of the total population is projected to decline slightly. This is in line with the national trend. Given this decline, the assumptions on economic activity rates and belief that jobs will be taken by the changes in retirement age, is considered to be subject to considerable doubt.

2.10.8 In explaining how the approaches are brought together the Council re-emphasises that the low population trend reflects the period 2013 -21 believing that 'this is the most logical trend to use to extend to 2029. This is not what the low trend does, it is a three year trend (2007 – 2010) which is only valid if 'the economy continues to grow more slowly than in the past' (para 6.21 of SHMA).

2.10.9 At paragraph 3.22 of the Annex 1 report the Council seeks to corroborate the figure of 8,300 from the employment led scenario with the same figure in the low trend migration scenario. In doing so it is seeking to demonstrate that latent demand for housing will be catered for. However, these two approaches are not compatible and cannot both be delivered together. High economic growth is by its nature dependent on an increase in economically active, which is largely achieved through migration. This is set out in the SHMA itself which at 6.22 says it is 'unlikely to be realistic if LEP aspirations are well founded.'

2.10.10 Table B at para 5.11 of the Annex 1 report sets out the requirement over the plan period as 7470, this equates to 415 houses per year, which when looking at the ORS report chapter 6 and the projection tested is similar to the low trend migration rate (420) or employment led 11,000 job change scenario (410), although we do not endorse either of these approaches for a number of reasons as set out above.

2.10.11 The objectively assessed requirement that is chosen from the SHMA (7470) is then supplemented by an addition of:

- the shortfall/backlog (1167)
- an element to meet the identified affordable housing need.

2.10.12 It is useful to understand the level of affordable need from the objective requirement, and appropriate to set a target for achieving this level of need. The Council argues that the affordable housing need within their chosen scenario is considered to be 2700 social/affordable rented homes over the plan period. When added with the backlog the affordable need rises to 3110. This cannot be achieved by the delivery of existing sites identified through the SHLAA. Consequently a calculation is made at table 4 of the Annex 1 report to establish how many more units are required to meet the need (569) and consequently how many more market homes are required to deliver this affordable need at either 30 or 40%, ie 1870 homes.

2.10.13 The figures are set out in Table 4, which incidentally is mis-labelled as the requirement based on ORS moderate growth scenario. Nowhere in the SHMA, as set out in para 6.3 is there a moderate growth scenario. This demonstrates another mismatch between the evidence and the Core Strategy.

2.10.14 There seems to have been a misunderstanding of the evidence, whether deliberate or not.

Despite purporting to use the SHMA scenarios as an indication of the requirement, they are in fact used only to identify affordable need, this is then assessed against the supply to see whether it is deliverable. The affordable need exceeds the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

supply and the methodology seeks to meet this gap by allocating additional land. The logic of this is interesting and is driven solely by meeting the affordable need. So the provision figure of 12,722 is made up of the supply 10,852 plus the additional 1,870 necessary to provide affordable housing. This approach mixes the requirement with the supply to create provision, which is not an acceptable and robust approach.

2.12 Affordable Housing Provision

2.12.1 The Council has considered the level of housing provision to be made has made use of the assessment of affordable housing need, and the contribution to be made to meeting the need for affordable housing appears to be a factor in explaining the very wide ranging set of scenarios included in the ORS report, though this is far from clear.

2.12.2 The objective assessment of the housing requirement arising within BANES set out in these representations uses a different approach – one which looks at the corroboration between the population level from demographic change and the number of people required to meet the number of jobs that the Council and the plan are seeking to see added in the District. If housing was provided in accordance with this assessment of the housing requirement, there would be a contribution to affordable housing, but this would not meet the full affordable housing need.

2.12.3 The level of affordable housing need is difficult to ascertain from the Council’s evidence. It is noted however that in 2011 there were around 11,051 applicants on the housing register, a figure which had more than doubled since 2005; and which included 1171 applicants in need of older person’s accommodation. This represents a huge increase in the need for affordable housing over recent years, which the Council has failed to begin to address. In particular, there were in these figures 3,476 applicants with a preference to live in the City of Bath.

2.12.4 In order to seek to meet this need – as para. 47 of the Framework requires – the level of housing provision would have to be considerably higher in order that sufficient affordable housing is provided as a proportion of the open market housing according to policy and viability considerations. This case is made in separate representations made on the Proposed Changes by Tetlow King Planning on behalf of the Guinness Partnership in relation to Sulis Down.

2.12.5 It can be reiterated here that sites such as the land adjoining Odd Down can be very efficient in the delivery of affordable housing, and in the specific case of this site, the requirements for infrastructure that would undermine the viability of the scheme and detract from the ability to the scheme to provide affordable housing are relatively low.

Change to the policy requested:

2.13 Conclusion on the housing requirement

2.13.1 To conclude it is clear that the SHMA does not provide an objective assessment of need, and that the scenarios that are tested are inappropriate and severely limited in their usefulness and accuracy. While the demographic approach would indicate that the requirement is likely to be around 9,600 dwellings, this merely reflects the low level of growth provided for and experienced by BANES in the past and is not compatible with its economic ambitions. A jobs led scenario is useful to provide corroboration of these figures, and should be based on delivering 12,825 jobs between 2011-2029. This is consistent with the West of England ambitions.

2.13.2 We would suggest an alternative approach which translates these jobs into the need for 13,961 homes.

2.13.3 Consequently this employment led approach to the housing requirement indicates that a far higher level of housing should be provided. This is also corroborated by the affordable housing need which exists within BANES and which will only be adequately addressed by increasing the housing provision set out in the plan. In addition there will also be an unmet need from Bristol which will have to be met on the edge of the city and will require further land being made available. The Council have inadequately assessed all this evidence and come to a conclusion and level of provision which is not consistent with the evidence and which fails to meet the objectively assessed need that exists.

Respondent Number: 320 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Jolliffe

Respondent Organisation: Ammerdown Estate

Agent ID: 45 **Agent Name:** Savills Planning and Regeneration

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We are supportive of this increase in the housing target for BANES as a whole, which is needed in order to fulfil identified need and ensure consistency with the NPPF. We would however suggest that the policy is modified to confirm that housing numbers are minimum figures, rather than limits.

Change to the policy requested:

In policy DW1, where there are references are housing targets, replace the word "around" with the words "at least". This is consistent with the approach of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, where the Inspector concluded that targets should represent "a floor, not a ceiling", to accord with the NPPF.

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell**Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

With a 14000 plus waiting list for rented affordable housing in BANES(Somerset) 3100 affordable housing units is far too low and below the proposed housing provision with the Core strategies of Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire, West of England Councils Greater Bristol and Bath City region.

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a policy that allocates and sets higher targets for affordable housing in the district to meet its housing waiting list and balance jobs and employment instead of providing affordable housing in Western Wilts, Bristol, Mendip or Swindon.

Bath policy do not reflect the need to house its working community Bath, Keynsham, Saltford, Whitchurch, Stockwood, Paulton, Radstock, Midsomer Norton, Peasedown St John have good bus corridors and rail improvements.

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell**Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst we support this policy of extra housing in Bath at Odd Down Weston and MOD, Endsleigh Lansdown and two sites at Odd Down, extra housing allocation is required in the Bath Twerton area to the West of Bath towards Bristol .

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a further allocation of housing on the two Odd Down sites and extra housing allocation to the West of Twerton towards Saltford. Bath needs to provide more housing to meet its waiting lists for social housing. Odd Down and East of Twerton are on a good public transport bus corridors to Saltford, Keynsham and Bristol A4 A367 to Radstock Midsomer Norton and Wells .

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4515 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Sue Walker**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I would hope that houses are built on brownfield sites. Whenever possible, and not on greenfield/greenbelt areas. It seems common-sense to preserve areas of natural beauty for as long as possible.

If/when houses are built in Temple Cloud, I hope that vehicular access and how extra traffic is going to impact, will be carefully considered. Also, whether there are places available in the local primary school for newcomers.

My concern with the Placemaking Plan is that there are members of the Cameley Parish council who have a vested interest in building houses, and their connections with a landowner(s) has coloured their views on where new houses should be built. Applications have been turned down when villagers have voiced their concerns about suitability (I am thinking of land adjoining Temple Inn Lane) of additional houses and I hope other sites would be considered in the future.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Respondent Number: 4516 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr David Hayward**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The city is inundated with supermarkets particularly with Tesco which takes up valuable space which should be used for residential accommodation.

There are sufficient small local shops to service the sites which the supermarkets now occupy.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4532 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Silverwood Partnership Ltd / JE Sheppard & Sons**Agent ID:** 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy DW1 – District Wide Spatial Strategy

Whilst the principle of the District Wide Spatial Strategy is supported, objections are lodged to a number of criteria namely 1(d), 2 and the monitoring timescales.

With regards criterion 1d, support is given to the principle of development being located in the rural areas at settlements

with a good range of local facilities. This is in line with the advice in NPPF Paragraph 55 which states:

“To promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities. For example where there are groups of smaller settlements development in one village may support services in villages nearby...”

Objections are lodged on the basis that there is no definition of ‘good access to public transport’, neither is there any acknowledgement that development will sustain and improve existing services, facilities and public transport. The criterion needs to be amended to recognise that new development can sustain and improve public transport and other facilities within settlements in the Rural Areas.

With regards to criterion 2, objections are lodged to the proposed net housing increase of 12,700 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029

The NPPF makes it clear in paragraph 47 that Local Plan should meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Even if it cannot do so because of the exception in NPPF unmet needs must be objectively assessed so as to identify any unmet needs that should be sought in adjoining areas.

One of the main reasons for RSS abolition was to remove top down imposition of housing requirements. However, this needs to be considered in the context of a clear parallel message for Government that it expects to see an acceleration in house building through a planning system which proactively supports growth and views housing development positively as set out in the NPPF. Increasing house building is a frequently stated Government priority and the Ministerial Statement dated 6th September 2012 on “Housing and Growth” which stated:

“The Localism Act has put the power back in the hands of communities but with this power comes responsibilities: a responsibility to meet their needs for development and growth and to deal quickly and effectively with proposals that will deliver homes, jobs and facilities.”

The move towards abolition of the RSS has not been made to facilitate reduced housing provision solely on the basis of community consultation which is what this Local Plan is seeking to do.

Indeed it should be remembered that in June 2012 the Core Strategy inspector published his preliminary conclusions on strategic matters in respect of the submitted Core Strategy. With specific regard to housing land the inspector concluded that: -

“There is a lack of National Planning Policy Framework compliant assessment of the housing requirements given the unsuitability of the Council’s methodology.”

The inspector concluded that there was a: -

- i. Need to make up the shortfall of 850 dwellings and 2,006 under the existing adopted Local Plan;
- ii. Need for a 20% buffer to be applied to the 5 year housing land supply and calculation;
- iii. Lack of flexibility to accommodate any delay in bringing forward proposals.
- iv. Student accommodation should not form part of the Council’s supply or completion figures unless the future requirement for such accommodation is also taken into account.

Indeed the issue of housing land provision in the District together with a 5 year land supply position was the subject of considerable debate at the Sleep Lane, Whitchurch appeal in October 2012. Of particular relevance are the following conclusions of the appeal inspector:-

“There are a series of other considerations that require analysis. The first is that as that, as it readily accepts, the Council is nowhere near being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Moreover, there is an acknowledgement that there has been a record of persistent under- delivery of housing. All this is laid bare in the preliminary conclusions of the inspector dealing with the draft Core Strategy Examination, which have led to the suspension of proceedings. It is evident that the failure in terms of the delivery of affordable housing is especially acute with 565 units having been supplied between 2001 and the latest Annual Monitoring Report, against a requirement of 5,047 units between 2002 and 2009.

The inspector went on to conclude in Paragraph 24 that: -

“... it is very clear that the draft CS will have been subject to radical changes. In particular, there may be a need to identify land for up to 16,000 houses. According to the Council, this will require a number of major urban extensions and Whitchurch is a likely option that, it is suggested, could be prejudiced if planning permission was given for housing on the appeal site.”

At the Whitchurch appeal the Council led with evidence that the housing provision would be increased to some 16,000 new dwellings. This however is clearly not what has resulted in the now published Core Strategy with a suggested new housing provision of 12,700 new dwellings between 2011 and 2029. It is considered that the Council’s methodology is still significantly flawed. They have not adequately addressed the failings identified by the Core Strategy inspector. In view of the above, the Core Strategy is not sound in that it is not backed up by evidence rather the actual evidence indicates that a substantially higher housing provision should be adopted in excess of 16,000 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029. It is considered that the actual housing provision is in the region of 21,500 new dwellings.

Turning to the delivery of housing, objections are lodged to the lack of identified housing sites in the Local Plan. It appears that the identification of potential sites for housing and employment is being left to either the Site Allocations DPD or the production of Neighbourhood Plans. It is considered that the lack of site identification is contrary to guidance in NPPF which seeks to boost the supply of housing and provide certainty to developers and landowner on the release of land for housing. This is especially important in this District where the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing has been evident for a number of years and recognised at appeals in Farmborough and Whitchurch where both inspectors recognised the chronic shortfall in the Council’s 5 year supply of housing. The preparation of Site Allocations DPD or Neighbourhood Plan will take some time to complete which consequently will produce a ‘lag’ in the delivery of housing sites. Indeed there is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will be produced in a realistic timescale. It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan be amended to specifically identify a number of strategic sites for both housing and employment. The objectors control land at High Littleton. The site is immediately available and suitable for development. It is considered that part of the site is suitable for at least 50 dwellings. Furthermore there are no technical or environmental constraints which would prohibit their release. Accordingly, this land should be identified within the Local Plan (see plan).

It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan specifically identify a number of strategic housing and employment sites which includes amongst others land to the south of Greyfield Road, High Littleton (see attached plan).

Finally we object to the suggested monitoring timetable level the Core Strategy will be reviewed around five yearly intervals. We consider that this timetable is too long in that given the consistent poor delivery performance of housing in the area. Accordingly we consider that a more realistic period would be say 2 years.

It is therefore recommended that: -

- a) Additional growth in rural areas can help sustain existing services and facilities;
- b) Clarify certain terminology such as good access to public transport.
- c) The level of housing provision is too low and should be increased to at least 23,500 new dwellings and take account of the actual need for development and the poor historic performance.
- d) That the monitoring period be amended to say 2 years;
- e) That additional sites be identified for housing in the rural areas e.g. land at High Littleton.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number:	4547	Comment Number:	4	Respondent Name: Mr Martin Davis	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:		Agent Name:			
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>				Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

THE 20% INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF HOUSES PLANNED AND THE REQUIRED RATE OF DLIVERY HAS FORCED THE COUNCIL TO OPT FOR DEVOPMENT ON AONB/ GREEN FIELD SITES WHICH OTHERWISE WOULD HAVE BEEN LEFT INVIOALATE. THE NUMBERS ARE QUESTIONABLE

THE PROPOSED CHANGE AND PLAN IS THEREFORE UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4564 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The brownfield site which the now redundant Gas meter sits on could become a prime site for development – why isn't this included? Why build on green belt in an AONB when there are already sites available for development within the City and ones that have much better access to jobs/City Centre etc.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4607 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** JC & PA Elliot-Newman
The Elms Weston Bath**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The stated number of homes required – 12,700 and jobs – 10,170 suggest very few homes with more than a single worker.

It has not been shown how or where that correlation has been calculated.

The breakdown of Job Location – table 9 / item 5.30 of Annexe No 1. is disproportionate for the B&NES area – 6,750 for Bath as against 3,420 for the whole of the remainder.

It has not been established that there is scope for the expansion of the retail and services sectors to support the above Job Increase figures. There are no stated aims to encourage manufacturing in Bath, nor where any such employment opportunities may be established.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4664 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Constrat Limited**Agent ID:** 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Prior to suspending the examination of the BANES Core Strategy examination in 2012, the Inspector in Note ID/28 confirmed that the Council had not undertaken an NPPF compliant Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and he stated:

“Paragraph 159 (of the NPPF) sets out the evidential basis for authorities having a clear understanding of housing needs in their area based on a SHMA, prepared collaboratively where the HMA crosses administrative boundaries.”

Furthermore Paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that local planning authorities preparing plans should account for the presumption in favour of sustainable development by positively seeking opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans ‘should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...’.

We contend that the proposed modifications to the submitted Core Strategy relating to housing requirements as informed by the ORS draft SHMA (March 2013) still fail to comply with the provisions of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The revised BANES Core Strategy endorses a housing target of 12,700 homes, a far lower target than was considered sound as part of the three iterations of the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy (15,500, 18,800, 21,300 dwellings). The revised target was informed by a baseline housing requirement of 8,300 dwellings over the period to 2031 (7,470 dwellings to 2029) set out in the draft SHMA dated March 2013). Our concerns regarding the robustness of the above SHMA figures include:

- The figures equate to the low trend migration projection; a projection that is unlikely to meet the West of England LEP (of which BNES is a member) aspiration for growth as acknowledged in Paragraph 6.21 of the draft SHMA:

“... this is unlikely to be realistic if the LEP aspiration for economic growth is well founded and there is no behavioural change in respect of state retirement age.”

This approach is therefore unsound as it relies upon a population/household projection that is based on a period that includes an extended recession and where there was an under-supply of housing in the district that would have distorted migration trends. Similarly, as well as projecting historic trends, the NPPF (Paragraph 50) requires LPAs to plan for ‘current and future demographic’ trends.

- One of the key concerns raised by the Inspector in Note ID/28 was the absence of a SHMA which assessed housing need on a Housing Market Area level and ensuring that the unmet needs of adjoining local planning authorities were met if necessary. The draft SHMA disregards the potential housing needs of Bristol where the adopted Core Strategy is due to be reviewed shortly and the Inspector previously voiced concerns that the housing target (26,400)within the Bristol Core Strategy:

“... is very unlikely to meet, and could fall very substantially below, the potential housing demands in Bristol over the plan period... as this is the first Core Strategy of the West of England authorities to be examined, it would be short-sighted to rule out the possibility of a cross-boundary approach to development in the Green Belt in the future.” (Paragraphs 48 & 52, Inspector’s Report on the Bristol Core Strategy, March 2011)

The draft SHMA published in February 2013 confirmed at paragraph 6.4 that “...none of the scenario incorporate a strategic housing allocation to cater for the unmet needs from adjoining areas such as Bristol.”

While this extract was removed from later iterations of the SHMA, it demonstrates that ORS/BANES Council acknowledged there are unmet needs from adjoining LPAs however the SHMA does not account for this in its scenarios, thereby departing

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

from the Inspector's advice in ID/28.

Furthermore, while the Core Strategy increases the housing target from 7,470 dwellings to 12,700 dwellings to facilitate a greater level of affordable housing delivery; this is a tokenistic approach considering the level of affordable housing need in BANES in February 2013 stood at 12,800 households as set out in the Council's Homeseach List. Indeed the West of England SHMA identifies the need for 847 affordable homes per year in BANES; in excess of the total annualised delivery rate of approximately 705 dwellings (comprising both market and affordable units) per year proposed in the revised Core Strategy.

The soundness of the Core Strategy housing target is also undermined by the fact that projections in the draft SHMA exclude the student population in BANES as set out in paragraph 3.14 of Annex 1 of the 4th March Committee Meeting Report Pack. This is based on an assumption that none of the students will seek to remain in BANES once they have completed their study: a scenario that does not appear to be based on empirical evidence. This approach does not constitute 'proactively driving and supporting sustainable economic development' advocated by the NPPF (Paragraph 17) as the NPPF would clearly expect BANES to do all it can to retain a highly educated workforce in order to attract further economic investment in the district.

It is therefore concluded that the housing target being pursued by the Council is unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Council needs to review its draft SHMA to assess the district's full housing needs for all types of housing, including need that may arise from neighbouring planning authorities in accordance with Paragraph 159 of the NPPF. The current assessment fails to account for these considerations.

Once the objectively assessed housing needs of the district have been established, the Core Strategy should seek to embrace the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 14, NPPF) by positively seeking to meet the development needs of the area; not apportioning growth based on capacity analysis as is currently the case.

Respondent Number: 4664 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Constrat Limited

Agent ID: 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Written Response by Baroness Hanham, House of Lords, 26 March 2013.

Lord Taylor of Warwick: To ask Her Majesty's Government what assessment they have made of the statement from the chairman of the National Trust that new housing developments for young people should be in towns rather than in rural areas.

The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for Communities and Local Government, Baroness Hanham: The National Trust is an independent organisation. But I would make the following observations in relation to government policy on rural housing.

Under the last Administration:

Home ownership fell by 302,000 from 2005 to 2010, despite a Government target to increase it by 1 million over that Parliament (22 January 2013, Official Report, Commons, col. 209WA); only 26% of families aged under 40 could afford to buy a home in England (National Housing and Planning Advice Unit, Evaluating requirements for market and affordable housing, February 2010, Annexe C); and the Government's Rural Advocate asserted: "The long-term future of the countryside is in jeopardy because so many young people are being forced out of rural areas to find homes, jobs and support" and "the lack of affordable housing-to buy or to rent-is cited as the major factor forcing young people out of rural areas, or discouraging their return". He recommended: "Local authorities should review their housing land assessments to take better account of rural needs and adopt a more creative and flexible approach to planning" (Commission for Rural Communities press release, 4 March 2010).

Ministers in this Government believe that home ownership should not be the exclusive preserve of people with large incomes or wealthy parents. Affordable and accessible rural housing for young people is essential for a vibrant rural

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

economy. We want to see successful rural businesses and thriving rural communities in a living, working countryside, and housing is an essential part of that vision. We disagree with the suggestion that the children of rural families should be excluded from the countryside.

The National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. Housing should be located in rural areas where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Policies should also recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it.

To help provide both rural and urban housing, this Government are championing initiatives such as our Affordable Housing Programme, Home on the Farm schemes, the Community Right to Build, the Rent to Build fund, Firstbuy, Newbuy, Neighbourhood Planning, the New Homes Bonus, a comprehensive empty homes programme, and reforms to change of use to get redundant agricultural buildings back into productive use.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4692 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Grainger plc

Agent ID: 123 **Agent Name:** Savills (L&P)

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We do not include within these representations a detailed critique of the overall strategic housing requirement or the broad distribution strategy for the scale of growth proposed. These matters are addressed in the representations on behalf of the Hignett Family Trust by Peter Brett Associates and we do not therefore wish to repeat or duplicate these arguments. Nevertheless, Grainger do support the proposed increase in the strategic housing requirement and consider that additional land should be identified for residential development in order to address this need.

To address the strategic housing requirement, Grainger strongly support the reference in Clause (4) of Policy DW1 to the removal of land from the Green Belt adjoining Odd Down. For the reasons outlined later in these representations and in those to Policy B3A, the land at Odd Down is considered to be an entirely suitable and sustainable location for strategic growth. The land represents a clearly defined and logical extension to the built up area. It is well contained by the existing landscaping and the scale of development responds appropriately to the topography of the site and the surrounding areas.

Furthermore, the site benefits from many positive attributes, it is well related to services and facilities, including public transport provision, schools, shops and employment opportunities. In the context of the significant constraints impacting upon the development potential of land surrounding Bath, the site is undoubtedly the most suitable location for strategic scale growth.

Given its suitability and sustainability, it is considered that the land adjacent to Odd Down is appropriate for a greater scale of growth than proposed in the Core Strategy. The scale proposed and the rationale for this is provided in our representations to Policy B3A.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4701 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Dutton **Respondent Organisation:** Gladman Developments

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This letter is in response to the above consultation and provides Gladman Developments' representations. We understand the current consultation follows the suspension of the authority's Core Strategy Examination in September 2012 and outlines proposed modifications to address the Inspector's concerns that the Council may not be planning for a sufficient amount of new housing and had not calculated its housing needs in conformity with national requirements.

The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) has been with us now for just over 12 months and the industry is beginning to get to grips with its application and the need for some fundamental changes in the way in which planning operates. One such change relates to the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and how this fundamental requirement of the Framework should be reflected in the plan making process. Gladman, who operate on a national basis, have had the opportunity to become involved in a number of local plan preparation processes since the Framework was brought into force including participation in the Examination stage and have gained significant experience as a result.

What continues to be clear from this experience is that many local authorities have not fully addressed the requirements of the Framework when preparing their Local Plans and this has led to significant concerns being expressed by Inspectors on the soundness of their plans in their current format. The main concerns centre upon the requirement in the Framework to "use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area" (§47). The process of undertaking an objective assessment is clearly set out in the Framework principally in §14, §47, §152 and §159 and should be undertaken in a systematic and transparent way to ensure that the plan is based on a robust evidence base.

Comments

The Proposed Changes increase the number of new homes required over the Plan period to 12,700 between 2011 and 2028. This change is founded on the findings of an updated SHMA prepared in 2013. Gladman are concerned that this figure could still be arbitrarily low and is considerably lower than the authority's requirement in the draft South West Regional Strategy. In particular it appears to be constrained by future employment growth and an unrealistic assumption that recession period migration rates will continue over the whole plan period up to 2028. This is likely to underestimate the full need for housing. It is important to remember the Framework requirement to boost significantly the supply of housing by meeting full, objectively assessed needs.

As you are aware the Office for National Statistics recently issued interim-2011 based household projections. We consider that these projections should be used with some caution, as they are interim and likely to have been influenced by short term issues affecting the housing market and economy. When these issues ease household formation rates are likely to return to a pre-recession trajectory over the longer term. Further, as the projections only cover the period 2011-2021 they are unlikely to reflect predicted requirements across the whole plan period.

It is also important to stress that the process in relation to determining the objectively assessed need should be undertaken with full regard to the Duty to Cooperate as set out in §110 of the Localism Act. This ensures that if the needs of the authority cannot be fully met within their own area then the surrounding authorities agree to accommodate the shortfall or, if the surrounding authorities cannot meet their full need, then the shortfall is picked up within your authority.

Gladman welcome the Council's recognition that it must address its historic market and affordable housing backlog. We further welcome the commitment to address the shortfall in the first five years of the Plan period. The failure to include past shortfall in housing delivery in the proposed housing target would be considered unsound.

I hope you have found these representations constructive, if you require any further information or wish to meet with one of the Gladman team then please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Withies Farm Landowners' Group,
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The scale of housing growth for which provision is made in para. 1.26 and Policy DW1 (2) is insufficiently justified and inconsistent with a plan that is positively prepared to meet objectively assessed needs. Moreover, there is little evidence that the plan has been prepared in accordance with the 'Duty to Cooperate', as required in order to ameliorate the potential consequences of the abolition of an overarching regional tier of strategic planning policies.

The Core Strategy provision for around 12,700 new homes represents an annual requirement of around 700 dwellings over the Plan period, representing a reduction of over one-third (34%) compared with the RS requirement. Bearing in mind that a substantial proportion of the annual requirement now provided for is made up of a housing backlog from the previous Local Plan period, the like for like reduction from the RS figure is significantly greater. Whilst the latest 2011-based Interim Household Projections indicate a slowing in the rate of household growth, such a reduction would seem to be disproportionate to the reduction in household growth rates and inconsistent with the NPPF objective to 'boost significantly' the supply of housing.

In the RS, Bath and North East Somerset was included in the West of England HMA, which included the districts of West Wiltshire and Mendip parts of which are acknowledged as falling within the Bath HMA as commissioned for the current purposes. It is apparent that the higher quantum of housing proposed in the RS was in part due to the recognition of the influence of Bath on those parts of West Wiltshire and Mendip within the HMA, and the appropriateness of accommodating such growth at Bath.

Notwithstanding the statutory obligations on the local planning authority in accordance with S33A of the 2004 Act, there is no evidence that the Council has discharged its duty cooperate with its neighbouring planning authorities, in particular Wiltshire and Mendip Councils, in the preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. It has already been conceded that there has been little joint working with Bristol City Council in the matter for that part of the district that has been identified as having a HMA that is influenced by the neighbouring Bristol urban area.

Whilst Bristol City Council has indicated that there are no unmet housing needs that should be accommodated within BANES at the present time, there is little evidence of any constructive dialogue with Wiltshire and Mendip Councils to ascertain whether they are intending to meet their housing requirements in full, and in particular whether there are any needs arising from within those neighbouring authority areas that are more appropriately accommodated within BANES.

It is interesting to note that one of the considerations that has delayed the Wiltshire Core Strategy from proceeding to Examination is that Inspector's concerns regarding the lack of clear evidence concerning the duty to cooperate, not least with BANES, concerning the accommodation of housing requirement. The Inspector's attention is drawn to the Wiltshire Core Strategy Inspector's Second Procedural Letter to Wiltshire Council seeking clarification on, inter alia, how the housing evidence base and provisions had had regard to cross border matters, with Bath being identified as one of the relationships of particular concern to him. Attention is also drawn to the Council's reply, which did little to provide any substantive evidence to demonstrate how the Plan had responded to such considerations. Copies of both these items of correspondence are available on the Wiltshire Council Web Site (Core Strategy Examination page).

Just as the Duty to Cooperate and the requirements of para. 159 of the NPPF are of relevance to the Wiltshire Core Strategy Examination Inspector, they are of equal relevance to the current Inspector in coming to a view on whether the Plan is sound. However, at the present time there is no clear or substantive evidence relating to how the duty has been discharged, and in particular, how it has influenced the provisions of the Plan. In terms of housing provisions there is little to demonstrate how cross-border issues may have caused an adjustment to the housing provisions in terms of either an increase or decrease in the provisions that have been made. Since the neighbouring authorities in the West of England HMA, including Bristol, North Somerset and Wiltshire Councils, are all providing for significantly reduced housing

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

requirements compared with the requirements for the HMA as identified in the RS, there is a significant risk of full objectively assessed needs not being met.

In order for the current Plan to be found sound it is essential for the Council to demonstrate how the duty to cooperate has been discharged, and to provide clear evidence as to how it has affected the provisions of the Plan. At the present time there is little in the way of clear evidence from any of the neighbouring authorities to demonstrate that this duty has been discharged in a satisfactory and meaningful manner. As such, the housing provisions of the Plan cannot be held to be sound as the present time.

Neither Wiltshire Council nor Mendip Councils are able at the present time to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land, which is being reflected in appeal decisions, a most recent example of which relates to a site at Evercreech in Mendip District which was allowed on the basis of the lack of a five year supply of housing land (18 April 2013). This is clear evidence that there are unmet needs in those neighbouring authority areas that it may be more appropriate to accommodate in BANES owing to the influence of Bath on the HMA.

The Council has correctly increased its overall housing provision to take account of the need to deliver a significant quantum of affordable housing, However, the overall increase presumes that affordable housing will be delivered in conjunction with market housing in accordance with the target proportions set out in the policy provisions. This is an unlikely scenario bearing in mind that the policy criteria are maxima and aspirational. Bearing in mind prevailing market conditions, together with the quantum that is allowed for on brownfield regeneration sites in Bath where there are significant costs of site reclamation and infrastructure, the funding for which remains uncertain, it is unlikely that affordable housing will be delivered in full accordance with the policy aspirations. It will therefore be necessary to increase the provisions for market housing in order to ensure that the affordable housing need is met in full.

Change to the policy requested:

Review the scale of housing growth for which provision is made in the Plan

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Respondent Number: 4465 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Nicola Fickling and Andrew Berry **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We do not believe that the proposal for building on the Odd Down site is either justified or consistent with national policy.

The proposed plans to build are in direct opposition to the National Planning Policy Framework. In particular:

- It does not meet the need for planning to be environmentally sustainable (P2 of the National Planning Policy Framework). The plan to build on green belt land and in close proximity to a conservation area will lead to a destruction of natural environment, biodiversity and will have an effect on wildlife within the area including the protected species of bats. It does not “promote biodiversity” which is a key point of the National Planning Policy Framework
- It is building on protected green belt land. This goes against P5 of the National Planning Policy Framework where it states “protecting the green belts around them (cities/towns)”
- The proposed plans do not “recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside” (P5) with the proposed building work being located within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- It does not “support thriving rural communities” (P5) with the proposed building site being located in close proximity to South Stoke – in itself a conservation area that will be swallowed up by Bath.
- It is not “land of lesser environmental value” (P6). The land that is proposed being built on is extremely environmentally sensitive, including ancient woodland and tree belts.
- It specifically states in the National Planning Policy Framework that “the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence”. Releasing green belt land for building on does not support green belts as “permanent”. It specifically states in the national planning document that “a local planning authority should regard construction of new

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

buildings as inappropriate in green belt”

- The area is AONB and the policy document states “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in areas of outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty”

- On P27 it states that building should “promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats”. Any building in the area proposed will have an impact on protected species of bats.

The proposed building site is: an area of outstanding beauty, is adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument, in close proximity to a conservation area, hosts protected species of bats and is green belt land.

Because of this, we do not believe that any building on this site is justifiable.

In addition, the building on the site at Odd Down will lead to increased traffic to an already congested road, and in particular have an impact of traffic going into Bath and Bristol.

Change to the policy requested:

We suggest that an area of not such environmental sensitivity is chosen, perhaps in enhancement to already existing plans, such as those to build around Keynsham.

Another alternative is to look at building in Radstock.

Both these areas are well connected to the local area, and would greatly benefit from the economic enhancement of new building. They are not as environmentally sensitive and in general have less protected historical sites.

Respondent Number: 4709 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** James Walters

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposed area is a designated Green Belt. Erosion of the Green Belt on the edge of the city impacts detrimentally on Bath’s status as a World Heritage Site and therefore on one of the most significant sources of capital flowing into the city – from its visitors. Aerial photographs of the proposed site show how, if building is allowed to proceed, it will contribute to the establishment (following the development of the Sainsbury’s site at Odd Down) of a concrete halo around the city.

The proposed area is an area of outstanding natural beauty. However sympathetic the designs for the development may or may not prove to be, the moment the first set of earth moving equipment is allowed onto the site, it will lose that status and Bath will be poorer for it.

Wansdyke Way is an ancient important archaeological feature. The proposed development would likely cause irreparable damage and potentially limit access for future generations.

The area is recognised as an important foraging area for the Greater Horseshoe bat. Any development of the site would inevitably disturb and likely threaten the bat population.

The proposed housing will exacerbate traffic congestion in the immediate surrounding area, which is already at breaking point at the busiest times of day. Moreover, no indication has been given of how this might be addressed through additional infrastructure. After all, this is not simply an issue that can be handled by adding roundabouts at key junctions or promoting the “park and ride”.

The area provides a recreational facility to support healthy lifestyles of Combe Down, Odd Down, Fox Hill, Southstoke and Sulis Meadows residents and this important facility would be lost if the proposed area were to be released from Green Belt for development.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

It is clear from the NPPF that central to any review of Green Belt, indeed the whole purpose of reviewing Green Belt is “the need to promote sustainable patterns of development”. In BANES the Council, quite rightly in our view, has largely ruled out channelling development towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Moreover, given the obvious constraints on Bath as a World Heritage Site, the Somer Valley, Midsomer Norton, Radstock and the Rural Areas, the town of Keynsham is an obvious choice for consideration, for a variety of reasons which the Council has set out, even though it is ‘inset’ within the Green Belt.

The rejection of Redrow’s land at Lays Farm (See attached Site Location Plan and Site Analysis) on the grounds that a gas pipeline runs through the central southern part of the site and that the “HSE buffer zone severely limits development” or “effectively limits development to a very minor area to the north west of the site” is simply wrong and wholly misleading (Ref: BANES Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2013).

We are clear that an old high pressure (steel) gas main runs across the site at a depth of approximately 1.2m. However, the route of this pipeline as shown on the (unnumbered) plan attached to the SHLAA, does not accord with the records held by the company who own and operate the pipeline, namely Wales and West Utilities Ltd (see attached W&WU Pipeline Plan). Moreover, the existing easement is only 7m and Wales and West has confirmed that it would require a no-build zone of 16m although a highway may be constructed across the main.

The impact of the existing pipeline on the development potential of the site is consequently minimal and certainly not such that would warrant disregarding it completely as a sustainable option. Moreover, it is feasible to divert the main, and Redrow have recently done just that elsewhere in Bristol, and by using modern materials it would further reduce any no-build easement to 6m.

The site, south of Lays Farm (Ref: Area 10 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L) is bound on two side by development and forms a far more logical addition to the built-up area of Keynsham than that proposed to be released from the Green Belt to the south (Ref: Area 13 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L). Development would project no further west than the existing Lays Farm Business Centre. Moreover, the submitted site analysis shows that the distance and the intervening topography ensure that the role of the remaining Green Belt separating Keynsham from Stockwood (identified as Stockwood Vale) would not be unacceptably eroded. In no sense would the release of this site result in the coalescence of Keynsham with Bristol.

It appears to us, from close examination of the SHLAA and the Green Belt Review, that the Council’s primary reason for not also identifying the land at Lays Farm for release from the Green Belt was based on incorrect information about the route and scale of any safeguarding associated with the gas pipeline.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Change to the policy requested:

Land at Lays Farm is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing (150 dwellings)

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Council has failed to demonstrate that, insofar as the provision for new homes is concerned, it has met the national planning policy imperatives set out at paragraphs 17, 47, 48, 159 and 182 of the NPPF, namely:

- Base its plan on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues (NPPF Paragraph 17) irrespective of the legal duty to co-operate
- That every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth (NPPF Paragraph 17)
- Use their evidence to ensure their Local Plan meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing (NPPF Paragraph 47)
- Identify a five years supply of specific deliverable site (NPPF Paragraph 47)
- Only make allowance for windfall sites in the first 5 years where there is compelling evidence for doing so (NPPF Paragraph 48)
- Crucially, Local Plans should... be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities (NPPF Paragraph 157)
- Prepare a SHMA to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries (NPPF Paragraph 157)
- The SHMA should identify the scale .. of housing (NPPF Paragraph 159)
- Prepare a SHLAA to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period (NPPF Paragraph 159)
- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. (NPPF Paragraph 182)

There is no clear and transparent objective explanation as to how the Council arrives at its figure of 12,700 dwellings having regard to the SHMA and the SHLAA. It still appears to us that the Plan results in a substantial shortfall in meeting housing needs.

We are still anticipating that the Council will be seeking to address some of the above short comings prior to the resumption of the hearing sessions later in the summer, but until it does, participants will not be able to be more specific and consequently more constructive in their analyses at this stage.

For example, the Council says that it has reassessed the small sites windfall allowance in light of paragraph 48 of the NPPF (Ref: BNES/40 paragraph 5.2). However, on its own admission, this assessment is confined to considering historic delivery rates. Paragraph 48 is clear, however, that LPAs may only make such an allowance if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. The Council has indicated that it will publish its evidence in relation to the “rate of replenishment of the stock of permissions” in May, but this is after this round of consultation closes. In the circumstances therefore we cannot conclude that there is compelling evidence in this regard, as required by the NPPF.

Notwithstanding the above, there is nothing in the work undertaken on the SHMA or indeed the Green Belt Review to provide any hint that the Council has engaged in any meaningful joint working and co-operation with adjoining authorities where housing market areas evidently cross the administrative boundary. Clearly the opportunity to rectify that now, so late in the suspension period, is very limited to say the least.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Change to the policy requested:

That the housing figure is based on, and transparently linked to, a NPPF-compliant objective assessment based on joint working and co-operation.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 4600 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Margaret Williams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: 28 **Agent Name:** Nash Partnership

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. Overview

1.1. SPC24 states that 'retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt within B&NES, with no strategic change to the boundaries other than removing land to meet the District's development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram:

D Land adjoining Odd Down

D Land adjoining Weston

D Extension to MoD, Ensleigh

D Land adjoining East Keynsham

D Land adjoining South West Keynsham

D Land at Whitchurch

1.2. It is our belief that the decision to change the green belt boundary to the South West and East of the town ahead of land to the West of Keynsham at Lays Farm is unsound because it is not effective in meeting the wider aims of the Core Strategy or consistent with national policy.

1.3. It does not offer the best approach to maintaining the separate identity of the town and is therefore in conflict with this ambition of the Core Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol. In this regard it should also be regarded as not legal.

1.4. Evidence demonstrates it is a less sustainable location for development than Lay's farm to the West of Keynsham, which should be named in SPC24 instead as a location for green belt land release.

1.5. The two areas covered in SPC24 which would have sites released from the Green Belt – the boundaries to the South West and East of the town - are discussed in turn below and in comparison to the alternative for releasing land to the West of Keynsham, specifically at Lays farm.

2. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the South West of Keynsham

2.1. All Green Belt sites considered for release in light of the revisions to the Core Strategy have been analysed as part of Arup's Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013). Within the conclusions and recommendations of this report, land to the South West of Keynsham is listed as a 'worst performing' development option. The report states that 'Land adjoining South West Keynsham has similar transport characteristics to the west of Keynsham. The development area is further from Keynsham town centre making it less accessible on foot and the east-west alignment of the area could make it difficult to integrate buses into the development so travel patterns are likely to be car dependent'.

2.2. Further to this assessment, the Arup Development Concept Options Report for this area – considered as part of the land south of K2 parcel – notes that 'The area is remote from the town and has limited vehicle and pedestrian connections to the neighbouring residential area....a regular bus service runs through the residential area to the north (Cedar Drive/Newland Road) though this is some distance from the site. No regular services run directly through or past the study area. Extension of these routes to serve the area may prove difficult due to limited access opportunities. The study area lies around 2km from Keynsham railway station'. It goes on to state that 'The study area lies around 1.7km from the town centre and has few tangible connections in this direction due to the layout of the existing residential area. Though adjacent to a primary school, the study area is over 500m from the neighbourhood centre on Queens Road. This poses issues regarding the social and environmental sustainability of future development and could lead to the creation of an isolated and car-dominated environment.[...] The peripheral location means that additional bus services are less likely to come forward.

2.3. This is evidence that releasing green belt land at the South West of Keynsham ahead of land at the West of Keynsham (incorporating Lay's Farm) is a less sustainable option and should be considered contrary to paragraph 34 of the NPPF which states 'Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the

need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised'. In this regard the changes to the Core Strategy are unsound.

2.4. Further to these poor sustainable transport credentials, the Development Concept Options Report goes on to state that 'The study area is very constrained in terms of vehicle access opportunities. Access relies on the suitability of Charlton Road as there is insufficient capacity on Redlynch Lane (south/east) and no suitable access points from the north (the K2B scheme does not allow for a vehicle connection). If Parkhouse Lane is to be used as an access there will be a need to improve its capacity though through access to Keynsham centre would be unsuitable. The limitations on access and connectivity indicate that it may not be feasible or desirable to develop the entire area.' Given that the viability of access to the site has not been established, it is not sound plan-making practice to release the site from the Green Belt for housing development ahead of Lay's Farm, which is located in a more sustainable location for transport and has access arrangements already established through the trading estate.

2.5. Releasing land from the Green belt to the South West of Keynsham, as identified in the Green Belt Stage 1 report threatens encroachment into the gap between Queen Charlton and Keynsham which is essential in maintaining separate identities for each of these settlements. The green belt review stage 1 report notes that 'The Green Belt in this land parcel 'protects the individual character and strong urban edge of Keynsham and prevents the merger of Queen Charlton with Keynsham. It is noted that the western part of the land cell bounds provides the setting for the Queen Charlton Conservation Area'.

2.6. In a similar regard to heritage, the green belt review states that Green belt allocation here also 'protects the setting of Parkhouse Farmhouse, which is a Grade II listed building.' In this regard green belt which does not serve the function of protecting the setting of listed buildings should be developed ahead of Green Belt which does serve this function.

2.7. The green belt review identifies this parcel as serving a strong agricultural purpose which would be lost as a result of being released from the green belt for housing. Releasing land at the South West of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality'.

2.8. The green belt review notes that 'The stream that passes to the east of Queen Charlton is designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. It is reasonable to assume that Abbots Wood would have relatively high biodiversity value, although it is not currently designated'. The allocation of green belt land for housing development within the South West of Keynsham study area ahead of other areas with lower biodiversity constraints is not in pursuit of sustainable development, as is a requirement of paragraph 9 of the NPPF. This states that 'Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to): [...] moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature'. In this regard the changes to the core strategy should be considered unsound.

2.9. Further to the Green Belt review, B&NES commissioned Arup to produce a 'Development Concept Options Report' in light of the inspectors' requirement to make more housing land allocations which adds further evidence that land to the South West of Keynsham (assessed as part of the 'South of K2' parcel) is a more unsustainable location for release of green belt land than at Lay's Farm.

2.10. Firstly the report notes that 'the study area lies on the mid-slope of a gently sloping plateau falling towards Keynsham from the southwest. Within the boundary there is a change in level of around 30m from south-west to north-east, making the southern and western parts more exposed and visible.' This exposure and visibility renders the site unsuitable for release from the Green Belt due to notable potential impact of any development here on views and the local open countryside character. The report states that 'Development could have a significant impact on landscape character and views from surrounding areas from the east and south east, particularly across the Chew Valley'. These landscape character impacts are not present in potential development of Lay's Farm which should therefore be considered as a preferable location for release of green belt land for housing development.

3. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the East of Keynsham

3.1. Paragraph 6.6 of BNES/40 ('B&NES response to Inspector's note on proposed changes to the Submitted Core Strategy')

states that 'At Keynsham the Council considers that at the location on the eastern side of the town there is no capacity for longer term development and therefore, the Placemaking Plan will not consider the identification of safeguarded land. This is because land in this location is of significant importance to the Green Belt. As set out in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review undertaken by Arup (available as part of the supporting evidence throughout the consultation period) land in this area is of high importance in Green belt terms as it lies directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt) and it prevents the merger of Bristol, Bath and Keynsham'. The parts of the green belt proposed for release for housing development serves the same function as this land and therefore, by extension of the council's own logic, should not be released for development and an alternative approach sought.

3.2. The potential locations for green belt release for housing development to the East of Keynsham fall within two areas analysed as part of the Green Belt stage 1 report – Land South East of Keynsham and Land North East of Keynsham. Both of these sites are described in the green belt review as being 'of high importance on the basis that [they] lie directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt). It prevents the merger of Bath and Keynsham, while acknowledging that the area of land remaining open between Bath and Keynsham (and Bath and Saltford) is wider than that remaining open between Bristol and Keynsham'. Maintaining a separation and separate identities between Bath and Keynsham is a key aim of the Core Strategy and therefore releasing green belt in this area is contrary to these aims and should be considered unsound. To the same end it notes that 'It is considered that the Green Belt does play a role in constraining the potential urban sprawl of Bristol (Oldland and Willsbridge) in a southerly direction towards Keynsham'. Therefore losing this Green Belt to housing would threaten the separate identities of Bristol and Keynsham secured by this designation. In this regard the removal of green belt designation here would have more significant adverse impact than removal at Lays Farm, where sprawl is more naturally restricted by the adjacent topography and proximity to other settlements.

3.3. The area to the East of Keynsham is identified in Arup's Development Concept Options Report as Agricultural Land Class 2 'very good agricultural land' and is therefore ill suited to release from the green belt ahead of other sites available which are likely to be of lesser agricultural quality. Releasing land at the East of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality'.

3.4. The site is also constrained by incorporating, or being near to a number of landscape and biodiversity designations which are not present at Lays Farm. The presence of Broad Mead Farm SSSI and the site's proximity to Stidham Farm SSSI/Conservation Areas (Keynsham and Saltford) and the Cotswold AONB should all be considered as reasons for developing Lays Farm ahead of East of Keynsham. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF lists 12 key principles that plan making should adhere to, one of which is to 'contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework'. The release of land from the green belt at the East of Keynsham ahead of sites with lesser environmental value and designations such as Lays Farm should be considered contrary to the NPPF and therefore unsound plan-making practice.

3.5. The impact on the existing road network resultant from releasing land to the East of Keynsham is especially significant and certainly moreso than allocating land at Lays Farm. The Development Concept options Report states that 'Any development in this area would have a significant impact on the A4 which already has issues with its capacity. This would necessitate road and junction improvements, particularly at the roundabout. Manor Road to the south is particularly narrow leading towards Saltford and it would not be desirable to introduce high volumes of traffic onto this road. Access from the west is possible via the existing residential development though capacity is limited'.

3.6. Within Arup's Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013), land to the East of Keynsham is classified as an averagely performing site for the location of development. In this sense it should not be considered suitable for development ahead of better performing sites.

4. Proposed Location – Lay's Farm, West of Keynsham

4.1. The main advantages of releasing land from the Green Belt to the West of Keynsham and specifically at Lays Farm have been discussed in contrast to the council's preferred sites for release above.

4.2. In addition to these comparative advantages, Arup's Development Concept Options Report dismisses development on a large part of Lay's Farm, which it suggests is the location of a large underground gas pipe 'protected by an HSE-regulated buffer zone which permits residential development within only the outer zone (beyond 70m either side of pipeline)'. This constraint is discussed as the primary issue with the site. However this assertion is incorrect. The pipeline is in a different location and according to its operators only has a 5m buffer zone. The pipeline is also of an aged nature and the operator would be willing to accept its re-location and replacement with a modern efficient structure. The pipeline does therefore not represent an issue of constraint against development.

4.3. The evidence base upon which the Core Strategy base is therefore unsound and as such the Core Strategy should also be considered unsound by default.

4.4. The Development Concept Options Report identifies a number of significant strengths in the Lays Farm site which are not identified at Land to the South West and East of Keynsham. It notes that the area 'has an existing vehicle access to Lays Farm which could be utilised and expanded for development. The southern part is directly adjacent to Charlton Road which gives opportunity for a new connection'. Similarly the study area is within walking distance of existing facilities in the Keynsham area including retail, primary schools and bus routes. Development has the opportunity to connect to these facilities via existing pedestrian routes.

4.5. There has been no visual impact assessment carried out on the impact development on the site would have on views towards Keynsham. Although the Development Concept Options Report states 'The area itself is visible from across the valley meaning development could have a strong visual impact' there is no evidence of this. The only areas of public road the site would be visible from outside of immediately adjacent neighbourhoods is Stockwood Vale and Stockwood Road. Due to the topography of the valley between these roads and the presence of a tree screen at the brow of the valley slope, it is likely that the impact of development at land to the West of Keynsham on views across Charlton Valley would be negligible or nil. The evidence presented as part of the base supporting the council's proposed changes to the Core Strategy should be considered unreliable, rendering the Core Strategy unsound.

5. Conclusions

5.1. In summary, in comparison to the Land to the South West and East of Keynsham, releasing Lays Farm from the Green Belt for development would:

- Have less of a threat on development encroachment towards, and impact on, the individual identities of Keynsham, Bristol, Bath and Queen Charlton
- Have lesser impact on heritage assets
- Have a lesser visual impact on the natural landscape
- Have a lesser impact on biodiversity
- Use poorer quality agricultural land for development
- Be easier to accommodate sustainable transport and bus services; especially over land South West of Keynsham which is particularly isolated and suffering severe access issues.

5.2. As a result of these outcomes the Core Strategy could be considered compliant with national policy, consistent with the wider aims of the Core Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol, effective at delivering these and therefore be considered sound and legal. In its current form the Core Strategy should not be considered to be either of these.

5.3. Furthermore, as demonstrated above, the evidence base reports produced for the council as a means to making decisions on the release of green belt following the Inspector's Report on the Core Strategy is factually incorrect and cannot therefore be considered as a reliable source of information for sound plan-making.

Change to the policy requested:

: retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt within B&NES, with no strategic change to the boundaries other than removing land to meet the District's development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram:

- D Land adjoining Odd Down
- D Land adjoining Weston
- D Extension to MoD, Enleigh

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

D Land adjoining East Keynsham
 D Land adjoining South West Keynsham
 D Land at Whitchurch

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Respondent Number: 251 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Bovis Homes

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

2.9 We object to the revised plan period that has been introduced through the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy; which changes the plan period from 2006-2026 to 2011- 2029. We question the logic of preparing a plan to cover an 18 year period. We recognise that this is to plan for a period of 15 years from the date of adoption; however it causes significant inconsistencies in the evidence base, which has been prepared to cover a 20 year plan period. Indeed the SHMA has been prepared to inform the Proposed Changes to the Plan covers the period 2011-2031, and we see no reason why the Plan Period should not be changed to cover the same period, with the housing and employment requirements adjusting accordingly.

2.10 We also question the intended longevity of the Plan. Paragraph 1.36 (Proposed Change SPC22) states that: “the Council will monitor delivery rates in the Plan Period which will shape the early review of the Core Strategy programme for around 2016 to co-ordinate with the other West of England Districts.”

2.11 Whilst we fully endorse the need for the Core Strategy to take account of the housing need and provision in the rest of the West of England Authorities, an early review should not be seen to be a way of making an unsound plan sound. It is possible for the Plan being prepared now to adequately address the long term needs of the District, taking account of the unmet needs of the neighbouring authorities, within a Plan that delivers a Sound development strategy up to 2031.

2.12 We recognise the benefits of the West of England Authorities working together in order to provide a strategic framework for planning across the West of England, but do not consider that this should delay the adoption of a sound plan for B&NES, or necessitate an early review, so long as the plan properly takes account of the housing needs and economic aspirations of the West of England Authorities. Adopting a sound B&NES plan now will assist other Local Authorities in the review of their respective plans, through:

- a) Demonstrating to the other local authorities how to positively deal with Green Belt release by making an allocation for a strategic urban extension to Bristol within the Green Belt (as will be required in all neighbouring authorities); and
- b) Demonstrating how part of the unmet need from the Bristol area could be met within B&NES, enabling other neighbouring authorities to make allocations to meet the remaining unmet need arising from Bristol.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 251 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Bovis Homes

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

3.0 POLICY DW1: DISTRICT-WIDE SPATIAL STRATEGY – SPC23 and SPC146

3.1 We object to Policy DW1: District-wide spatial strategy (Proposed Change SPC23) as it fails to identify sufficient housing to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of B&NES.

3.2 We submit that the policy is unsound on the grounds that it has not been adequately justified. It is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base and does not satisfy the requirements of the NPPF. Furthermore, it is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the alternatives.

3.3 As a consequence, we object to Policy RA5 (Proposed Change SPC146), which does not allocate sufficient housing to Whitchurch which is an appropriate location to meet a significant proportion of the objectively assessed housing needs.

4.0 HOUSING REQUIREMENT

4.1 Within his Preliminary Conclusions (ID/28) the Inspector identified 5 critical problems with the Council’s methodology for the housing requirement,

- It is primarily an assessment for BANES, and not the HMA;
- It gives overriding primacy to a linear link between homes and jobs;
- The reliance on a single job growth projection to underpin the housing target;
- Lack of transparency in the Council’s methodology; and
- The Council considers no need to review the multiplier moving forward.

4.2 In order to address these weaknesses, the Inspector requested that the Council undertake an assessment of housing needs within the SHMA to provide an NPPF compliant objective assessment of housing needs.

4.3 Barton Willmore consider the SHMA undertaken to support the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy to be fundamentally flawed.

4.4 At Paragraph 1.1 of ID/28 the Inspector made his expectations of the work required in undertaking an objective assessment of housing needs clear, by referring to the NPPF and stating, “Paragraph 159 sets out the evidential basis for authorities having a clear understanding of housing needs in their area based on a SHMA, prepared collaboratively where the HMA crosses administrative boundaries. The latter element applies here as the HMA covers the 4 authorities in the West of England Partnership area, Mendip and the former district of West Wiltshire, now part of Wiltshire Unitary Authority.”.

4.5 We understand that the intention of the Inspector in requesting a SHMA was to assess the housing requirement for the West of England Housing Market Area to determine the level of housing required to meet total housing needs across the West of England HMA; the proportion of which is attributed to B&NES Authority Area; and identify the level of ‘unmet need’ (as required under para 47 of the NPPF) that would be appropriate to be accommodated within B&NES.

4.6 However, the Scope of the B&NES SHMA conducted by ORS does not fulfil this requirement and as such fails to address the issue that the Inspector and participants at the EIP Hearings were raising.

4.7 The ORS SHMA Update report considers that B&NES falls into two Housing Market Areas (Bristol and Bath with West B&NES falling within the Bristol HMA). We do not dispute that this definition may be true for a tier 2 housing market area (i.e. a local housing area defined by migration), however we consider that an assessment of the tier 1 HMA (i.e. framework housing market area defined by long distance community patterns), is necessary in order to achieve an NPPF (para 159) compliant Objective Assessment of housing need “to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full and objectively assessed needs for the market and affordable housing in the housing market area” (NPPF, para 47) or to address the issue raised by the Inspector.

4.8 Despite concluding that West B&NES falls within the Bristol HMA, the B&NES SHMA only assesses the housing requirement within B&NES itself. In doing so it makes no consideration of whether the unmet housing needs from outside B&NES (e.g. Bristol), despite recognising that the settlements in the west of B&NES have low levels of self containment and are strong connections with Bristol.

Relationship with Bristol

4.9 The Council sight the adoption of the Bristol Core Strategy as illustrating that there is no unmet need from Bristol that

needs to be accommodated in B&NES. However, the Inspector will be aware that the Conclusion of his Bristol Core Strategy Inspector's Report was not that all housing needs could be met within the confines of the Authority, but rather that the constraints to delivery were such that no higher land of growth could be guaranteed as deliverable.

4.10 Paragraph 48 of the Bristol City Council Core Strategy Inspector's Report (March 2011) stated:

"The Council's proposed changes for a minimum housing provision of 26,400 is very unlikely to meet, and could fall very substantially below the potential housing demands in Bristol over the Plan Period. If the Council's anticipated delivery of 30,600 dwellings is achieved this would avoid the worst consequences of the lower figures, but could still be underprovision" (BW emphasis).

4.11 Furthermore, in investigating opportunities for increasing the capacity at Bristol, the Inspector only discounted the use of urban extensions in the Green Belt (as proposed in the in the emerging RSS) because of the opposition of the relevant adjoining Council's to such development (Para. 52, BCC Core Strategy Inspector's Report, March 2011). He went on to state that:

"it would be unreasonable to expect the City Council to explore cross-boundary urban extensions at a time when the neighbouring authorities are opposed to such development and there is no higher tier of planning actively pursued to promote such an approach. Nonetheless, to be examined, it would be shortsighted to rule out the possibility of a cross-boundary approach to development in the Green Belt in the future. The Localism Bill may also require adjoining authorities to cooperate on Cross Boundary Issues."

4.12 Bristol City Council was also specifically required to retain references within their Core Strategy to joint working with neighbouring authorities in the context of any urban extension in adjoining authorities (Para. 60, BCC Core Strategy Inspector's Report, March 2011).

4.13 On this basis, it is not justified to conclude that there is no unmet need arising from Bristol and dismiss out of hand the further assessment of what need could realistically be accommodated in B&NES to address any wider unmet need. As set out above, whilst there may be debate as to whether the Duty to Cooperate should apply, the requirement of the NPPF test of Soundness for the Plan to be 'positively prepared' and for the Plan to establish:

"a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development" (para 182, NPPF) cannot be avoided.

4.14 Given that the examination process for the Bristol City Core Strategy identified: first, that there would be unmet need, but second that the scale of unmet need would not be quantified in that context; it is now for the examination process of each individual plan to surrounding Bristol (including B&NES) to consider the scale of unmet needs it must accommodate to meet the requirements of the NPPF. This may be difficult to do, but it is a requirement of the NPPF. The fact that Bristol's plan does not quantify the scale of unmet need does not negate this. Nor does the fact that B&NES has sought to avoid any proper consideration of the scale of unmet need from its neighbour as part of the SHMA process. The NPPF requires this issue to be addressed now, in order for the plan to be found sound.

Flaws in the ORS B&NES SHMAA

4.15 There are also inconsistencies and a lack of detail to explain the assumptions that underpin the SHMA. The Committee Report (4th March 2013) for the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy confirms that the student population has been removed from the calculations of housing need, despite the SHMAA recognising the impact students are likely to have on the housing markets of B&NES due to a significant proportion living in private rented accommodation and this directly conflicts with the Inspector's comments in paragraph 2.10 of ID/28.

4.16 Furthermore, whilst the ORS report does not conclude on the trend of housing recommended to be planned for the B&NES, and it is not entirely clear from any of the Evidence Base where the 12,700 target figure has been derived from. The SHLAA seeks to establish a target of just 7,740 dwellings over the plan period for the purposes of 5 year land supply. This is discussed further below, but highlights the inconsistencies throughout the evidence base.

4.17 Whilst the Council placed an overreliance on the jobs:homes ratio through the previous evidence on housing needs, it now pays little regard to the economic growth aspirations of the West of England. We understand from Paragraph 3.21 of Annex 1 to the Council Report for the meeting on 4th March 2013, that the Council chose to use a demographic forecast based on the low trend migration to establish their housing need, and justify this with reference to the ONS 2011-21

population projections. However, the ORS study casts doubt over whether this projection is appropriate, indicating that the levels align with the period of recession and concluding that it is “unlikely to be realistic if the LEP aspiration for economic growth is well founded and there is no behavioural change in respect of state retirement age” (para 6.22).

4.18 B&NES discount the higher migration scenario, because it reflects the migration trends experienced in the years 2002-2005, which the report considers coincides with a period of higher demand, which it concludes is unlikely to be seen in the foreseeable future.

4.19 However, we consider this to be a circular argument, and there is significant risk that the housing target being passed by the Local Authority could itself suppress housing supply, if not assessed in a positive and aspirational manner as required by the NPPF through its ‘Core Planning Principle’ to “proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver sustainable economic development to deliver the homes and thriving local places the country needs” (para 17, NPPF). Similarly, the NPPF makes it clear that a lack of housing should not stifle the economy of an area.

4.20 The calculations around the affordable housing need are incomprehensible and we question their validity. We cannot comprehend that the total affordable housing need, which was 847 dwellings per annum in B&NES (15,246 over 2011-2029) outlined in the 2009 West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), (West of England Partnership/Professor Glen Bramley, June 2009), has fallen to circa 150 dwellings per annum (2,700 over 2011-2029) as reported in the ORS SHMAA without explanation.

4.21 This significant reduction in the affordable need within B&NES has not been explained by the Council and seemingly does not include any reference to the existing and historic affordable housing need. If not based on robust evidence, this could result in a severe housing shortage and exacerbate the affordability gap yet further, conflicting with the requirements of Paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

4.22 For all of the above reasons we believe that the evidence prepared to support the Council’s Proposed Changes in relation to housing numbers is fundamentally flawed. Perhaps more alarmingly, we have reason to believe that this is not only because the Council has misdirected themselves in the evidence that they have prepared.

4.23 Barton Willmore has obtained correspondence from B&NES Council under a Freedom of Information request that sought details of any correspondence between B&NES and Bristol City Council in respect of the proposed urban extension at Whitchurch. An email from B&NES Policy and Environment Manager to Bristol City Council Policy Officers in January 2013 stated that the interim reports conducted by ORS indicated that even an Oxford central based growth target would require in the order of 16,000 dwellings. See Appendix 1. As a result, we have concerns that there has been intervention at some level to influence the findings of the ORS SHMAA in order to reduce the housing need significantly. This perhaps explains the fragmented and complex nature of the SHMAA report and may explain why Option 3 of the site assessment table in the Stage 4 Growth Level Assessments included at Appendix L of the Sustainability Appraisal appears to have appraised the impacts of 16,000 homes, rather than the 14,000 suggested in the supporting text. Such inconsistencies raise concerns over the Council’s approach to ensuring that the Plan will meet the full, objectively assessed needs for housing, as required by the NPPF

Barton Willmore Objective Assessment of Housing Need

4.24 Because of the shortcomings in the assessment work undertaken by the Council, Barton Willmore has undertaken an NPPF compliant objective assessment of housing needs for the West of England Strategic Housing Market Area.

4.25 We consider that the definition of the HMA required to meet the objectives of paragraph 159 of the NPPF is the West of England HMA, most appropriately defined within the Proposed Changed to the RSS. Furthermore, we consider the economic aspirations of B&NES and the aspirations for economic growth throughout the West of England Authorities should be a fundamental consideration in the assessment of housing needs in order to ensure that there is sufficient supply of housing in order to enable the West of England to deliver the level of economic growth they have committed to plan for.

4.26 The full technical report is attached as Appendix 2 to these representations, but in summary, it provides a comprehensive assessment of housing requirements within the West of England Housing Market Area.

4.27 The study responds to the requirements of the NPPF, which requires Local Plans to be informed by a ‘proportionate’ evidence base which meets an objectively assessment of need for market and affordable housing, using the most up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic prospects of an area, and to set a housing target which meets population

and household projections taking account of migration and demographic change.

4.28 It provides a robust assessment of housing requirements using the most up-to-date official population and household projections by ONS and CLG, in addition to providing bespoke demographic and economic-led scenarios for growth using the PopGroup demographic model.

4.29 Our analysis of the most up-to-date official interim 2011-based CLG household projections (9 April 2013) shows that cumulative household growth across the four local authorities is projected to be 5,200 new households per annum, 2011-2021. This represents a significant increase from the emerging/adopted Local Plans for the four authorities (4,099 dpa).

4.30 However, the CLG projections are considered to be heavily constrained due to recent recessionary trends. As a consequence we consider that migration and household formation assumptions have been suppressed to such an extent that these projections do not by themselves provide a reasonable basis for determining long term future housing requirements. Furthermore, these projections are not forecasts, they are policy neutral and they do not take into account the clear and economic growth objectives of the four local authorities, and the West of England LEP, which seeks to establish 95,000 new jobs in the West of England by 2030. They should not therefore be taken at face value, but used as a starting point from which to assess housing requirements, as confirmed by the Inspector in paragraph 1.32 of ID/28.

4.31 To provide robust scenarios for housing growth in the West of England, we have used the PopGroup demographic forecasting model to provide an assessment of demographic and economic-led housing requirements within the four local authorities. This is consistent with the Council's own SHMAA.

4.32 The demographic-led scenario is based on the latest ONS interim 2011-based sub national population projections (28 September 2012) between 2011 and 2021, and the 2010-based ONS net-migration projections (March 2012) between 2011 and 2031. The results of the demographic-led scenario show a requirement for 5,642 new dwellings per annum, over the period 2011-2031, representing a significant increase of 38% from the combined Development Plan targets of the four local authorities in the West of England. This reinforces the most up-to-date interim 2011-based CLG projection (5,200 new households 2011-2021), and provides a starting point from which to assess housing need. However, it is also essential to establish the extent of additional housing required to balance with job growth targets.

4.33 The second element of our PopGroup modelling exercise establishes household growth based on (1) delivery of the West of England LEP job growth (95,000 new jobs up to 2030) and (2) the most recent Experian workforce jobs forecast (February 2013) of 135,560 new jobs, over the period 2011-2031.

4.34 This results in a requirement for between 6,538 and 7,816 new dwellings per annum between 2011 and 2031.

4.35 Our analysis provides clear evidence to show that the combined draft/adopted Local Plan targets of B&NES, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire would not provide the level of housing provision required in order to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF. To meet the clear economic growth aspirations of the four local authorities and their support of the West of England LEP, between 6,538 and 7,816 dpa should be targeted across the far West of England Authorities. The conclusions of housing need arising from our study within each of the four WoE authorities are set out below, together with a summary of the unmet housing demand assuming each authority were to continue to pursue its emerging/adopted housing target. In short, we calculate that over the next 20 years this could lead to a shortfall of between 50,000 and 75,000 new homes across the West of England.

Emerging Local Plan Housing Target (dpa)	PopGroup Recommended Housing Target (dpa)	Unmet Housing Demand
B&NES 14,120 (706dpa)	18,805 to 20,600 (940 to 1,030dpa)	4,685 to 6,480
Bristol 26,400 (1,320dpa)	36,200 to 54,749 (1,810 to 2,737dpa)	9,800 to 28,349
N Somerset 14,000 (700dpa)	29,034 to 29,365 (1,452 to 1,468dpa)	15,034 to 15,365
S Gloucestershire 27,460 (1,373dpa)	46,711 to 51,623 (2,336 to 2,581dpa)	19,251 to 24,163
West of England 81,980 (4,099dpa)	130,750 to 156,337 (6,538 to 7,816dpa)	48,770 to 74,357

Change to the policy requested:

Changes Sought:

4.36 On the evidence presented within our objective assessment of housing need, we recommend that the Inspector rules that the housing requirement for B&NES should be increased to a minimum of 18,805 dwellings over the period 2011-2031 (16,925 over 2011-2029) to enable B&NES to accommodate the level of housing required to meet its own housing needs

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

and its own economic objectives. This is a minimum requirement and does not take account of any unmet need from neighbouring WoE authorities.

4.37 There is undeniably a strong economic link between west B&NES and the Core City of Bristol, which is ratified by the Council's own SHMAA. In order to comply with the NPPF requirement to meet the unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities; an appropriate share of the unmet need from Bristol should be allocated to B&NES. We consider that this should be at least 3,000 homes, meaning that the overall requirement for B&NES should be nearer to 22,000 dwellings (2011-2031), when including a proportion of Bristol's unmet need. There would also be significant economic benefits to B&NES in addressing a higher level of growth. The potential lost economic opportunity of not pursuing our recommended level of housing growth will total approximately £600 million over the period to 2029 (as set out in Appendix 7).

4.38 This additional 3,000 homes should be specifically directed adjacent to the Bristol urban area, within the Bristol tier 2 Housing Market Area, along with an appropriate share of the 18,805 (2011-2031) that is justified in delivering the most sustainable patterns of development.

4.39 In order to assist in meeting the overall housing requirement, the allocation of land at Whitchurch (RA5) should be increased to about 3,500 homes and associated facilities.

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The development site at Whitchurch and Stockwood is not big enough and could take further development with good quality urban design and good buffers between them and improved bus links to Bristol Temple Meads, City Centre, Wells, Keynsham station with a Park and Ride bus link at Whitchurch. The site at Whitchurch does not provide enough affordable housing and employment opportunities.

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a proper development plan for Brislington, Hicks Gate, Whitchurch, and Stockwood protecting the "Green lungs" and providing affordable housing including a public transport plan for the area improving bus links to the City Centre, Keynsham Station, South Bristol Hospital (Whitchurch), Stockwood and Brislington with its protected public transport corridor between Brislington Callington Road and Bristol Temple Meads and the City Centre (Policy SPC23 and SPC24) are not strong enough in providing housing and employment growth.

Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton

Respondent Number: 4479 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Helen Dudden **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I feel that the changes are compliant and sound legally.
Also, I ask about the Duchy proposals they too are needed, we have an extremely serious housing issue and it needs action. It seems as if our voices are still not heard!

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

None

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Respondent Number:** 4587 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Robert Williams**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I note that in Key Diagram 4, Changes (SPC 23 & SPC 24), that a number of rural villages, including TEMPLE CLOUD, has had the Policy RA1 notation removed. Also comments on the Changes (SPC143 & SPC144) on the RURAL AREAS, which included Temple Cloud.

My personal concern was Appendix 1 of the facilities of Cameley Parish, including Temple Cloud, which was prepared in about 2011 by a company who had been hired by the Planning Services to assist in the preparation of the Core Strategy. In this the population of Cameley Parish was recorded as 2,224, and that of our neighboring parish of Clutton was 1,469. I was aware that there had been a glaring error and this was confirmed after I contacted the staff of the BANES register of electors which had prepared for the 2012 election. This showed that there were 483 dwellings and 980 electors over the age of 18 years in Cameley and the figures for Clutton 643 dwellings and 1253 electors over 18 years. School records show that the 120 pupils in Cameley and 216 in Clutton. Although these records do not show the exact number of the populations; it is reasonable to record that the Appendix 1 population for Clutton of 1469 was feasible. HOWEVER, THE CAMELEY POPULATION WAS AT LEAST 1000 LESS THAN THE 2,224 RECORDED.

I have heard that the BANES Planning Services have not vetted the Appendix 1 details and I have been told that at the present time that the Placemaking Team have not delegated any of their team to concentrate on Rural Villages. This is understandable, having regard to the more detailed work they are to undertake. However, I do hope that they are able to deal with a number of matters that need to be resolved in the rural villages.

I am concerned that the members of the Cameley Parish Council did not spot the error in the population of their own parish. I believe this is quite important as it is well known in planning circles that villages with a population of about 1000 are considered to be regarded as being unsustainable.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4633 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ms Louise Worlock**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 155 **Agent Name:** Aspect360 Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

In terms of commenting on the specific changes proposed, policy DW1 should be altered from that proposed in the change to the submitted Core Strategy to remove the term 'large' urban extensions and the changes to the strategic boundaries should include 'land to the north-west of Saltford along the A4 corridor' as land to be excluded from the Bristol and Bath Green Belt.

The BANES Green Belt Review identifies that the development of all of these areas for urban extension would prejudice the

openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. We do not disagree with this summary but would contend that the approach of only providing the large urban extensions proposed would be more harmful to the character of the countryside and the openness of the Green Belt than the development of smaller parcels of land which adjoin and infill the fringe areas of towns and villages which would enable urban areas to be contained but the critical mass of residential units to be achieved.

In particular development to the east and south-west of Keynsham would result in a much larger urban area that would threaten the very character of the settlement and cause substantial urban sprawl. This proposed area of extension should be reduced with some development allocated on the land to the north-west of Saltford as shown on the attached plan.

The proposal to extend the urban area of Keynsham to the east should be reconsidered for the following reasons:-

- The extension into the land to the north of the railway line would extend the urban area into the Avon Valley which is largely undeveloped save for a sewage works, waste treatment site, farms and the Avon Valley Country Park.
- This proposed urban extension is a poorly conceived concept because it will extend development beyond the Great Western railway line which is a successful barrier to development into the area and has safeguarded the countryside.
- Any development in Keynsham should be restricted to the south of the railway line which is a major physical barrier that would threaten the success of any urban extension in communication and viability terms.
- Any development to the north of the railway line would be reliant upon vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists circulating via Saltford to the east or via Keynsham to the west (each adding an extra mile to any journey) or

would be reliant upon new bridges constructed over the railway line. Connections between the new urban area and the existing settlement would be very poor as a result.

- The requirement to provide a bridge over the railway makes development in this location unviable and delivery unrealistic.
- Land to the north of the railway line is in the Green Belt and the majority of the land is in Flood Zone 2 and 3. There is no suggestion that climate change has been accounted for in the extent of the flood zone.
- Extending land to the north of the railway line will open the floodgates to further development to the north of Keynsham where at present there is no development for this reason.
- The town of Keynesham with two major urban extensions proposed will be disproportionately extended becoming effectively a third major urban area between Bristol and Bath – resulting in a Bristol/Bath conurbation.

A smaller amount of development would be more appropriately located in other urban areas including the settlements of the Somer Valley and the other major settlements in the Green Belt including the area to the west of Salford as annotated on the attached plan . This land is immediately available for development, has excellent access along the Bath Road A4 corridor where there is an established public transport network and a strategic cycle path. Primary schools, shops and community infrastructure (doctors, village hall etc) are within easy walking distance.

The land is not visually prominent and is physically contained within the mature hedgerows that surround the site. The site is question measures 2.4 hectares and could support approximately 40-50 dwellings without causing any significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt or the character of the countryside. The land would be contained within the existing hedgerows and is free from significant development constraints. The site:

- Is in Flood Zone 1;
- Contains no Tree Preservation Orders;
- Contains no nature conservation designations;
- Has no conservation constraints (Listed Buildings or Conservation Areas);
- Is not visually prominent;
- Is within walking distance of the local school and shops;
- Is within 5 miles of Bath city centre, 7 miles of Bristol city centre, 2.0 miles of Keynesham Town Centre and less than 0.5 miles of Saltford village centre and local primary schools.

A development of this scale is not so large that the openness of the Green belt would be significantly harmed (when compared with the large urban extension of Keynesham) and the identity of the village would be safeguarded. Modest development of this scale in Saltford would allow families to be remain in the area and local facilities to be supported.

A further factor to consider is the deliverability of development. 40-50 dwellings on a site of this scale could be delivered immediately without requiring significant infrastructure. The same cannot be said for land to the east/north of Keynesham

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

which lies upon significant infrastructure provision nor allocated land elsewhere in Keynesham which has not been delivered previously due to infrastructure issues. The reliance on major urban extensions to provide a substantial number of homes will not deliver the required number of new homes at an early stage in the Local Plan. Additional smaller sites for housing should be allocated as alternatives to ensure sufficient choice and flexibility for new development in this area.

As the attached annotated plan demonstrates, the allocation of the land on the north-western edge of Saltford will enable the strategic Green Belt gap between Keynesham and Saltford to be retained.

- There will be no adverse impact on the main reasons for including land in the Green Belt . Neighbouring towns will not merge into one another.
- Encroachment into the countryside will be significantly less than if the large urban extensions are provided;
- The setting and special character of historic towns will not be affected;
- The proposal will have a neutral impact on urban regeneration when compared with the proposal for large urban extensions elsewhere.

Change to the policy requested:

* Diagram 4 should be altered accordingly to reflect the above comments.

** SPC112 – The text at Change Ref SPC112 should be amended accordingly to include land to the west of Saltford to accommodate 45 dwellings

Respondent Number: 4664 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Constrat Limited

Agent ID: 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

It is recommended that the change be amended as follows to address our aforementioned concerns:

There is already a significant number of housing commitments (over 2,000) in the Somer Valley and a limited capacity to generate new jobs. The Council will seek to ensure that new housing in the Somer Valley is sustainably located in respect of employment opportunities or employment proposals will therefore be restrained in the interest of sustainability but some additional housing will be needed to meet the District Housing land requirement. The Core Strategy plans for an at least another 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments, estimated capacity on large brownfield sties and windfall sites. And The HDB will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan to facilitate this. However in light of the objective of economic led revitalisation, it is important that the additional housing this does not significantly worsen the balance between homes and jobs and the out-commuting problems and the council may therefore seek to ensure an economic benefit from new housing

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4713 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Phillip Chichester **Respondent Organisation:** JPC Strategic Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.4 Positive planning requires local authorities to consider unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and be consistent achieving sustainable development. Clearly there has been little, if any, cross border consultation or analysis on potential issues with unmet demand within the Bristol boundary. Bristol City Council is currently consulting (until Friday the 10th of May, 2013) on their Site Allocations Development Plan Document. The site allocations DPD suggests the following amounts of existing open space and recreational provision for development; Avonmouth & Kingsweston 4.7 hectares, Henbury 5.5 hectares, Horfield & Lockleaze 7.5 hectares, Fishponds 10.9 hectares, Bedminster 4.1 hectares, Filwood & Knowle 45.4 hectares, Brislington 10.6 hectares, Dundry 10.4 hectares and Hengrove 53.9 hectares. In total, the site allocations DPD is reliant on 153 hectares (377 acres) of existing open space and recreational provision to be developed to meet their housing requirements. Given the plan policy requirements of DM16, Bristol City Council simply cannot deliver the sites without falling foul of their own policy requirements. The proposals for development on open space sites across the city where dismissed by each ward in their latest consultation exercise, and were met with fierce local opposition.

1.5 Bristol's Core Strategy policy BCS5 allows for possible development in the Green Belt, including land at southeast Bristol (Hicks Gate) as a long-term contingency. It is clear from the suggested development sites which involve open space (153 hectares), their ability to fulfil the requirement is compromised. The contingency at Hicks Gate will be required by Bristol City Council, paragraph

5.25 Annex 1 of the changes to policies on housing requirement and housing land supply states, in the event that Bristol Concludes in the planned review of their core strategy that their contingency at Hicks Gate is required to meet their housing needs, then reconsideration of the land on the B&NES side of the boundary will need to be addressed in conjunction with Bristol.

1.6 Appropriate dialogue with Bristol City Council and analysis of their housing delivery mechanism should have been carried out to inform BANES latest housing strategy. To ensure the core strategy can be deemed positive in its approach requires appropriate assessment of neighbouring authorities housing supply, clearly BANES have failed to meet the basic test set out in the NPPF.

1.7 Fully exploring the potential for Hicks Gate, and its likely requirement as development site for Bristol, would have potentially enabled the authority to allocate up to 1200 units within the BANES boarder. The Hicks Gate Development Concept Options Report, produced by ARUP's on behalf of the council in March 2013, demonstrates that the land would have sufficient capacity to avoid the proposed greenbelt allocations at the MOD Enleigh (120 units), Odd Down (300 units), Weston (300 units), South West Keynsham (200 units), East Kenysham (250 units) and potentially Whitchurch (200 units). Through reactionary planning, the council has proposed five greenbelt development locations, when one site could have accommodated the required growth.

1.8 The evidence base available does not suggest cross border consultation or sufficient analysis of Bristol's housing supply was carried out. For BANES Core strategy to be considered justified, the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

1.9 In the context of Bristol City Council's current housing delivery, the uncertainty of major projects and the compromised position of the site allocations DPD, it is considered that the Hicks Gate contingency will be required. Therefore the BANES land will be a highly deliverable alternative to the proposed strategic housing locations. In this context, failure to fully explore the Hicks Gate viability results in an unjustified Core Strategy process.

1.10 For the Core Strategy to be deemed effective, the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities. The lack of any appropriate evidence to demonstrate BANES has fully explored the potential requirement for Hicks Gate results in an ineffective Core Strategy. At the very least, before allocating numerous greenbelt development locations, BANES should have been in the position to rule out the long term requirement of Hicks Gate.

1.11 The proposed allocation in Whitchurch will result in significant transport implications for South Bristol, and affect the demand and appetite for development within area. The effectiveness of the allocation for Bristol and the wider regeneration of South Bristol should be questioned.

1.12 It is considered that the approach to BANES core strategy is neither positively prepared, justified or effective, therefore the plan should be deemed unsound.

2.1 SHLAA Review

2.2 BANES review of the SHLAA in response to the Inspectorate's concerns in ID/28 par2.1 is flawed. It is considered that the requirement for the strategic development locations is a result of BANES failing to fully appropriately assess deliverable sites which have been proposed via the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

2.3 An example of the failure to appropriately assess suitable, deliverable sites is the current application at 5 arches greenways, on land which links Midsomer Norton and Radstock (appendix 3). Map 1.1 identifies the sites considered in the SHLAA for Radstock and Midsomer Norton. The current application site refers to area 14d within the SHLAA assessment, which forms part of the whole site assessed by the authority. The site offers the opportunity to deliver the Town Park, providing appropriate access and funding to initiate the project. In the response to the Inspectors question, Is policy SV1 4b justified in linking some additional housing developments to contributions to a Town Park? The councils response was; The Town Park is a longstanding objective with strong support in the area and there is currently no such facility in this part of the District. SHLAA plans for the Town Park to come forward after 2016 which is after the anticipated adoption of the CIL (September 2013). The Council and the local community have acknowledged that it is more likely to be implemented if facilitated by new housing. The precise arrangements will be negotiated between the Council and land owners as part of a Placemaking Plan and planning application. The CIL regulation allows 'in-kind payments' where it will be more desirable for a charging authority to receive land instead of monies to satisfy a charge arising from the levy. This will be one of methods to be considered.

Map 1.1 : Midsomer Norton & Radstock SHLAA

2.4 As a principle land owner, and current applicant, no such dialogue has occurred. The application has focused on ensuring the Town Park can be delivered yet the council have failed to engage in the process. Based on the council's SHLAA assessments, the whole site (all four areas) could provide a strategic infill for around 280 units. The council's assessment of sites 14a,b and c identify that the land is available and achievable with appropriate mitigation. However, site d has not been considered due to its SNCI status.

2.5 The failure to appropriately review site d, and its historic designation, has led the council to overlook the site. Site d was simply dismissed by the authority and not assessed due to its policy designation. Although it could be deemed acceptable in the original SHLAA assessment, the latest review should have considered the site in view of the extensive survey work and assessments provided within the current application. The current application identifies that it is possible to retain the areas of ecological value on site, and develop on areas which have little or no ecological significance. The application retains extensive areas of the site, which will be enhanced as part of the proposed development. The highways strategy has been approved, as has drainage. The application would facilitate the council to deliver areas 14a,b and c, enabling a development which would eradicate the need to allocate up to 280 units in the greenbelt.

2.6 In light of the application and detailed assessments available to the authority, It is considered the core strategy process would have provided the ideal opportunity to amend the existing development boundary, incorporating the land without compromising the greenbelt. The inspectorate posed the question to BANES;

Does the existing Housing Development Boundary exclude potentially sustainable sites, including previously developed land, potential mixed use employment housing sites, or sites included in the SHLAA as part of the housing supply? If so, is policy SV1 4b justified or should the Core Strategy signal the intention to review the Housing Development Boundary? This is proposed in minor change PC62 (introducing new paragraph 4.15a), but would this change then be consistent with SV1 4b?

2.6 BANES responded;

As set out in proposed changes PC62, the HDB will be reviewed in accordance with the Core Strategy policies through the Placemaking plan. However any such change will need to be in accordance with the overall approach in the Core Strategy of limiting unsustainable patterns of development and mitigating climate change

2.7 It is considered that due to a lack of appropriate assessment of sites via the SHLAA review, the council have overlooked the opportunity to amend the settlement boundary within Radstock & Midsomer Norton and deliver a highly sustainable site, which can facilitate a key core strategy priority in the form of the Town Park.

2.8 Given there was a current application on site 14d whilst the SHLAA review took place, it is considered that not appropriately assessing the site has influenced BANES decision to propose greenbelt locations. In the context of the strategic greenbelt locations suggested by the council for housing, it is considered that a development at 5 arches Greenways (which could deliver the Town Park) would be a far more appropriate, sustainable and deliverable development. NPPF para 14 requires that local planning authorities should seek opportunities to meet development needs of the area and that local plans should meet objectively assessed needs. It is considered that the SHLAA review was rushed and failed to objectively assess the development opportunity of the proposed site. Had the authority appropriately considered the site it is considered that it would have been far more favourable than any of the suggested greenbelt sites. Therefore, the core strategy has not been positively planned, it is unjustified, ineffective and unsound.

2.9 Another example of the flawed SHLAA review is the land to the East of Church Road, PEA5. Appendix 1 of this report sets out the sites credentials, it is considered that the site is highly sustainable and deliverable. The SHLAA assessment is incorrect, as it relates to the wrong boundary. As land owner, and pending applicant, it is unacceptable to see misinformation published by the local authority. The SHLAA assessment includes a substantial parcel of land to the North East of PEA5, which is not under the same ownership. The proposal submitted to the council as part the SHLAA review process identified the ownership boundary, and the proposed areas of development. The proposal identifies the plan to utilise PEA5 as the principle development site, with the Northern area used as open space, enabling a natural rounding off of the settlement boundary whilst protecting the visual impact of the site.

2.10 There is no intention to use the Northern part of the site, as the topography and visual impact would preclude development from that specific area of the site. Clearly the authority has failed to appropriately assess the site. It is considered the SHLAA review would have been significantly different if the correct boundaries had been analysed, and the intended scheme would have been considered. The SHLAA identifies that the impact of development at PEA5 would be low, it would substantially lower if the complete scheme, with the open space, would have been appropriately considered.

2.11 If appropriately considered, the site could deliver a low impact development, which would be significantly less intrusive than any of the suggested greenbelt locations. The lack of appropriate assessment and due diligence by the local authority in the SHLAA review has led to pressure to deliver on greenbelt locations. Therefore, with basic site information clearly being overlooked, the core strategy cannot be deemed as positive, justified or effective and therefore should be deemed unsound.

2.12 It is considered that if the sites in Radstock and Peasedown had been appropriately assessed and presented as potential alternative development options, the sites would receive far greater support than the suggested greenbelt locations. Allocating the two sites would also reduced the greenbelt requirement by up to 350 units.

Map 1.2 : Peasedown SHLAA map

3.1 Bath Western Riverside (BWR)

3.2 Following a review of each of the SHLAA sites identified as deliverable in the latest review, it is considered that there is an overreliance on the area for housing. Appendix 2 details the review of the SHLAA sites, which the vast majority of the BWR planned as flats. There is little justification as to how the expected land value in the current market conditions can justify the delivery of the planned units.

3.3 The commercial realities of the location and the current market conditions have already triggered planning applications which deviate from the BWR plan. There is a current application on the land retained by Withy King, James Street West, for student housing and retail. The market conditions point to either a retirement scheme or student flats as the only deliverable and financially viable option in the area. The application should act as a warning to the council, their highly ambitious plans cannot be implemented without the land owners engaging and adhering to the plan. Without clear economic benefits to land owners, the plan will not be delivered. In the case of the James Street West application, House builders could not match the land values required to complete with student accommodation. With additional infrastructure costs, section 106 and land assembly issues facing the BWR, the reality of delivering sufficient land values to ensure the plans can be delivered should be questioned.

Map 1.3 : Bath SHLAA Sites

4.1 Recommended changes to the Core Strategy Housing Supply

4.2 As identified previously in the report, the failure to fully explore Hicks Gate as a long term deliverable option has forced the authority into a complete reversal in their stance on greenbelt development. Given Bristol City Council’s land supply position, it is increasingly likely that the BCC Hicks Gate contingency will be required. Utilising the BANES land at Hicks Gate would have enabled the council to reduce the impact of development within the greenbelt to one site, as opposed to the five locations currently suggested. The five proposed sites were deemed inappropriate up to the inspection of the core strategy, the resultant switch in favour of the greenbelt locations is product of pressure and not objective planning.

4.3 The examples set out in this report identify a flawed process in terms of the council’s ability to appropriately review the SHLAA sites, with two sustainable locations which could have reduced the housing requirement in the greenbelt by up to 350 units. Had the sites been appropriately considered and assessed, it is unlikely the greenbelt locations would have been a preferred choice given the council’s historic long term stance on greenbelt development.

4.4 The proposed developments at Odd Down and Weston present significant ecological issues, with considerable impact on their respective AONB, SNCI and Conservation Area designations. They are inappropriate development locations and it is considered they have been identified due to a flawed core strategy process.

4.5 The developments proposed at South West and East of Keynsham would not be as strategically favourable as an infill at Hicks Gate. It is highly likely that development will occur at Hicks Gate to deliver Bristol’s housing requirement, therefore the land within BANES boundary will be utilised. Further work between BCC and BANES should take place before developments at Kenysham are considered. The proposed developments have significant infrastructure issues, which could lead to deliverability issues. The work required to provide appropriate access and address the extreme flood issues at the sites is vast, and unknown at this stage. The proposals are again reactionary, and a result of a flawed core strategy process and should not be supported.

4.4 The proposed Whitchurch development compromises the regeneration plan for South Bristol. The impact on transport network has not been factored in by BCC, and therefore adds to the existing issues within South Bristol. The allocation does not reflect the areas RA1 village status. With the successful Barratt appeal and the pending Horse World application, the area could see up to 450 new units. The level of development is unsustainable, and should not be considered as a proposed development site.

4.5 There is an overriding question which will remain unanswered, had the council identified an appropriate requirement for housing from the outset of the core strategy process would the same sites be considered for development? It is considered that the latest plan is purely the result of to poor planning, pressure to deliver housing and a lack of appropriate research into alternative development sites. Therefore we consider the core strategy wholly unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 110 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Robert Sawyer **Respondent Organisation:** Wedco Limited

Agent ID: 163 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Wedco Limited believes the SHMA is unsound as a basis for determining the full housing needs of Bath and North East Somerset over the plan period to 2029. This position is supported by a critique of the SHMA methodology which has been prepared by Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants. The critique is appended to these representations and we make reference to the relevant pages and extracts from the critique (Pioneer Critique) in our representations below.

Our key concerns relating to the methodology adopted by ORS in preparing the Council's SHLAA include:

- While the use of a migration-led (trend based) modeling approach is appropriate for scenario building, in the case of BANES such an approach is inappropriate for determining the district's housing requirement as past under-delivery of housing will have restricted opportunities for people to in-migrate in the past, thereby skewing projections for future years. (Paragraphs 3.1 – 3.5 of the Pioneer Critique)
- As confirmed in Pioneer Critique (Paragraphs 4.1 – 4.10) the outputs of the economic-led projections are wholly unrealistic – suggesting a far higher increase in the resident workforce than is supported by national projection data.
- The Pioneer Critique suggests in paragraph 4.12 that to achieve employment growth of 10,170 as envisaged by the Council would see the population increase by 25,300 with an additional housing requirement of 11,200 rather than the 7,470 suggested by the low migration figure in the draft SHMA. With regard to the SHMA projections Pioneer conclude: "The ORS projection outputs for population and households do not follow expected trends and are almost certainly wrong (evidenced by the expected decrease in households over the first six years of the projection period). No explanation is given by ORS for the trends and it can be concluded that no weight can be placed on the analysis carried out by ORS. This needs to be redone with correct assumptions and logical outputs."
- One of the key concerns raised by the Inspector in his note of 21 June 2012 (ID/28) was the absence of a SHMA which assessed housing need on a Housing Market Area level and ensuring that the unmet needs of adjoining local planning authorities were met if necessary. The ORS SHMA disregards the potential housing needs of Bristol where the adopted Core Strategy is due to be reviewed shortly and the Inspector previously voiced concerns that the housing target (26,400) within the Bristol Core Strategy:
"... is very unlikely to meet, and could fall very substantially below, the potential housing demands in Bristol over the plan period... as this is the first Core Strategy of the West of England authorities to be examined, it would be short-sighted to rule out the possibility of a cross-boundary approach to development in the Green Belt in the future." (Paragraphs 48 & 52, Inspector's Report on the Bristol Core Strategy, March 2011)

The ORS draft SHMA (21 February 2013 version) confirmed at paragraph 6.4 that "...none of the scenario incorporate a strategic housing allocation to cater for the unmet needs from adjoining areas such as Bristol." While this extract was removed from later iterations of the SHMA, it demonstrates that ORS/BANES Council acknowledged there are unmet needs from adjoining LPAs however the SHMA does not account for this in its scenarios, thereby departing from the Inspector's advice in ID/28.

The more recent iteration of the SHMA (dated 18 March 2013) confirms at Paragraph 8.25:

"This would still leave the issue of the strategic requirements for adjoining areas (such as Bristol) which may need to be delivered in BANES and these can only be understood by comparing land capacity in those areas against their projected growth. Therefore, it is important for BANES to continue to work with its neighbouring authorities, under the Duty to Cooperate, to identify its role in meeting sub-regional housing requirements."

There is no evidence within the revised Core Strategy that the unmet needs of adjoining LPAs and particularly Bristol City Council will be addressed by BANES.

- The Pioneer Critique (Paragraphs 6.1 to 6.28) reviews the projections for affordable housing need in and concludes: "The ORS assessment of affordable housing need does not follow CLG guidance and cannot therefore be seen as a compliant piece of work. The analysis carried out is 'black-box' with very little explanation of the methodology.

Parts of the method can clearly be seen to be wrong – i.e. estimating and projecting forwards an Intermediate / Social Rented affordable housing tenure split on the basis of 'social trends' is problematic when seeking to assess the extent of the future requirement for Intermediate housing for sale as it will simply reflect the choices that households have made in the past within the context of the housing opportunities available to them at the time (and the limited available stock of such housing).

This analysis needs to be redone with correct assumptions and following the model set out in CLG guidance. "

It is therefore concluded that the ORS SHMA does not accord with the requirements of Paragraph 159 of the NPPF which prescribes the content and analysis that should inform such assessments. Furthermore, the SHMA fails to address the Inspector's concerns as expressed in ID/28 and ID/30 which can be summarised as follows:

- SHMA did not identify an overall housing demand figure for the HMA
- The district's housing requirement was established at district rather than HMA level.
- Housing figure based upon linear and inflexible multiplier between jobs and homes, and did not consider population or household projections
- Affordable housing needs would not be addressed by housing target.

In summary it is our opinion that the Core Strategy is currently unsound based on the evidence base contained in the SHMA and these representations should be considered in conjunction with the Independent Critique Report on the SHMA

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

prepared by Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants (appended)

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 110	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: Mr Robert Sawyer	Respondent Organisation: Wedco Limited
-------------------------------	--------------------------	--	---

Agent ID: 163 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Wedco Limited believes the overall housing target is not properly justified, positively prepared or consistent with national policy and is therefore unsound in its current form as a basis for determining the additional housing need for the plan period to 2029. This position is based on the concerns below which have been informed by an independent 'Housing Requirements Assessment in Respect of B&NES/B&NES Rural Areas' (May 2013) prepared by Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants.

The NPPF is explicit in requiring LPAs to positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of their area (Paragraph 14), to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes that the country needs (Paragraph 17) and to promote sustainable development in rural areas (Paragraph 55).

Migration Scenario

The Council has based a 12,700 housing delivery figure for new homes between 2011 and 2029 on the "low migration" scenario assessed within the draft ORS SHMA (March 2013) which suggests 7,470 new homes are required over 18 years prior to taking the historic housing delivery shortfall into account. This scenario is unlikely to meet the West of England LEP (of which BNES is a member) aspiration for growth as acknowledged in Paragraph 6.21 of the draft SHMA:

"... this is unlikely to be realistic if the LEP aspiration for economic growth is well founded and there is no behavioural change in respect of state retirement age."

Conversely it should be noted that the "high migration" scenario in the same draft SHMA suggests an increase in population of 15,300 between 2011 and 2031 (or 13,770 over 18 years). It is contended that the high migration scenario would reflect the NPPF Core Planning Principle of proactively driving and supporting economic development (Paragraph 17, NPPF) better than the low migration scenario preferred by the Council.

When the high migration figure is adjusted to reflect the 18-year plan period and adjusted in line with the process undertaken by the Council in Table 4, Annex 1 of the 4th March Committee Meeting report pack (i.e. to factor in overall backlog housing requirements and the level of additional housing supply necessary to enable affordable housing need to be addressed during the Plan period) an overall housing requirement figure of up to 16,049 is suggested.

To put the Council's pursuance of a low migration growth scenario in context; where greater levels of migration occur, the overall planned housing supply will be insufficient once housing backlog requirements are factored in, resulting in increased pressure on market and affordable housing stock and reduced affordability / housing choice, particularly for lower income households. A lack of suitable accommodation is also likely to impact adversely upon certain sectors of the BANES labour market.

Economic Led Scenario

The appended Pioneer Report (Pages 20-31) provides bespoke housing requirement analysis which suggests that on the basis of economic-led projection outputs, a supply of around 11,200 new homes in BANES between 2011 and 2029 would be of about the right order prior to taking the 1,167 pre-2011 backlog requirements into account – which would inflate this to 12,367 as noted above. Furthermore, this is equivalent to 12,444 (net of backlog which would inflate the figure to 13,611) over the slightly longer 20 year period of 2011 – 2031.

This 11,200 figure is significantly higher than the draft SHMA based low migration 18 year 7,470 dwelling assumption applied by the Council as the starting point for the calculation of the overall housing delivery requirement, and falls broadly midway between the 18 year average (i.e. 9,575) and high (i.e. 13,780) draft SHMA based migration scenarios.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Conclusion**

In summary, the Council is promoting a baseline housing requirement figure of 7,470 over the 18-year plan period (or 8,300 dwellings over 20 years), whereas the Council's evidence base suggests a maximum baseline housing requirements figure of 13,770 over 18 years (or 15,300 over 20 years). The bespoke housing requirements analysis within this report suggests a baseline housing requirements figure of 11,200 over 18 years (or 12,444 over 20 years). All of these figures are prior to taking the housing backlog into account. Therefore, the low migration housing figure approach preferred by the Council is unlikely to be sufficient to address housing requirements arising within BANES, which over the next 20 years are likely to range between 12,444 and 15,300 net of the Local Plan housing backlog. Taking the backlog into account an overall 20 year housing requirement figure ranging up to 16,049 is suggested.

This suggested figure accords with evidence presented to the Inspector by BANES planning policy officers at a recent appeal (Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/A/12/2171418 Land South of Orchard View, Sleep Lane, Whitchurch BS14 0QW). Under cross examination by Christopher Boyle of Landmark Chambers (Counsel for the Appellant) the officer responded, when questioned by Mr Boyle on the likely Housing number for the Core Strategy that the figure looked to be in the region of 16,000. The Inspector then referred to this figure in his decision in Paragraphs 24-25. A copy of this decision is also appended.

Change to the policy requested:

The Council will need to review the information inputs and analysis within its SHMA to deliver a NPPF compliant assessment than can robustly support proposals within the Core Strategy. The Council should then adopt a housing target that will ensure that the growth ambitions of the district and the housing needs of the district over the plan period can be sustainably accommodated without having to undertake an impromptu review of the plan.

Respondent Number: 148 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ian Bell

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Initiative in Bath and North East Somerset is a business leadership organisation made up of members with a long term commitment to sustainable economic growth in the district. We are keen to see our area continue to play a significant part in the creation of wealth in the West of England and therefore are eager to see an increase in the number of jobs and also the number of homes for those workers.

We are anxious that unless an ambitious approach is taken to job creation there is a real danger that B&NES could become little more than a dormitory for surrounding, more economically active cities, overly reliant on revenue from tourists visiting a World Heritage Site theme park.

In our opinion the number of new jobs set out as the target in the Core Strategy document is too low. We would like to see the district continue to generate at least the same proportion of West of England jobs as it presently does. This means that if the Local Enterprise Partnership achieves its objective of creating just under 100,000 new jobs by 2030, the contribution from B&NES should be around 15,000, a position we in the Initiative have held for some time. In fact there is a case for a broad sub-regional approach not only to job creation but to planning and land use.

We are concerned in B&NES that the amount of employment space, both office and industrial is being set too low. This brings the double risk of failing to attract new businesses and leaving us unable to provide sufficient facilities for growing existing businesses.

The corollary of more jobs being created is there will be a demand over the period for a similar number of houses, especially those which are affordable to people on average wages, as opposed to those specifically designated "affordable". We do not want to comment specifically on any particular proposed development site but take a broad position that we accept there is insufficient brownfield land available to build the necessary numbers of houses and therefore it is inevitable that the green belt must be breached.

However, we are certainly not calling for large housing estates to provide all the numbers. Ideally we would like to see high quality, sustainable new neighbourhoods which also make a contribution to employment targets, including the ever increasing numbers of people working from home thanks to the improving provision of fast broadband.

We also believe smaller developments could generate a useful supply of housing without significant damage to the environment. One specific concern we have is that the number of dwellings in a development which triggers the 40%

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

affordable housing element is set far too low. Many developers who would otherwise be interested in sites for, say 20 dwellings which could be incorporated into many villages in B&NES, will be put off by the high marginal additional costs of the affordable element. Indeed the 40% requirement itself could impact on the provision of high quality homes. Another important element which has not been taken into account in the Core Strategy is the change in Government policy to relax the regulations on changing the use of buildings from commercial to residential. This is particularly pertinent in Bath, where many Georgian buildings in the city centre currently provide unsuitable office space. The switch to residential would bring two advantages. First there would be an increase in the number of homes in the city centre and second, the reduction in office supply, leading to an uplift in achievable rents, would make it attractive for developers to create more appropriate and attractive offices elsewhere in the city. Where those offices would go is a particular concern. There are a number of potential development sites in the centre of Bath and we are keen that they are used to maximise employment, albeit as part of a mixed use approach. We think it would be a waste which would have long term consequences if they were used exclusively for other purposes such as housing or even flood mitigation. In summary, we are of the opinion that the Core Strategy as set out is not sound and look forward to seeing changes made which will remove uncertainty and ensure Bath and North East Somerset can look forward with confidence to a prosperous economic future.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd
Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Pegasus objects to the Councils assessment for development need within the district for the plan period. The SHMA does not address the issues identified in the Inspectors Preliminary Conclusions (ID/28). The assessment is not in accordance with the NPPF eg para 159 as there is no evidence of a joint SHMA being produced. The NPPF states that the SHMA should be prepared collaboratively where the HMA crosses administrative boundaries. Paragraph 2.15 and 2.16 states that the west of BANES falls within a Bristol focussed housing market, while the city of Bath, its environs and the south of BANES form a housing market which extends into Wiltshire and into Mendip. The Proposed Changes do not constitute a sound plan as the assessment of housing need cannot be justified in accordance with the NPPF. The SHMA produced does not fulfil the comprehensive role required by the NPPF – see supporting paper to accompany these representations.

Change to the policy requested:

A revised SHMA should be produced in order to assist in the objective assessment of housing needs and amendments should then be made to Policy DW1.

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd
Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Core Strategy Proposed Change to Policy DW1 clause 2 is not compliant with national policy. Whilst the SHMA has been updated this only covers the BANES area, yet there are two housing market areas that extend beyond the district

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

boundary. The complete and comprehensive SHMA has not been prepared as requested in ID/28 the Inspector's Preliminary conclusions. (see our representations on SPC14)

Change to the policy requested:

(see representations on SPC 14)

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We oppose the decrease in the number of affordable homes – B&NES covers an area which includes considerable poverty and lack of affordable housing. To be cutting back is irresponsible and will ultimately lead to further pressures on the system as young people fail to find housing, thus jeopardizing their health and their potential to contribute to the economic development of the area.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 244 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Home Builders Federation

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Plan period

The original plan period was 2006-2026. It is now proposed to change the plan period to 2011-2029, which would leave 15 years remaining if the CS is adopted in 2014. Whilst the Council is acknowledging that plans require longevity to successfully achieve long term policy objectives, the proposed modification SPC22, which proposes an early review of the plan in 2016 seems to undermine this principle. An early review process should not be used to rectify deficiencies in a plan, especially if these deficiencies have been identified prior to adoption of that plan. This proposed approach for such an early plan review is not compliant with the NPPF, which is commented upon by the Inspector in Paragraph 1.36 of ID/28. Unfortunately the supporting evidence base in particular the BANES Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update 2013 Report of Findings Draft 18 March 2013 by Opinion Research Services uses a timeline of 2011-2031, which is confusing and overly complicates the comparison of data. It would have been simpler and more logical if the Council had proposed a plan period of 2011-2031. The Council gives no reasoned justification for truncating the plan period to 2011-2029.

Moreover the Council has changed and added to the information contained on its website throughout this consultation period causing further difficulties for participants.

An Objectively Assessed Housing Need

The Council proposes the following modifications:-

- Modification SPC14 to Paragraph 1.26 "The Core Strategy makes provision for around 12,700 new homes and around 10,170 new jobs".
 - Modification SPC23 to Policy DW1 Clause 2 "Making provision for a net increase of 10,170 jobs and 12,700 homes between 2011 and 2029, of which around 3,110 affordable homes will be delivered through the planning system".
- The use of the word "around" in the above mentioned modifications is imprecise. It would be preferable if the word "around" was replaced by "minimum".

This modified housing requirement of 12,700 homes (average 705 homes per annum) is based on the findings of the BANES Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update 2013 Report of Findings Draft 18 March 2013 by Opinion Research Services. Whilst on face value the modifications purport to facilitate more housing than included in the submitted plan, the Council has failed to provide an objective assessment of its market and affordable housing needs and then met that need in full as required by Paragraphs 14, 17, 47,

158 and 159 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The SHMA Update 2013 report does not address the concerns raised by the Inspector in ID/28 about the lack of an objective assessment of housing need by the Council. Furthermore the report is not NPPF compliant. The SHMA Update 2013 report identifies two housing market areas. The West HMA linked to Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire. The East HMA associated with Wiltshire and Mendip. However the report is specifically focused on BANES as a self-contained entity. There is no evidence of collaborative working with neighbouring authorities. There is no consideration of the impact of any unmet housing needs from outside BANES such as from Bristol or Wiltshire despite the acknowledgement of migratory patterns between BANES and these adjacent locations. In Paragraph 6.7 of the BANES Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update 2013 Report of Findings Draft 18 March 2013, the Department of Communities & Local Government (DCLG) household projections are dismissed on the grounds of being national figures, which are not representative of BANES's local circumstances in particular its large student population. The DCLG 2008-based figures show household growth of 14,400 over the plan period of 2011-2029 (800 households per year x 18 years).

The Council removes the student population from its calculations. The need for student accommodation is specifically excluded from the SHMA. This ignores the Inspectors comments in Paragraphs 2.6 - 2.14 of ID/28 where the Council is asked to assess the likely changes in student numbers and the effect on the demand for student accommodation. The removal of the student population from the calculation of the housing need demonstrates an inconsistent approach by the Council. In modification SPC54 Policy B1 the Council remains intent upon incorporating off-campus student cluster flats in its housing supply.

The BANES Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update 2013 Report models eight alternative scenarios as summarised in the Table below:-

SCENARIO SHMA 2011-2031 PLAN PERIOD 2011-29 (SHMA dwellings per annum x 18 years) Nil net migration 1,950 dwellings

(97 per annum) 1,755 dwellings Low trend migration 8,350 dwellings (417 per annum) 7,515 dwellings Mid trend migration 10,640 dwellings (532 per annum) 9,576 dwellings High trend migration 15,310 dwellings (765 per annum) 13,779 dwellings

Employment led 9,000 jobs – static female retirement pattern 5,100 dwellings (255 per annum) 4,590 dwellings

Employment led 9,000 jobs – changed female retirement pattern 6,400 dwellings (320 per annum) 5,760 dwellings

Employment led 11,000 jobs static female retirement pattern 7,000 dwellings (350 per annum) 6,300 dwellings

Employment led 11,000 jobs – changed female retirement pattern 8,300 dwellings (415 per annum) 7,470 dwellings

The report also undertakes a complicated calculation, which splits the overall housing requirement for each of the above scenarios between tenures namely market housing, intermediate housing and affordable housing. These calculations are complex and incomprehensible. The affordable housing needs established by these calculations are summarised in the Table below :-

SCENARIO SHMA 2011-2031

AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEED PLAN PERIOD 2011-29

AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEED

(SHMA dwellings per annum x 18 years)

Nil net migration 1,900 dwellings (95 per annum) 1,710 dwellings

Low trend migration 3,000 dwellings (150 per annum) 2,700 dwellings

Mid trend migration 3,400 dwellings (170 per annum) 3,060 dwellings

High trend migration 4,100 dwellings (205 per annum) 3,690 dwellings

Employment led 9,000 jobs - static female retirement pattern 2,400 dwellings (120 per annum) 2,160 dwellings

Employment led 9,000

jobs – changed female retirement pattern 2,700 dwellings (135 per annum) 2,430 dwellings

Employment led 11,000 jobs - static female retirement pattern 2,800 dwellings (140 per annum) 2,520 dwellings

Employment led 11,000 jobs – changed female retirement pattern 3,000 dwellings (150 per annum) 2,700 dwellings

Previously the West of England SHMA identified an affordable housing need for BANES of 847 dwellings per annum, which over the plan period 2011- 2029 would equate to 15,246 dwellings (847 dwellings per annum x 18 years). This significant reduction in the perceived affordable housing need is not explained by the Council. As stated by the Inspector in Paragraph 1.12 of ID/28 "Suppressing housing provision below actual demand may mean that local people in need of a home lose out to wealthier in-migrants".

The report makes no recommendations on which housing figure is the most appropriate choice for the Council to make.

The decision of the Council to choose the low trend migration scenario is set out in Paragraph 3.21 of the Report for the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Council meeting held on 4th March 2013 Annex 1: Changes to Policies on Housing Requirement and Housing Land Supply. The Council justifies its decision by cross referencing this scenario to the Office of National Statistics (ONS) 2011-21 population projections.

However this decision propels forward low growth from a period of recession on the assumption that future growth will not rebound to post recession levels. The economic crisis of the last five years has had a negative impact on household formation. There has been a steep fall in household formation among younger age groups (25-34 and 34-44). ONS data also shows a big increase in the number of young people living at home with their parents. It is inappropriate for the Council to project forward housing figures which include the suppression of younger households as this will inhibit further the ability of such households to form.

The Council also appears to have abandoned its previous methodology of a direct link between homes and jobs as a method of assessing housing needs. This methodology was criticised by the Inspector in ID/28 and in other representations. However, the Council's new approach underplays the importance of economic growth. In choosing the low trend migration scenario, the Council is ignoring the importance of economic growth, the ambitions of the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and its proposed economic growth / job creation strategy set out in its Business Plan. BANES Council is part of the West of England LEP and the Council claims to support its proposals for economic growth. The choice of the low trend migration scenario rather than the mid or high trend migration models is contradictory to the Council's statement of support for economic growth.

Moreover the choice of the low trend migration scenario does not give sufficient consideration to cross border migration between BANES and Bristol nor BANES and Wiltshire. The Council has not co-operated with any neighbouring authorities in the preparation of the SHMA. There is no consideration of the consequences of any unmet needs in these areas or in BANES itself. It is important that the Council does not assume that just because its neighbouring authorities have not drawn attention to any matters of a strategic nature, such strategic pressures do not exist. If neighbouring authorities are not adequately meeting their assessed housing needs, these housing pressures could impinge upon BANES.

The Council has not explained why it considers that the low trend migration assumption provides a realistic planning scenario: why does it consider that inward-migration will fall over the proposed plan period compared to the indications provided by DCLG 2008-based projections? For this to happen, then BANES's neighbouring authorities would have to increase their levels of housing supply when measured against household projections. However, an examination of the adopted and emerging local plans of neighbouring authorities shows that this is not the case. The situation in Bristol City and whether it is meeting its own needs in full is particularly uncertain.

In Paragraph 3.24 of Annex 1 of the Council Report 1,167 dwellings are added to the identified housing need of 7,470 for a shortfall of housing delivery in the Local Plan period prior to April 2011. The shortfall figure of 1,167 dwellings appears to be an under-estimate when the DCLG statistics for BANES permanent dwellings started and completed figure (2006-2011) of 1,070 is subtracted from the proposed annual dwelling requirement of the submitted CS (2,750). This calculation illustrates a deficit of 1,680 dwellings.

In Paragraph 3.28 of Annex 1 a shortfall (-569 dwellings) in the provision of affordable housing need is identified so extra market housing provision is added to deliver the undersupply of affordable housing. Hence the 12,700 dwellings proposed in modified version of Policy DW1.

The SHMA fails to answer the concerns raised in ID/28 as a consequence the Council's proposed modifications to the submitted CS are unsound because the SHMA is not an appropriate evidence base from which to determine policy. The Council has failed to satisfactorily address the Inspectors concerns because the Council's methodology remains unsuitable and the Council gives no reasoned justification for the decision not to meet in full its housing needs. The SHMA as undertaken by the Council does not fulfil the requirements of the NPPF. The methodology applied by the Council in setting the figure of 12,700 as its housing need as outlined in Annex 1: Changes to Policies on Housing Requirement and Housing Land Supply of Council Report

for the meeting on 4th March 2013 is not NPPF compliant. Therefore the modified plan remains unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt

Respondent Organisation: Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- 3) The Inspector made clear in ID/28 that there were five critical problems with the Council's original methodology, the first being that it was an assessment for B&NES rather than a SHMA for the HMA. The Inspector was referring to a SHMA for the West of England HMA; he identified that the lack of proper assessment of the wider area as an inadequate basis in which to allow the plan to move forward.
- 4) The work B&NES has commissioned has subsequently identified two HMAs affecting the District, one for Bath the other for Bristol. In Annex 1 of the 4 March Full Council Report, paragraph 3.4 identifies that ORS review provides housing requirement scenarios for the whole district. In the next paragraph it is established that it is inappropriate for B&NES to seek to undertake a SHMA for the separate Bristol HMA.
- 5) It is difficult to understand quite what study has been undertaken. Given that two HMAs have been identified, correct procedure would be to undertake two separate SHMAs and understand the implications of both for establishing the housing requirement for the district. Embracing the Duty to Cooperate is an essential element of establishing the most sustainable distribution of development across the affected districts. The Bristol HMA has been completely ignored without proper justification; moreover a SHMA for the Bath HMA has not been prepared. Instead, a SHMA for B&NES has been prepared in fundamental conflict with the requirements of paragraphs 14, 47 and 159 of the NPPF. There is no B&NES HMA. Paragraph 8.4 of the 4 March Full Council report refers to the fact that the terms of the Duty to Cooperate have been fulfilled; how can that possibly be if it has chosen to ignore the requirements of half of the district because it falls within an HMA that it is simply not prepared to deal with? Moreover, it doesn't appear to have considered the wider Bath HMA and how the needs of that area can be met across LPA boundaries.
- 6) It is not enough to persistently rely on the terms of the Bristol Core Strategy that there are no unmet needs arising. The Bristol City position is based on the requirement for the Bristol City administrative area, not the Bristol HMA; the Bristol City Core Strategy is not a NPPF compliant strategy. Whilst the Bristol Core Strategy pre-dates the NPPF it is wholly unacceptable for B&NES to seek to pursue the same approach and provide a housing requirement for just the administrative area (and in doing so excluding the needs of half of the district).
- 7) The matter is further confused by the subsequent case for determining the spatial strategy. The spatial strategy is skewed towards meeting the needs of the Bath HMA as opposed to the district as a whole; this is evidenced at paragraph 4.27 of the Annex that establishes development on the edge of Bristol as inherently unsustainable as it is 'poorly located for Bath and not within the Bath HMA'. Nevertheless, the Core Strategy does seek to identify areas for development outside of the Bath HMA and in doing so fails to provide properly for the needs of that area. The Core Strategy is neither one thing or the other; as a consequence it fails to meet the needs of any particular HMA and as such is fundamentally flawed.
- 8) The story should end here as there is little value in seeking to explore matters further, nevertheless, matters of acute concern are raised below. The evidence has been produced at various stages during the consultation period; there has been no notification of when new documents emerge and without constantly returning to the website it is impossible to keep track. BNS/40 stresses that it was produced during the consultation but there was no notice of its publication. Drafts and updated versions of other documents have been published throughout the consultation; it is difficult to rationalise whether appropriate recommendations and decisions were made/taken on 4 March in the context of the available evidence base.
- The Plan Period
- 9) Extending the plan period to 2029 is a sensible strategy. In adjusting the base date from 2006 to 2011, the CS rather conveniently chooses to ignore those five years and instead relies on a historic Local Plan requirement to establish the backlog figure. If the needs of the 2006-2011 period had been properly factored based on a more up to date analysis then the overall backlog would be much greater. In the absence of an up to date SHMA then it falls upon the RS evidence to be considered as the most up to date independently scrutinised assessment of need for this period, not an out of date Local Plan. Even against the original draft requirement of 11,000 homes, the requirement in the period 2006-2011 would have been 2,750 homes; the Local Plan backlog would have been added to that. That rate was found to be deficient in all respects and now the Council intends to simply use the Local Plan backlog figure to cover that period.
- 10) The reality is that the Council has not sought to significantly boost the supply of housing. It will no doubt make great play of the fact that the annual requirement has increased from 550 (11,000 from 2006-2026) to 705 over the new 18 year plan. In reality, the plan has simply been extended by a couple of years and the truncated plan period used as a front for a higher rate of growth. The backlog was required to be taken into account on top of the new requirement in the 2006-2011 period. That requirement cannot now be swept under the carpet. A more credible strategy would be to plan for the period 2006-2029 inclusive of the LP backlog, however, no doubt the implications would be unpalatable to Members. The LPA

should remind itself of the Inspectors comments at paragraph 1.39 of ID/28.

Housing and Economic Growth

11) The draft B&NES SHMA is a confused document that is difficult to draw clear conclusions from. RPS reserves the right to comment more fully when the final version is published.

12) The estimation of housing need is confused; it is not clear how it has been derived. The 2009 SHMA established an annual need of 847 affordable homes in the period to 2021. It is well established that the original CS sought to significantly under-provide and this was one of its key failings. The 2013 SHMA states that affordability declined in 2003-2007 but improved to 2009; more recently affordability has declined again and is almost back to the peak of the market in 2007. The position appears to have worsened since the 2009 SHMA was published. Notwithstanding these facts, there is now an affordable housing need of 3,100 homes. This is lower than the original figure of 3,400; for the reasons set out above this cannot possibly be regarded as a step change in despite a shorter plan period. It seems to be based on what can be achieved by applying a 36% requirement to any given overall figure (para 6.76 of the composite CS refers), which in no circumstance could be considered a robust or reasonable approach.

13) The evidence needs to explain in very clear terms how an affordable housing need figure of 3,100 has been arrived at and whether this will meet the full, objectively assessed needs of the two HMAs. The Duty to Cooperate must be engaged in order to reach logical conclusions.

14) It is not clear why the student requirement is now dismissed. The CS seeks to accommodate the growth of students in dedicated on or off campus accommodation but hasn't established what the level of need is. This is a backwards approach and is a naive methodology in assuming that all new students will choose to live in such accommodation. At paragraph 2.10 of ID/28 the Inspector asked for an up to date assessment of student needs arising, not to simply suggest that all needs (whatever they might be) can be met in dedicated accommodation.

15) In terms of jobs growth scenario the pursuit of moderate growth and maintenance of market share does not reflect the aspirations of the NPPF. It suggests restriction and is used as a basis for restricting housing growth and making difficult decisions in respect of the Green Belt. This goes against the grain of everything that the NPPF is seeking to achieve.

Calculation of five year supply

16) The methodology is flawed. The housing requirement established in DW1 is 12,700 homes. This is the basis in which the five year requirement should be calculated:

A Overall Requirement 2011-2029 12,700

B Completions 2011-2013 924

C Residual requirement 2013-2029 (B-A) 11,776

D Minus Local Plan backlog (1,167) 10,609

E Annual requirement 2013-2029 (D/16 years) 663

F Five year requirement 2013-2018 (Ex5 years) 3,315

G Plus Local Plan backlog (1,167) 4,482

H Plus 20% buffer (663) 5,145

Five Year Requirement 5,145

Supply 2013-2018 4,423

Shortfall 722

17) If the Core Strategy was ever to be adopted on the basis of the proposed modifications, it is not the evidence base that establishes the five year requirement, it is the requirement itself.

18) Without even examining the robustness of the supply, B&NES does not have a five year supply of land. It would be an unsound basis in which to proceed (it is worth noting South Gloucestershire's present position in respect of its Core Strategy) and the only consequence is that further land that can ensure the delivery of at least 700 homes in the next five years has to be identified. It is unlikely that any (at present) unidentified development site, greenfield or brownfield, would deliver much more than 200 homes in the next five year period. At least four further sites of strategic significance are required to be identified.

19) For all the reasons already established, the housing requirement is insufficient, the backlog from 2006-2011 has been misjudged and the five year requirement should in reality be significantly higher; the implications are stark.

20) The conclusion that the SHLAA supply is 10,852 is not reasonable. Despite the fact that the SHLAA acknowledges the suitability of locations such as Hicks Gate and the major positive contribution it could make, locations such as this are ignored. It is not the role of the SHLAA to dismiss such sites, that is the role of the CS. The SHLAA should present a factual assessment of available and suitable land in the District. The Council should reflect on the fact that the supply of such land is much greater than the 10,852 figure it suggests.

'retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt within B&NES other than removing land to meet the District's development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram...'

21) For reasons already stated, the spatial strategy is based on a flawed premise that all of the district housing requirement should be focused towards meeting the needs of the Bath HMA. The fact that a significant proportion of housing land is

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

identified outside of the HMA (ie within Bristol HMA) means that the needs are not being fully met, and the distribution that falls within the Bristol HMA does nothing to address the needs of that HMA but at least prevents difficult decisions being made in respect of release of further land at Bath.

22) The three stage process for identifying suitable options falls at the first hurdle with the District-wide locational sequence. Locations on the edge of Bristol are deemed the least sustainable because they are poorly located for Bath and not within the Bath HMA. There are supposedly no unmet needs arising from Bristol so there is no case to answer.

Paragraph 4.5.17 of the Bristol City CS states:

“The Council also acknowledges that the SHMA suggests a substantial gap between forecast affordable housing need and potential affordable housing supply. The Council’s choice of the scale of overall housing to be accommodated inevitably limits the number of affordable homes that can be delivered. The likely gap between affordable housing need and provision will have negative socio-economic consequences.”

23) Neither Bristol nor B&NES can justify the stance that there are no unmet needs arising. We reiterate the fact that the current policies of the Bristol CS would not meet today’s requirements of the NPPF or the tests of soundness. In order to maintain this stance B&NES has to demonstrate that there are no unmet needs arising from the Bristol HMA, a task that it readily acknowledges that it has chosen to ignore.

24) As a consequence of the failings of the locational sequence, the remainder of the exercise to identify suitable sites is rendered flawed in every sense.

Sustainability Appraisal

27) The SA reflects on the overall premise of the locational strategy, that Bristol is the least sustainable location compared to anywhere else due to the relative lack of benefits arising to Bath. It is heavily influenced by that notion rather than taking a balanced assessment of looking to understand and meet the needs of both HMAs. By way of just one example of the many that exist, to suggest that Keynsham is better located to employment opportunities than the edge of Bristol is stretching credibility to the extreme.

28) There is nothing in evidence to suggest that Hicks Gate is nothing but an inherently sustainable location to accommodate growth. The SHLAA acknowledges it as a suitable location for development. The extent of development proposed would overcome the concerns regarding skyline impact and we broadly accept the appraisal work of the relevant Development Concept Options Report. It is only the insistence on the value of the Green Belt compared to other locations along the A4 corridor and ignorance of the needs of the Bristol HMA that prevents its release. The fact that it and Whitchurch are considered as part of the rural area speaks volumes of the lack of coordination with neighbouring authorities.

Change to the policy requested:

1) The CS cannot be found sound on the basis of the terms of DW1. The evidence base is fundamentally flawed and NPPF compliant conclusions cannot be drawn to be in a position for solutions to find overall soundness to be contemplated. The District needs to complete SHMAs for the Bristol and Bath HMAs. Finding the plan unsound now would enable the results of the West of England SHMA to be fully considered.

2) The locational strategy is equally flawed and as a consequence the choice of Green Belt releases is not properly justified.

3) There is no value in proceeding to adoption. No sites would be prejudiced if the CS was to be found unsound. The Green Belt releases that have been made are not capable of implementation anytime soon given the need to establish the context for development through the placemaking plan. This is not due for adoption until 2015. Work should progress on a new Local Plan that looks to address the above factors but that also produces the context for abandoning the unnecessary placemaking plan and dealing with progressing detailed allocations in a similar timescale as that for the placemaking plan.

Respondent Number: 281 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy

Respondent Organisation: Natural England

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Twerton

We are pleased to note that development at this site has been screened out by the Council. The land in question is

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

currently managed as grassland and forms part of the Avon river valley character area. Although it is outside the Cotswolds AONB, development here would introduce an urban form into an otherwise undeveloped area and would be uncharacteristic in terms of the existing landscape in a key gateway to the City of Bath. In addition, development in this location would be highly visible from many places, including the Cotswolds AONB, the Cotswolds Way National Trail and Kelston Manor historic park and garden, all of which are located on the opposite side of the river valley.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson

Respondent Organisation: Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Housing Land Supply

3.1 It is essential that the Council provides a robust and credible housing land supply. This needs to be based on the suitability, deliverability and availability of sites as well as being assessed against the appropriate housing target i.e. not one that is set artificially low to “show” compliance with the requirement of the NPPF that councils are able to demonstrate a rolling 5 year housing supply plus an appropriate buffer (20% in the case of B&NES).

3.2 Curo are concerned that the Council has inadequately assessed this matter and sites contained within their calculations may in fact not be available or deliverable. Whilst it is not appropriate to rehearse these concerns for the purposes of the Core Strategy it is important to recognise the importance of allocating sufficient sites both within the Core Strategy and in the forthcoming Place Making DPD.

3.3 As previously mentioned Curo have a number of land interests within and adjoining the urban area of Bath, as well as at the other towns and in several villages. These sites are being promoted through the Plan process, including the SHLAA, with an explicit recognition that these sites are suitable, available and ready for development.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson

Respondent Organisation: Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

4.1 Curo support the principle of boosting the overall housing figure to increase the provision of affordable housing, as set out in SPC21. However, the proposed increase in the overall affordable housing target from 3,000 to 3,110 is modest. It remains unclear as previously how this target will be achieved and how it links in with the individual site targets. No affordable housing implementation strategy has been set out as required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 301 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South West HARP Planning Consortium
Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC13 – Development Need

We are concerned that the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) update document, which accompanies the proposed Core Strategy changes, does not meet Government guidance on the content and procedure of a SHMA. We outline our main concerns below.

SHMA Procedure

Our primary concern is that the update does not meet the minimum requirements to be 'robust and credible' as set out in the SHMA Practice Guidance (DCLG, 2007), as the update does not cover the whole of housing market area as defined by the 2008 West of England SHMA. Cross-boundary working is a key policy within the NPPF and particularly applies to the production of housing evidence; see the extract from paragraph 159 of the NPPF below:

"Local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should:
- prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries."

This is a particular concern in the West of England as Bristol's Core Strategy pre-dates both the Localism Act and the NPPF and as such the adopted plan does not cater for all of the assessed housing needs within Bristol City. Given that Bristol is so constrained, its future housing needs will have to be met by neighbouring authorities including B&NES and the Council should have taken this into account in its SHMA.

Our second concern with the SHMA process is the lack of engagement with key stakeholders, such as Housing Association Registered Providers. Whilst we understand the Council was required to produce housing evidence to a very short timetable we consider that engagement with housing providers would have better informed the SHMA process.

Finally, we note the 2013 update of the SHMA uses assumptions about welfare reforms and private rented accommodation to justify a lower affordable housing need. These assumptions have yet to be shown in practice. We are concerned that this will lead to further under-delivery of affordable housing compounding the effect of the existing shortfall.

SHMA Content

Firstly, we are concerned that the document does not adequately test the affordable housing tenure mix required in the district. We would suggest the Council conducts further research into the need for different tenures within the affordable housing sector to enable a fully justified policy to be formulated.

Secondly, we are disappointed the Council has not taken the opportunity to fully assess the need for specialist older people's housing in its updated SHMA. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF is clear that the housing needs of older people should be considered as part of this evidence base:

"The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:

- addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)"

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

We seek for the Council to produce further evidence to demonstrate it has considered the housing needs of all groups within the local population.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 301 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South West HARP Planning Consortium
Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC14 & SPC23 – Overall Housing Target

We previously raised concerns about the ability of the Core Strategy to meet the housing needs of both the district and the city of Bath. Whilst we note that the Council has increased its overall housing target from 11,500 to 12,700 homes and increased the annual target to 706, we remain concerned that the Council’s housing figures do not meet the fully assessed need of the district. We are aware of a shortfall of 850 dwellings which were not provided during the Local Plan period and were not included within the Council’s original housing target. Taking into account this backlog, the proposed housing target only represents an increase of 350 dwellings from that previously proposed. Clearly, this is not enough as the Core Strategy should be meeting B&NES’ objectively assessed needs.

Notwithstanding the continued limitations of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), as summarised above, we note it concludes on a range of possible housing requirements of between 5,100 and 15,300 dwellings (2011 – 2031). We consider the high end of the Council’s range, 15,300 dwellings, is an absolute minimum.

The proposed housing target is particularly inadequate when taking into account shortfalls elsewhere in the West of England Housing Market Area, most notably Bristol. We note that growth at Whitchurch has been introduced close to Bristol City’s southern boundary however this only goes some way towards meeting some of the additional growth required at B&NES; it does not assist Bristol City’s growth in any way at present.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 303 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Ian Bowen **Respondent Organisation:** Mendip District Council
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Please note this is a preliminary response to the consultation as time has not yet allowed formal member consideration of the Proposed Changes.

You will be aware that Mendip District Council raised strong concerns (in March 2011) over the inadequate scale of housing proposed in the B&NES ‘submission’ version Core Strategy. In this regard, the north eastern fringes of Mendip share a functional relationship with Bath in particular.

Whilst a detailed assessment of the draft SHMA prepared by ORS has not been possible at this time, the document’s

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

conclusions that the 2011 census population results tend to cast doubt on the high levels of growth projected in the earlier 2008 based population and household projections are noted. It is further noted that the revised housing requirement for B&NES is informed by a bespoke methodology involving a combination of locally specific data sources and assumptions. In this regard, it is understood that further refinement and iterations of the draft SHMA are expected shortly.

Nevertheless, Mendip District Council remains concerned that the revised proposed housing requirement of 12,700 for the period 2011 – 2029 falls considerably short of the scale of need implied by the current 2008 based sub-national population and household projections. Whilst these projections ought rightly to be regarded as a starting point only, the clear disparity is a cause for concern. Moreover, it is unclear as to how the proposed requirement intends to adequately remedy past levels of housing under-provision in the B&NES area – a trend which will already be reflected in the published CLG household projections.

Further still, it is not clear how assumptions over the following have been treated in the draft SHMA:

- Rates of past internal and international net in-migration;
- Household formation rates;
- Future vacancy rates in housing stock
- Allowance for second homes.

Given the above, there is a risk that the Core Strategy will perpetuate under-provision in B&NES thereby seeing increasing growth pressure in Mendip’s towns and villages and, for example, continued unsustainable out-commuting from the north eastern fringes of the District. Mendip District Council does not therefore support the proposed change and maintains its objections to the proposed housing requirement.

This should be regarded as a holding objection, however, as this Council will wish to review its position in the light of any further demographic evidence your Council may publish following the imminent 2011 based CLG household projections. In this regard, further ongoing cross-boundary discussions would be welcomed.

Change to the policy requested:

The Proposed Change should make clear that the housing requirement is preliminary pending publication of further 2011 Census based demographic projections and indicate a commitment to hold further consultation with adjoining councils and other stakeholders on a final version of the SHMA.

Respondent Number: 384	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Georgina Clampitt-Dix	Respondent Organisation: Wiltshire Council
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Wiltshire Council fully supports the approach and strategy to identifying the housing and employment requirement contained in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy.

The increase in housing requirement from 11,000 (averaging 550 per annum) to 12,700 (averaging 706 per annum) new homes provides more than sufficient accommodation to provide for the projected employment growth which has increased from 8,700 to 10,170 new jobs over the revised plan period. The plan period has been revised as part of the proposed changes from a period of 2006 to 2026 to 2011 to 2029 to ensure that the plan is compliant with the requirements in paragraph 157 of the NPPF that requires local authorities to preferably draw up local plans over a 15 year time horizon.

This has resulted in revised projections being prepared in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment report (produced in March 2013) that supports the housing requirement laid down in the Local Plan. The SHMA doesn’t appear to make any specific reference to how household size has been factored into the projections and this may benefit from clarification.

The updated SHMA has identified housing market areas (HMAs) across B&NES. These HMAs are those upon which the plan ultimately relies. The HMA which is adjacent to Wiltshire includes the eastern part of B&NES, a small bit of Mendip and a small bit of North Wiltshire. This HMA is considered broadly consistent with those identified in Wiltshire. This aligns with

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

paragraph 47 of the NPPF and demonstrates that the two Core Strategies are consistent in this regard.

The approach taken seeks to balance employment and housing growth by focussing on the regeneration of urban and central areas, supported by well planned strategic Greenfield sites, in order that B&NES can meet the overall housing and employment needs of the area. This approach is supported.

Wiltshire supports the ambitions of B&NES of reducing in-commuting by enabling a shift in self containment levels from 70% to 80% whilst ensuring that the overall employment offer at Bath is improved, by providing an ambitious level of housing. This reflects the sub-regional role of Bath, which is a major strategic employment centre in the region, and ensures the sub region remains a competitive and an attractive location to live and work. This approach is broadly in conformity with that identified in the Wiltshire Core Strategy and responds to previous consultation responses and ongoing joint working with Wiltshire Council.

On balance and taking account of the evidence presented in the SHMA Update report, Wiltshire Council support the quantum of housing being proposed in the B&NES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy. The increase in the housing requirement better reflects the sub-regional role of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 820	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: St James's Investments and Tesco UK Stores
Agent ID: 55	Agent Name: Terence O'Rourke Ltd		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Our client supports the changes to Policy DW1 District-wide spatial strategy, which recognise the increased need for employment and homes across the District. The higher targets emphasize the urgent need for the council to support development that will provide new jobs and homes.

Change to the policy requested:

None

Respondent Number: 837	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: David Redgewell
-------------------------------	--------------------------	---

Respondent Organisation: South West Transport Network
--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The plan needs to be clear about housing, employment and growth. There is no need to provide affordable housing. Simply moving the plan period and the SHMA does not allow for the level of growth and housing population within the district resulting in displacement of affordable housing within the BANES area into Western Wiltshire, Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Mendip and Swindon borough.

Change to the policy requested:

We wish to see more housing within the plan period as SPC11 & SPC13 which does not provide enough development need within Bath, Keynsham, Radstock & Midsomer Norton.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

BANES council is still under performing on housing job and growth delivery in the Bristol / Bath City region and is under performing on meeting basic housing needs within the district or meeting its housing waiting list. The target built should be about 900 a year and 12000 to 14000 jobs.

Change to the policy requested:

The policy needs to reflect the need for regeneration and economic growth as per the National Planning Policy Framework as a present housing growth is allocation in Mendip District Council area or Western Wiltshire around Trowbridge and Westbury. Frome and Shepton Mallet with extra inbound commuting.

Respondent Number: 2548 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Peter & Jean Collingridge **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

I have scrutinised the changes to the core strategy documents plus the changes (still pending) that might not in future discussion/mean future encroachment on the green belt areas surrounding Bath.
I particularly note the sustainable appraisal (A and F) to the East of Bath (which still seems to be under threat from Newton St Loe toward Twerton). An area we consider to be vital as Green Belt if Bath is to be maintained as a European heritage site. It's not obviously under threat at the moment but could be, I was informed by Kaoru Jacques (Planning Policy office).

Change to the policy requested:

Englishcombe, Priston, Newton St Loe itself are all in the completely unspoilt rural areas of outstanding natural beauty (without any of the infrastructure to support the expansion of Bath). May it continue so into the foreseeable future without any further encroachment by developers seeking permission on the 'house building'. This is our main concern and will remain so as long as this side of Bath is not given complete immunity from the outward growth of Bath.

Respondent Number: 2563 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Guinness Trust

Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

On behalf of the Guinness Partnership we hereby provide representations on the ability of the Core Strategy with Proposed Changes to meet the demonstrable housing needs at Bath, including the proposals for an urban extension at Odd Down.

These follow on from those submitted in December 2011 for the examination stage, in respect of housing issues no. 1 and 4. For brevity, we consider whether and how the proposed changes reconcile our earlier concerns.

SPC14: Impact of the Proposed Changes on the Core Strategy Housing Requirement

We previously raised concerns about the ability of the Core Strategy to meet the housing needs of B&NES and specifically those pertaining to Bath. At that time, the NPPF was at draft stage. Its subsequent adoption as a material consideration places a duty on all local authorities (including B&NES) to “use their evidence base to ensure their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area” (NPPF, paragraph 47 - emphasis added).

We note the Inspector’s concern in his preliminary conclusions (ID/28, paragraphs 1.3 and 1.8) that the housing requirement of 11,500 in the Submission Core Strategy does not reflect the scale of the affordable housing need. We contend that the uplift to the proposed 12,700, in offering a mere 1,200 extra dwellings, makes little difference to the outcome for affordable housing across B&NES. This fundamental concern therefore remains.

Furthermore, in rolling forward the Plan period the undersupply of 868 dwellings identified in the Council’s 2010-2011 Annual Monitoring Report. This should be included in the new housing target.

Notwithstanding the continued limitations of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) as summarised below, we note it concludes on a range of possible housing requirements of between 5,100 and 15,300 dwellings (2011 to 2031) which appears to be almost entirely derived from affordable housing need (of between 14,000 and 17,500 dwellings depending on the scenario used).

The SHMA Update seeks to forecast the impacts of the Welfare Reform Act with an assumed displacement of affordable housing need from the intermediate to the private rental sector, thereby resulting in an overall reduction in the projected level of affordable housing need to between 2,500 and 4,100. As acknowledged by the authors of the Update, the concept that sufficient affordable stock will become and remain available in this sector over the Plan period and beyond or that this would be the preference of households in need is highly questionable. The Council, however, appears to have proceeded to make these sort of assumptions.

According to the March 2013 Sustainability Appraisal Report, the 12,700 housing requirement now being proposed by the Council has been derived as follows:

“The revised housing target proposed is 12,700 homes from 2011 to 2029, based on the findings of SHMA, adding the Local Plan backlog, an extra to address affordable housing needs, 5 year land supply and flexibility to respond to non-delivery risks” (page 37).

We have been unable to obtain any explanation as to which of the scenarios in the SHMA Update has been applied here, which alternative scenarios were rejected and why. As such we consider there to be no sound evidence for the selected figure. We are, however, aware that the shortfall or ‘backlog’ already accrued from the old Local Plan is around 850 dwellings. This accounts for the majority of the 1,200 additional dwellings being proposed leaving just 350 to deal with the above mentioned ‘affordable housing needs’.

Clearly this is not enough as the Core Strategy should be meeting B&NES’ objectively assessed needs. In our opinion the high end of the Council’s range, 15,300 dwellings, is an absolute minimum. Given the limitations of the 2011-based interim projections, which only take into account selected 2011 Census data; only model forward to the end of 2021; and project forward trends observed from a depressed housing market, it is still relevant to take into account the 2008-based household projections’ indication of 16,000 new households by 2026 as part of a trend-based approach.

The precise figure does require further testing owing to the following limitations of the SHMA Update. These broadly reiterate our previous concerns in the enclosed response to Issue 1.

The SHMA Update suffers from the following fundamental shortcomings:

- It merely updates parts of the original, 2008 West of England SHMA. Its base date therefore remains as 2008. Moreover, the Update pertains only to an isolated area of the West of England Housing Market Area rather than in its entirety - in no way can it be deemed an up to date, stand alone or comprehensive SHMA.
- It fails to comply with the “minimum” requirements to be regarded “robust and credible”, as set out on pages 9 and 10 of

Strategic Housing Market Assessments: Practice Guidance (DCLG August 2007).

- There has been little or no engagement with key stakeholders, such as the Guinness Partnership.
- Lack of transparency arises from the omission of key data sources and detailed workings from the report. Paragraph 1.7 makes passing reference but that is all. The projection of the housing requirements appears to be based substantially on the ORS Housing Mix Model (Section 8). The full assumptions and how the Model works are unclear and we are left with the impression that this has been tailored to the Council's subjective brief rather than set up to objectively assess needs. This is not a widely used approach and certainly differs substantially from that used by Professor Bramley in the original and still core SHMA.
- The NPPF is not properly reflected. Paragraph 1.10 refers to the NPPF as some sort of replacement for the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) which clearly it is not. However, like the South West RSS it does iterate the need "to boost significantly the supply of housing" (paragraph 47). This key message is conveniently cast aside in paragraph 1.10 of the SHMA Update.
- In the same context, it is misleading for the SHMA Update to refer to the NPPF requiring production of "a range of housing forecasts" (paragraph 1.11). This is not correct; the NPPF advocates meeting objectively assessed housing needs and this should be the SHMA's starting point.
- As already noted above, some dubious assertions are made concerning the private rented sector being a proxy for affordable housing (paragraph 8.33). These are not supported by the preceding Chapter 7 which is very cautious about the potential effects of the current welfare reforms on the private rented sector, given that the reforms and their ramifications may manifest themselves in many different forms in the run up to 2031.
- It makes a spurious and dangerous assumption (paragraph 8.46) that a lower level of housing growth would suppress the level of in-migration to the benefit of overall affordability in the stock. This is not our perception. Our expectation is that wealthy in-migrants would still buy housing in B&NES with the advantage of being able to outbid (in some cases) existing residents for any available housing, thus raising local house prices even further. This would occur whether or not they were working in B&NES; for example, many could be working in Bristol, self-employed/working from home, or retired. Partly for this reason the Inspector cautioned in ID/28 (paragraph 1.11) not to determine a housing requirement on the number of new B&NES jobs alone.
- No reference at all has been made to the Council's own housing register data. The homelessness data quoted (paragraph 5.25) is at least four quarters older than it need be. No attempt has been made to assess the existing backlog of need as distinct from newly arising need.
- The assertion that there is a "lack of requirement" for intermediate housing products in B&NES is not supported by recent evidence and underlines the lack of communication with key stakeholders, such as our clients.
- There is little or no further information on the spatial distribution of housing demand and need across the District. Our earlier representations strongly emphasised the concentration of affordable housing needs at Bath.
- The updated SHMA is helpful in vindicating our previously expressed objections concerning lack of provision to meet the specific housing and care needs of older people. However, the Proposed Changes make no meaningful policy response in this regard.

The updated SHMA does not clearly underpin or justify the either the revised overall housing figure or the affordable housing target in the Core Strategy Proposed Changes.

Given the above, our concerns about the overall housing requirement have been overcome by the Council's Proposed Changes. The proposed housing requirement in SPC14 (and SPC23) is not supported.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 2564 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins**Respondent Organisation:** Strategic Land Partnerships**Agent ID:** 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We object to the methodology contained within the SHMA and how it has been interpreted by the Council to identify a robust objectively assessed need for housing. While we welcome the attempt to deliver more housing it is important that the figure of 12,700 homes between 2011 and 2029 is seen as an absolute minimum level of housing which merely rolls forward low growth. Such a level largely fails to meet the NPPF requirement to significantly boost supply and deliver sustainable economic development. We would expect the figure to be more like 13,500 homes required if the West of England employment objectives are going to be fulfilled. It is imperative to provide for the needs that exist from the local population and deliver the affordable housing need that exists within BANES.

It is important that any attempt to reduce the housing provision as a result of the recently published 2011 based interim household projections is resisted. The interim projections are not forecasts and in no way purport to illustrate the objectively assessed need for BANES over the plan period as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically we highlight a number of concerns relating to the methodology used, assumptions applied and lack of sensitivity testing that has been undertaken.

These projections are 'interim' and cover the period 2011 to 2021. Consequently they only cover the short term and do not provide a robust basis on which to plan for the medium to long term which is covered by the plan period. As with all projections they are based on trends for the previous 5 years. As the notes to the projections states 'They are not an assessment of housing need or do not take account of future policies, they are an indication of the likely increase in households given the continuation of recent demographic trends'. The projections reflect the period 2006 – 2010 during which the economy has experienced very low rates of economic growth. During this period house building has been at an all time low and migration rates have also been substantially reduced. These circumstances combine to mean that population growth has been low. Given that the population figures are the essential input into the household projections, it follows that the resulting household projections to 2021 represent a low level of growth, which if applied would be totally contrary to the NPPF.

The household projections are based on the 2011 based interim population projections. ONS highlight that caution should be used in the application of the population projections for planning purposes. They are not direct estimates of the actual number of households but rather are a result of a modelling exercise which derives household representative rates and relies on evidence from the labour market survey which demonstrate that household representative rates for some (particularly younger) age groups have fallen markedly since the 2001 Census. Full Census results are not available and have not verified that this assumption is correct. There have been no variant household projections produced to accompany this interim set of projections. This means that it not possible to understand the broad indication of the sensitivity of the projections to different demographic assumptions on fertility, life expectancy and net migration.

While BANES are not seeking to use the 2011 based interim household projections as a robust basis on which to set a housing requirement for their plan period, any attempt to extend or roll forward these projections should be treated with considerable care. A simple doubling of the requirement is entirely inappropriate. It is not a robust approach to multiply the projections by two to get a figure for 2031, because it is not necessarily appropriate to continue the assumptions used beyond 2021.

It is important that the five year land supply does not include any sites which do not have planning permission. In addition it must be calculated using the full housing provision of 12,700 set out in the Core Strategy Policy. This would require the provision of 3,500 units plus 700 as the 20% buffer as required by the NPPF to provide choice and competition, as well as deal with any backlog that might exist.

Change to the policy requested:

The Housing Requirement should be increased to reflect the need to significantly boost housing supply or at the very least expressed as a minimum.

Any sites without planning permission should be removed from the five year land supply. In addition it must be calculated using the full housing provision of 12,700 set out in the Core Strategy Policy. This would require the provision of 3,500

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

units plus 700 as the 20% buffer as required by the NPPF to provide choice and competition.

Respondent Number: 2564 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins **Respondent Organisation:** Strategic Land Partnerships

Agent ID: 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We object to the methodology contained within the SHMA and how it has been interpreted by the Council to identify a robust objectively assessed need for housing. While we welcome the attempt to deliver more housing it is important that the figure of 12,700 homes between 2011 and 2029 is seen as an absolute minimum level of housing which merely rolls forward low growth. Such a level largely fails to meet the NPPF requirement to significantly boost supply and deliver sustainable economic development. We would expect the figure to be more like 13,500 homes required if the West of England employment objectives are going to be fulfilled. It is imperative to provide for the needs that exist from the local population and deliver the affordable housing need that exists within BANES.

It is important that any attempt to reduce the housing provision as a result of the recently published 2011 based interim household projections is resisted. The interim projections are not forecasts and in no way purport to illustrate the objectively assessed need for BANES over the plan period as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically we highlight a number of concerns relating to the methodology used, assumptions applied and lack of sensitivity testing that has been undertaken.

These projections are 'interim' and cover the period 2011 to 2021. Consequently they only cover the short term and do not provide a robust basis on which to plan for the medium to long term which is covered by the plan period. As with all projections they are based on trends for the previous 5 years. As the notes to the projections states 'They are not an assessment of housing need or do not take account of future policies, they are an indication of the likely increase in households given the continuation of recent demographic trends'. The projections reflect the period 2006 – 2010 during which the economy has experienced very low rates of economic growth. During this period house building has been at an all time low and migration rates have also been substantially reduced. These circumstances combine to mean that population growth has been low. Given that the population figures are the essential input into the household projections, it follows that the resulting household projections to 2021 represent a low level of growth, which if applied would be totally contrary to the NPPF.

The household projections are based on the 2011 based interim population projections. ONS highlight that caution should be used in the application of the population projections for planning purposes. They are not direct estimates of the actual number of households but rather are a result of a modelling exercise which derives household representative rates and relies on evidence from the labour market survey which demonstrate that household representative rates for some (particularly younger) age groups have fallen markedly since the 2001 Census. Full Census results are not available and have not verified that this assumption is correct. There have been no variant household projections produced to accompany this interim set of projections. This means that it not possible to understand the broad indication of the sensitivity of the projections to different demographic assumptions on fertility, life expectancy and net migration.

While BANES are not seeking to use the 2011 based interim household projections as a robust basis on which to set a housing requirement for their plan period, any attempt to extend or roll forward these projections should be treated with considerable care. A simple doubling of the requirement is entirely inappropriate. It is not a robust approach to multiply the projections by two to get a figure for 2031, because it is not necessarily appropriate to continue the assumptions used beyond 2021.

It is important that the five year land supply does not include any sites which do not have planning permission. In addition it must be calculated using the full housing provision of 12,700 set out in the Core Strategy Policy. This would require the provision of 3,500 units plus 700 as the 20% buffer as required by the NPPF to provide choice and competition, as well as deal with any backlog that might exist.

Change to the policy requested:

The Housing Requirement should be increased to reflect the need to significantly boost housing supply or at the very least expressed as a minimum.

Any sites without planning permission should be removed from the five year land supply. In addition it must be calculated using the full housing provision of 12,700 set out in the Core Strategy Policy. This would require the provision of 3,500

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

units plus 700 as the 20% buffer as required by the NPPF to provide choice and competition.

Respondent Number: 4449	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mrs T Lewis	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC23		Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:	
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

We write as the owners of the above site with an area of land located to the west of Old Fosse Road, Odd Down. I wish to raise concern that the revisions to the Core Strategy in respect of the provision of new housing opportunities result in an over reliance upon the identification of large sites and not sufficient emphasis has been placed on the opportunities that may be gained by the identification of smaller sites for the provision of housing provision at the edge of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

The land we are proposing is identified by red outline on the attached site plan (drawing 1) and measures approximately 4 hectares in area. The site is adjacent to the clubhouse of the Old Culverhaysians RFC and outlined in blue. The Rugby Club it is understood are currently in the process of establishing new facilities as part of the Hub development at Odd Down Playing Fields in co-ordination with other partners and in response to the money provided by the Section 106 Agreement associated with the nearby Sainsbury development. In the event that this reaches a satisfactory outcome this would provide the opportunity to further enlarge the site and therefore the opportunity.

The site is adjacent to the highway and services whilst not provided within the site would appear to be realistically available within the adjacent highway.

The land to the north of the site and to the west of Old Fosse Road already has been developed including the site of the former Clarks factory site. The development of this land would result in the continuation of the built development to the west of Old Fosse Road. However, it is our view the existing western boundary and topography of adjoining land would enable the establishment of a revised boundary that would result in only minimal visual impact as a result of the development upon this site which when viewed from the rural land beyond would not be inappropriate (plan 2). Particularly having regard to the existing impact of the existing two storey housing to the east of Old Fosse Road. A well designed development of two storey development would permit views through the site to the open countryside and provide an appropriate edge to the urban area.

I note that the revisions proposed to the Core Strategy supports the reappraisal of the Green Belt boundary within the Odd Down area and the residential use of this site would in our opinion be consistent with such a reappraisal.

Respondent Number: 4469	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: Ralph Wynne-Griffiths	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC23		Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:	
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

I do not support the proposed change for the following reasons:

The change is to the forecast number of new homes that will be required before 2029. This change does not appear to be credible having regard to the other changes made to the forecasts of increased office accommodation and industrial work space in SPC53. This would suggest that the actual numbers of new jobs and the need for new houses is likely to be less than those forecast. The basis for the proposed change is therefore unsound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

The changes made to Policy DW1, clause 2 should be deleted, leaving the figures originally forecast.

Respondent Number: 4639 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Lands Improvement

Agent ID: 156 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Lands Improvement, whilst noting the minor increase in housing numbers, have significant concerns as to the overall quantum of development and its distribution as currently proposed. These concerns are:

- That the scale of growth remains inadequate and that the Council has failed to adequately and objectively assess the full needs for both market and affordable housing;
- That the distribution of growth does not represent the most appropriate and sustainable strategy; and
- That the Evidence Base, notably the SHMA, is both confused and confusing and contains significant inaccuracies.

In short, the Council has failed to adequately respond to the fundamental issues raised by the Inspector in his Preliminary Conclusions of June 2012 (ID/28).

Scale of Growth

The level of new housing being planned for has been a significant issue throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy including at Examination.

As is now widely recognised, the starting point for assessing the Core Strategy's approach to delivering new homes is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and, specifically paragraph 47 of that document. This confirms that Local Planning Authorities must:

- "Boost significantly" the supply of housing land; and
- Use their evidence to ensure that they meet the "full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing" in the housing market area.

Whilst noting that SPC 14 proposes an increase in housing numbers from 11,000 to 12,700, we consider that this is totally inadequate and does not address the concerns of the Inspector as set out in ID/28. We also have significant concerns as to the Core Strategy's approach to the location and delivery of the additional 1,700 dwellings which are set out in separate representations.

Whilst fully appreciative of the current position in terms of the revocation of the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (dRSS), we nevertheless consider that it remains a valid consideration in assessing the adequacy of the levels of development now being proposed. The dRSS identified a need for 21,300 new dwellings which is in stark contrast with the 12,700 now being proposed. It is our view that, other than being a politically expedient approach, the Council has failed to explain this significant reduction especially given the requirements of the NPPF.

In the context of the requirement previously set out in the dRSS, the 1,700 dwelling increased proposed by SPC14 is therefore negligible. This becomes even more evident when one takes into account the fact that this figure includes the addition of 1,167 dwellings which is the acknowledged shortfall in supply at the end of the Local Plan period (April 2011). It should not therefore be seen as an actual increase for the new plan period resulting from a reassessment of the needs of the HMA, including through the SHLAA and SHMA.

Flexibility

We are also concerned that the Core Strategy remains highly inflexible. For example, specific sites have been identified to exactly meet the "additional" 1,700 dwellings without any allowance for non-take-up or delayed delivery. We consider that this represents an unnecessarily high risk strategy and demonstrates that past issues of delivering sites within BANES, which has created the need for the 20% buffer to be applied, have not been acknowledged.

Evidence Base/Background Documents

We have reviewed those background documents to the Proposed Changes that are currently available. These include the report to Full Council (4th March 2013), the latest SHLAA (March 2013) and the update to the SHMA (March 2013). It is immediately clear that these documents do not respond to an objective assessment of need and that they contain inaccuracies and inconsistencies. We do not therefore consider that they allow the Core Strategy to be found sound or that they comply with the requirements of the NPPF.

In respect of the SHMA, whilst this is being relied upon to inform the Core Strategy, we note that the most recent version available on the Council's website is labelled as being "Draft". The reasons for relying on a draft document are not clear.

We also note that the SHMA provides the Council with various growth profiles based on both employment-led and population/household projections. Further the latter tests three growth profiles these being low, medium and high. The Core Strategy adopts the low population/household trend as being "the most logical trend to use to extend the projection to 2029" (report to Full Council, 4th March 2013; para 3.21 of Annex 1). There is little substantive justification for adopting the low growth trend as opposed to the high growth trend. This is, in our firm view, contrary to the requirements of NPPF paragraph 157, that Local Planning Authorities should "plan positively" to meet the needs of the area.

Based on the draft SHMA, the high growth profile would create a requirement for approximately 15,310 new dwellings during the 20 year period. This figure is notably similar to the results of the Chelmer modelling referred to below and previously submitted to the Core Strategy Inspector. Added to this would be the existing shortfall of 1,167 dwellings and an allowance for the shortfall in provision at Bristol City (we return to this point below). We consider that such an approach would be more in line with the NPPF and show a positive and ambitious approach rather than planning for continuing recession and a depressed housing market. Indeed, by ignoring the potential to plan for higher levels of growth in sustainable locations, the Core Strategy unnecessarily restricts the supply of land. In turn, this can only undermine the economic growth and wellbeing of the area contrary to one of the core aims of the council.

Land at Whitchurch

Lands Improvement believes that there is sufficient land that is both available and appropriate for development in sustainable locations to allow higher growth rates to be aimed for not least at Whitchurch. It is clear that the SHLAA and other evidence base documents identify that there is significant capacity at Whitchurch for approximately 3,000 dwellings. Whilst we believe that capacity of Whitchurch is higher still, it is notable that the Council Report of 4th March fails to acknowledge the availability of land on the edge of Bristol. Given this availability at Whitchurch and the requirement to "significantly boost" the supply of new housing, it is inexcusable for the Core Strategy not to adopt a more positive and ambitious approach.

Likewise, the Core Strategy does not seek to include land to meet the unmet needs of Bristol given the significant shortfall in provision that exists there. Lands Improvement is aware of and supports representations made previously to the Inspector on this issue. We are also aware that the 4th March report to Full Council declared that no such unmet need exists and that, in any event, Bristol is scheduled to review its Core Strategy in 2016. This conveniently ignores the fact that there is substantial unmet need in Bristol which cannot be met within its administrative area. The BANES Core Strategy must therefore be the appropriate vehicle to address this matter which, if not dealt with, will place pressure on housing elsewhere in the BANES administrative area and at the same time increase the level of commuting to Bristol.

Change to the policy requested:

Conclusions and Changes Sought

From the above, we do not consider that the Core Strategy is meeting the objectively assessed needs of the area. It is not therefore positively prepared and is not justified by a robust and transparent evidence base. As currently drafted, the Core Strategy cannot be considered to be sound.

Lands Improvement therefore requests that the housing requirement is increased. We are aware that, at the earlier Examination sessions, other parties adopted the Chelmer Model to identify a requirement of 15,500 dwellings. (It should be noted that this broadly complies with the higher growth profile identified in the SHMA). As discussed above, the existing shortfall of 1,167 dwellings should be added as well as the shortfall at Bristol (circa 3,500 dwellings). This gives a total requirement of 20,167 dwellings for the plan period. In our view, this figure should be rounded up to 21,000 dwellings to ensure that flexibility exists should any of the preferred allocation fail to deliver as anticipated by the Core Strategy.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Lands Improvement has also been party to other modelling work done on the housing requirements for the West of England which has been completed on behalf of developers with interests in BANES. This uses the PopGroup demographic forecasting model to provide an assessment of demographic and economic-led housing requirements. The demographic-led scenario is based on the latest ONS interim 2011-based sub national population projections (28 September 2012) between 2011 and 2021, and the 2010-based ONS net-migration projections (March 2012) between 2021 and 2031. This work also establishes household growth based on both the delivery of the West of England LEP anticipated job growth (95,000 new jobs up to 2030) and also the most recent Experian workforce jobs forecast (February 2013).

With respect to BANES, this work concludes that between 18,805 and 20,600 new dwellings will be required in the period to 2031. This, again, demonstrates that the Core Strategy is failing to meet the objectively assessed need of the area.

Respondent Number: 4650 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Geoff Davis & Ms Tania Rodrigues **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

It is difficult to understand the Housing Figures provided in the 'SHLAA', planning policy officers provided a briefing for B&NES Councillors in advance of the Special Council Meeting. In this document the need was summarised as follows:-
 Existing: 10,850 dwellings with 2,700 affordable homes.
 The Housing Requirement: 7,470 dwellings by 2029, add the backlog of 1,160 to give 8,630 dwellings with 3,110 Affordable homes.

Therefore the new provision of 12,700 dwellings is 4,070 in excess of the requirement. The sole reason for this over-provision is to 'persuade' would be developers to build sufficient Affordable Homes. It is difficult to see why the offer to build 4000+ homes for which there is no need would form any sort of enticement to a developer to build a few hundred extra affordable homes.
 This is not only UNSOUND, quite frankly it seems absolutely Bonkers to us.

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy appears to working from a figure of 25% affordable homes across all developments to meet need. A revision of this figure to 30% easily provides the 3110 affordable homes within the 10,850 figure. Thus the 10,850 needs no increase and could be reduced.
 The 30% affordable homes figure is also quite realistic, given that the Core Strategy readily proposes a figure of 40% when discussing Land adjoining Odd Down and Land adjoining Weston. If 40% is appropriate in these locations there is no reason why it should not be so elsewhere. Another inconsistency to contribute to the UNSOUNDness of these amendments.

Respondent Number: 4691 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** GD Baird Will Trust, Mackay, Mason and

Agent ID: 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Prior to suspending the examination of the BANES Core Strategy examination in 2012, the Inspector in Note ID/28 confirmed that the Council had not undertaken an NPPF compliant Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and he stated:

“Paragraph 159 (of the NPPF) sets out the evidential basis for authorities having a clear understanding of housing needs in their area based on a SHMA, prepared collaboratively where the HMA crosses administrative boundaries.”

Furthermore Paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that local planning authorities preparing plans should account for the presumption in favour of sustainable development by positively seeking opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans ‘should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...’.

We contend that the proposed modifications to the submitted Core Strategy relating to housing requirements as informed by the ORS draft SHMA (March 2013) still fail to comply with the provisions of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The revised BANES Core Strategy endorses a housing target of 12,700 homes, a far lower target than was considered sound as part of the three iterations of the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy (15,500, 18,800, 21,300 dwellings). The revised target was informed by a baseline housing requirement of 8,300 dwellings over the period to 2031 (7,470 dwellings to 2029) set out in the draft SHMA dated March 2013). Our concerns regarding the robustness of the above SHMA figures include:

- The figures equate to the low trend migration projection; a projection that is unlikely to meet the West of England LEP (of which BANES is a member) aspiration for growth as acknowledged in Paragraph 6.21 of the draft SHMA:

“... this is unlikely to be realistic if the LEP aspiration for economic growth is well founded and there is no behavioural change in respect of state retirement age.”

This approach is therefore unsound as it relies upon a population/household projection that is based on a period that includes an extended recession and where there was an under-supply of housing in the district that would have distorted migration trends. Similarly, as well as projecting historic trends, the NPPF (Paragraph 50) requires LPAs to plan for ‘current and future demographic’ trends.

- One of the key concerns raised by the Inspector in Note ID/28 was the absence of a SHMA which assessed housing need on a Housing Market Area level and ensuring that the unmet needs of adjoining local planning authorities were met if necessary. The draft SHMA disregards the potential housing needs of Bristol where the adopted Core Strategy is due to be reviewed shortly and the Inspector previously voiced concerns that the housing target (26,400)within the Bristol Core Strategy:

“... is very unlikely to meet, and could fall very substantially below, the potential housing demands in Bristol over the plan period... as this is the first Core Strategy of the West of England authorities to be examined, it would be short-sighted to rule out the possibility of a cross-boundary approach to development in the Green Belt in the future.” (Paragraphs 48 & 52, Inspector’s Report on the Bristol Core Strategy, March 2011)

The draft SHMA published in February 2013 confirmed at paragraph 6.4 that “...none of the scenario incorporate a strategic housing allocation to cater for the unmet needs from adjoining areas such as Bristol.”

While this extract was removed from later iterations of the SHMA, it demonstrates that ORS/BANES Council acknowledged there are unmet needs from adjoining LPAs however the SHMA does not account for this in its scenarios, thereby departing from the Inspector’s advice in ID/28.

Furthermore, while the Core Strategy increases the housing target from 7,470 dwellings to 12,700 dwellings to facilitate a greater level of affordable housing delivery; this is a tokenistic approach considering the level of affordable housing need in BANES in February 2013 stood at 12,800 households as set out in the Council’s Homesearch List. Indeed the West of England SHMA identifies the need for 847 affordable homes per year in BANES; in excess of the total annualised delivery rate of approximately 705 dwellings (comprising both market and affordable units) per year proposed in the revised Core Strategy.

The soundness of the Core Strategy Housing Target is also undermined by the fact that projections in the draft SHMA exclude the student population in BANES as set out in paragraph 3.14 of Annex 1 of the 4th March Committee Meeting Report Pack. This is based on an assumption that none of the students will seek to remain in BANES once they have completed their study: a scenario that does not appear to be based on empirical evidence. This approach does not constitute ‘proactively driving and supporting sustainable economic development’ advocated by the NPPF (Paragraph 17) as the NPPF would clearly expect BANES to do all it can to retain a highly educated workforce in order to attract further

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

economic investment in the District.

It is therefore concluded that the housing target being pursued by the Council is unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Council needs to review its draft SHMA to assess the district's full housing needs for all types of housing, including need that may arise from neighbouring planning authorities in accordance with Paragraph 159 of the NPPF. The current assessment fails to account for these considerations.

Once the objectively assessed housing needs of the district have been established, the Core Strategy should seek to embrace the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 14, NPPF) by positively seeking to meet the development needs of the area; not apportioning growth based on capacity analysis as is currently the case.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.37 Proposed change SPC13 states that the Council has assessed the likely requirement for new housing, both market and affordable, over the plan period through the BANES SHMA. It states that the BANES SHMA has taken account of various factors, including economic growth, but notably deletes reference to net migration, likely future growth rates and productivity.

1.38 The assessment of the housing requirement in the BANES SHMA is seriously flawed and is not compliant with the requirements of the NPPF. It is based on novel and unrealistic assumptions about changing rates of female economic activity and the role of the private rented sector in meeting affordable needs. (See Appendix 1).

1.39 The housing requirement does not take full account of the need for housing generated by economic growth, the need to provide for non- economically active migrants or existing affordable housing need. No assumptions about future economic growth rates or productivity appear to have been fed into the SHMA.

1.40 Please see the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS BANES SHMA' update submitted on behalf of Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd for full details of the grounds behind this objection.

1.41 In order to proceed BANES should prepare a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA by working with its neighbouring West of England authorities. Such a SHMA is already planned, as demonstrated by the Pre-Production brief published jointly by the four authorities on the West of England LEP website. BANES should await the results of this work before moving forward with the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, existing demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC14

1.42 Proposed change SPC14 introduces the revised housing target of 12,700 and jobs target of 10,170 between 2011 and 2029.

1.43 The overall housing target is based upon the ORS BANES SHMA Update 2013 low migration trend, which is seriously flawed and will not support the delivery of the proposed jobs target. Please see the separate 'Pegasus Critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update' submitted to the consultation on behalf of Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd for full details of the grounds behind this objection.

1.44 In order to be found sound BANES housing target must be based upon a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA, prepared jointly with its neighbouring authorities. The SHMA must realistically forecast levels of migration and housing demand, and reflect government objectives for growth.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC23

1.64 SPC23 makes reference again to the proposed homes target of 12,700 and jobs target of 10,170.

1.65 The overall housing target is based upon the ORS BANES SHMA Update 2013, low migration trend which is seriously flawed and will not support the delivery of the proposed jobs target. Please see the separate 'Pegasus critique of the ORS B&NES SHMA update' at Appendix 1 for full details of the grounds behind this objection.

1.66 In order to be found sound BANES housing target must be based upon a genuinely NPPF compliant SHMA, prepared jointly with its neighbouring authorities. The SHMA must realistically forecast levels of migration and housing demand, and reflect government objectives for growth.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES must prepare an NPPF compliant SHMA which realistically forecasts market and affordable needs, taking account of migration, demand and government objectives for economic growth across the whole HMA.

Respondent Number: 4712 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Support in principle of Change reference SPC23 (Page No. 20 of the Draft Core Strategy) 'Making provision for a net increase of 10,170 jobs, and 12,700 homes between 2011 and 2029, of which around 3,110 affordable homes will be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

delivered through the planning system' – Amends RC6.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4719 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Kingswood School**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC23

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 2:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Context

We write on behalf of our client, Kingswood School (KS), to make representations to the Bath and North East Somerset Council (B&NES) Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy (March 2013). As a major landowner, employer and education provider within the city, KS has a significant interest in the future growth of Bath and in B&NES Council's emerging planning policy framework which will enable this planned growth to take place and facilitate future development/investment.

KS encompasses both the Senior and the Preparatory Schools and is the freehold owner of a suite of sites which sit within their portfolio linked to their main Campus at Lansdown, Bath. This portfolio as illustrated on the attached drawing (reference 1711/SU/001) consists of two main locations comprising: the School campus, listed buildings, residential boarding houses, indoor and outdoor sports provision and agricultural land. The portfolio extends to approximately 49 ha (122 acres). The second attached drawing (reference 1711/SU/002) provides 6 locations within the portfolio with potential for development as detailed further below.

Estate Strategy

The School is currently engaging consultants in the preparation of an Estate Strategy to consider how it will expand and grow to meet future needs. This Estate Strategy has two overarching objectives for the School:

- i) To develop and improve its facilities to meet it's future needs and enhance it's position as the leading co-educational day and boarding school provider of all round education in the Bath area and its growing international reputation. These include improvements to its teaching, boarding and sports facilities.
- ii) To make optimum use of its estate including justifying development of some of its land interests for residential development to better enable the growth objectives of the B&NES Core Strategy and allow the School to re-invest in improving its facilities.

In this context KS wishes to make the following representations to the B&NES Core Strategy Proposed Changes.

Summary of Concerns with Core Strategy as Drafted

KS is concerned that the Core Strategy in its current form is too prescriptive and will not allow for the outputs of the Estate Strategy to be accommodated within the policy framework. The Core Strategy Proposed Changes therefore need to allow the School to make optimum use of it's estate including justifying development of some of its land interests (if deemed surplus as the conclusion of the Estate Strategy) for residential development to assist with delivering the overall objectives of the Core Strategy document and allowing the School to re-invest any capital receipts secured back into the Estate in the form of improved facilities. In this context, our detailed comments are set out within the remainder of this letter in the order that they arise within the Core Strategy document, however in summary we seek changes which will allow for:

- All KS Land Interests to be released from the Green Belt. Given that there is a significant need for school places (both independent and public sector) within the Council's administrative area, the Core Strategy must allow for existing education facilities at KS to have the ability to be expand and grow in response to School's future needs. The designation

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

of part of the KS estate in the Green Belt significantly compromises the ability of the School to meet this objective.

- Realise any land not required by KS to deliver education provision to be considered for alternative land uses, specifically residential through the Place Making Plan. The current planning policy position, as drafted, is inconsistent with the Council's stance to date, for example, the playing fields adjacent to MoD Ensleigh were briefly considered and dismissed for development in the 2013 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, the supporting assessment work (ARUP – Ensleigh Development Concept Options Report April 2013) commissioned to accompany the Changes to the Core Strategy Publication endorses development (residential/education) in this location. The School challenges this inconsistency and is keen to ensure that they are actively involved in the consideration of any revisions to the Ensleigh Concept Statement and School owned assets to be assessed as part of the emerging Place Making Plan (to support the Core Strategy Document). Furthermore, they reserve their position to promote development consistent with their emerging Estate Strategy.

- KS to develop and improve its facilities to meet its future needs and enhance its position as the leading co-educational day and boarding school providing of all round education in the Bath area and its growing international reputation. This programme includes improvements to its teaching, boarding and sports facilities. In order to do this KS is seeking the removal of their land interest from the Green Belt or the allocation of their land as a 'major development site in the Green Belt'.

Change to the policy requested:

Conclusions

In summary, KS is very keen to protect its ability to invest, develop and deliver the highest standard of facilities in line with its overarching objective to become the leading co-educational day and boarding school provider of all round education in the Bath area and its growing international reputation. These include improvements to its teaching, boarding and sports facilities and realise of value of any sites not required to meet this objective through an alternative land use. To achieve this, the Council needs to recognise the key role of the School and ensure sufficient flexibility through its planning policy framework to achieve the School's emerging Estate Strategy objectives. Without this flexibility the School may be commercially disadvantaged in its ability to continue to deliver nationally recognised co-ed independent education and experience barriers to continuing their programme of investment.

On this basis, KS is seeking for the Council to exclude the School's land interest from the Green Belt or as a minimum to re-designate the estate as a 'major development site within the Green Belt'.

I along with members of KS would welcome the opportunity to discuss the content of this letter and the emerging outputs from the Estate Strategy with you directly in due course, I am available on jo.davis@gva.co.uk / 0117 988 5224. We look forward to hearing from you.

Change Ref. SPC24

Plan Ref.: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 104 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Professor Donald Thomas **Respondent Organisation:** Greenway! Stakeholder Residents Forum

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

"Core Strategy Consultation: pollution impact from urban extensions
Greenway! Stakeholder Residents Forum
Traffic Committee: D. Thomas & R. Sackett

"The petrolled air of traffic-jams that lies visibly in the streets at the end of a hot afternoon, or tints the valley mist on autumn mornings, is probably no more offensive to the nose, though perhaps worse for the expectation of life, than the

horse-dung of the Hanoverian City."

Donald Thomas, Henry Fielding: A Life, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1990

1.The Calor Survey

The extent of air pollution in Bath, from chronicle-exhaust fumes, specifically from nitrogen dioxide, was first revealed by a Calor Gas survey whose results were published in November 2003. This found that the city of Bath "beat congested parts of London, Glasgow and Bristol for levels of oxides of nitrogen." Only Oxford had a higher pollution rating than Bath in the study of 30 urban "hot-spots" across the UK. The press headlined the fact that "pedestrians in Bath are inhaling exhaust pollutants equivalent to smoking more than two packets of cigarettes a day." The council was obliged to declare the London Road, from Bathwick Street to Batheaston by-pass, an Air Quality Management Zone.

The permitted exhaust limit under European legal remains 40 parts of nitrogen dioxide per cubic meter of air. By the end of 2013, B&NES had been required to declare 51 Air Quality Monitoring Zones. In 36 of these air pollution from exhaust fumes remains stubbornly above the legal limit according to the council's latest figures. Some of these were particularly worrying and well within the zone of hazard to health. They included Broad Street which had reached 72 parts of NO2 per cubic meter at the end of 2012 - double the permitted level. At times, some levels had been far higher. Indeed, Dorchester Street, running through the new Southgate development, had reached 96 parts of nitrogen dioxide — almost two-and-a-half times the safety limit — in August 2012.

Such figures may be adjusted for "constant user." The severity of pollution may be understated by taking samples well above breathing height to protect the apparatus from vandalism. Plainly, however, such readings are a cause for decisive action.

2.Paving the Price

The number of those who pay the price in terms of ill-health varies from one source to another. Three years ago, Boris Johnson published research which showed that in London. currently Europe's most polluted capital city, 4,300 deaths a year were attributable to such air pollution by nitrogen dioxide fumes. Government figures put annual death-rate throughout the country at 29,000 at the same time. The House of Commons Audit in 2010 put the mortality figure at 51,500. Figures for sickness, according to recent research in London and Los Angeles, cover childhood asthma and congenital defects. As Dr Jonathan Grigg of Barts and the London School of Medicine pins it, children's lung function is liable to be reduced by such pollution to a level "internationally regarded as hazardous."

3.The Strasbourg Judgment May 2013

In 2012 the UK government was taken to the High Court by an environmental group. ClientEarth, for its failure to implement measures to bring pollution within the legal limit by the required date of 2010. Only in three out of 43 areas did they appear to have done so. Indeed, the UK government proposed to spin out the process to 2025. On 1 May, the European Supreme Court ruled that UK government ministers were breaking the law and were "open to immediate enforcement action."

4.Urban Extensions

Against such a background, for many of those who live in Bath, the issue is not the building of urban extensions in itself. Indeed, where the new site is something like a former MOD complex, why would it be? The true objection is to ill-conceived extensions. One of the major difficulties must necessarily be the transportation of an increased population, with all its attendant services, in and out of the city. That in turn exacerbates problems of pollution which council after council, whatever its political complexion, has shown itself incapable of resolving. Urban Extensions necessarily require that a plan for resolving the chronic environmental blight of transport difficulties must be put in place first.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 170	Comment Number: 11	Respondent Name: Mr. Phil Hardwick	Respondent Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited
Agent ID: 19		Agent Name: Pegasus Planning Group	
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC24		Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4	
Development Location: Comment on general development locations			

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Proposed Change to clause 4 of Policy DW1 is considered to be unsound for the reasons that it is not consistent with national policy; it is not positively prepared, justified or effective. There has been no joint working to produce a collaborative SHMA as stated in the NPPF para 159, and the Green Belt Review has sought to minimise the impact on the Green Belt in terms of removing land in order to meet the housing requirement. Clause 4 only identifies the locations, rather than the sites, it is considered that as the sites are critical to the delivery of the housing provision in the plan period they should be allocated in the Core Strategy (NPPF para 47).

Change to the policy requested:

Policy DW1 Clause 4 should be revised to identify the sites in the Green Belt rather than the locations and cross reference should then be made to the specific policies which allocate the sites.

Respondent Number: 246**Comment Number:** 9**Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE**Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see Combe Hay Parish Council's detailed comments relating to SPC 88.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete "Land adjoining Odd Down"

Respondent Number: 248**Comment Number:** 3**Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt**Respondent Organisation:** Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd**Agent ID:** 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

25) The consideration of the Green Belt around Keynsham highlights the inadequacies of the assessment work. In respect of the gap between Keynsham and Bristol the review concludes that the GB is of fundamental importance in preventing the unrestricted sprawl of Bristol and reflects on the original intention to prevent the merger of Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath. RPS does not accept that the carefully planned mixed use urban extension at Hicks Gate should be regarded as 'sprawl', a term as outdated as the Green Belt itself. The Review fails to properly assess the Hicks Gate area based on the extent of development proposed, rather a much wider area that is inevitably going to have greater impact on GB purposes.

26) The review goes onto justify development east of Keynsham as acceptable on the basis that Saltford is a village so in effect 'doesn't count'. The justification that the Green Belt gap between Keynsham and Bath is still greater than between Keynsham and Bristol is nonsensical. Apparently Saltford is provided no protection on the basis that it is a village, despite the fact that its protection from coalescence was one of the founding principles of the Bristol/Bath Green Belt. If this crude assessment that 'only towns count' were taken as literally as the Council suggests, then the coalescence of the 'cities' of Bristol and Bath is equally irrelevant, and the only settlement that 'counts' in the consideration of the Green Belt is the 'town' of Keynsham.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 278 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cotswolds Conservation Board

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Cotswolds Conservation Board ('the Board') was established by Parliament in 2004.

The Board has two statutory purposes :

- a) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and
- b) To increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.

In fulfilling these roles, the Board has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of people living in the AONB.

2. The Board considers the proposed change to Policy DW1, clause 4

"4: retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt within B&NES, with no strategic change to the boundaries other than removing land to meet the District's development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram:

- Land adjoining Odd Down
- Land adjoining Weston
- Extension to MoD, Ensleigh
- Land adjoining East Keynsham
- Land adjoining South West Keynsham
- Land at Whitchurch"

to be unsound.

3. The sites at Weston and Odd Down are within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. AONBs are statutorily designated under Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) in order to conserve and enhance their natural beauty.

4. Section 85 (1) of the CROW Act states:

"In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty."

5. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states

"Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.9"

6. Footnote 9 states:

"9 For example, those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion."

7. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states:

"115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

8. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states:

“116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

9. The Board is of the view that in proposing the use of Green Belt land at Weston and Odd Down for development the Council has given insufficient weight to

- a) The location of these sites within the Cotswolds AONB
- b) The statutory purpose of the designation of the AONB
- c) Consideration of the restriction of development highlighted by footnote 9 of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.
- d) The “highest status of protection” given to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB compared to sites outside the AONB rejected by the Council; and
- e) The lack of any clear indication as to how the detrimental effect on the environment of the proposed release could be moderated.

10. With respect to point (e) it noted that the Council proposes under paragraph 2.15 of the plan to prepare a “Placemaking Plan” to indicate how development of these sites could occur. The Board submits that in the absence of such a Plan it cannot be demonstrated that the detrimental effect on the environment can be moderated.

11. With respect to paragraph 10, the Board would wish to draw the Inspector’s attention to paragraph 21 of the Secretary of States letter dated 13th February 2013 with respect to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 78) Appeal by Fay & Son Ltd Highfield Farm, Tetbury, Gloucestershire GL8 8SD (Appeal Reference APP/F1610/A/11/2165778) which states:

“The Secretary of State agrees that the primary concern about the impact on the AONB is the loss of fields to housing development (IR14.53). Despite the visual improvements that would result from the landscaping proposals, and to some extent moderate the impact of the new buildings, he agrees that the loss of open fields must inevitably have a detrimental effect on the landscape and environment.”

12. The Board is therefore of the view that the proposed use of AONB sites does not meet the tests as required by the CROW Act and the NPPF, which are

- a) does the change conserve and enhance the AONB? And
- b) does the change give the highest status of protection to the landscape and scenic “beauty of the AONB?.

13. The Board therefore suggests that the amendment to Policy DW1, clause 4 is amended to remove reference to the sites at Weston and Odd Down in order to make the Plan sound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Board therefore suggests that the amendment to Policy DW1, clause 4 is amended to remove reference to the sites at Weston and Odd Down in order to make the Plan sound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 279 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Rohan Torkildsen **Respondent Organisation:** English Heritage

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Thank you providing English Heritage the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions.

My consideration and response to the consultation is based on the expectation that the Core Strategy enables the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF')¹, with one of the core dimensions of sustainable development being the protection and enhancement of the historic environment².

English Heritage welcomes the numerous revisions made in response to our previous representations, changes which help to demonstrate the Plans positive commitment to the conservation of the District's heritage assets.

However, two key issues arise of a more contentious nature. English Heritage considers that the Inspector must be assured that the three developments, in particular, at the edge of Bath at Odd Down, the lower slopes of Weston and Ensleigh are clearly justified in principle. And secondly, that it is apparent that a thorough and convincing assessment process has been employed to determine their suitability.

Proposed modifications to the Core Strategy increase the amount of development directed to Bath and include three modest developments to the edge of the city within and beyond the Bath World Heritage Site (WHS) and in the Green Belt. Due to its historic significance, growth beyond the urban area of Bath is constrained by national planning policy designations, protected by legislation and national policy. Due weight must be given to this policy context. As a consequence a series of questions arise.

- Does Bath have the capacity to accommodate this amount of development without causing significant harm to the principles and policies of the NPPF?

1 NPPF paragraphs 151 and 182

2 NPPF paragraph 7

- If there is such harm, has the local authority demonstrated that it has looked elsewhere in the District or that it has worked with adjoining authorities to accommodate development needs in locations?

- Is the local authority able to demonstrate to the Inspector that there are "very special circumstances³" to allow development in the Green Belt particularly at Odd Down and Weston?

The local authority needs to set out very clearly a response to this national policy context and clarify the reasons why it considers these developments are appropriate in principle.

Policy guidance in Circular 07/2009 highlights the expectation in national policy that the WHS receives the highest level of protection with a main objective of policy frameworks Core Strategy's) being the conservation and preservation of Outstanding Universal Value.

- Will the promotion of this change conserve and enhance the OUV, authenticity and integrity and significance of the WHS and its setting?

- Can the local authority detail the impact that each proposal will have on the OUV and indicate how it believes the effects are acceptable in the context of the protection of the OUV, authenticity and integrity of the WHS?

- Can the local authority demonstrate that these encroachments do not cause significant harm to the principles and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

policies of the NPPF? At present the evidence base, including the Arup statements appear slightly ambiguous4.

The WHS Setting SPD will be an important tool to measure the relative impact. Likewise the WHS Management Plan should also be applied.

You will appreciate that significant impacts that fail to preserve OUV may need to be referred to the UNESCO World Heritage Committee via the Department of Culture Media and Sport.

Change to the policy requested:

I hope that my advice in this letter will help you to achieve the objectives of the NPPF for the historic environment and thereby pass the test for a sound local plan.

If there any issues you wish to clarify please don't hesitate in contacting me. Yours faithfully,

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;" The allocations at Odd Down and Weston will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4520 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Green Belt was set up to produce a barrier between urban development and adjacent open country. To prevent coalescence between towns and adjacent rural settlements. 300 houses built on the Odd Down/South Stoke plateau will inevitably cause coalescence between the village of South Stoke and the City of Bath. I am not convinced there is an overwhelming case for a change in the long established Green Belt protection and am strongly opposed and doubt the soundness of this proposition.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4547 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martin Davis**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

THE 20% INCREASE IN THE NUMBVER OF HOUSES PLANNED AND THE REQUIRED RATE OF DLIVERY HAS FORCED THE COUNCIL TO OPT FOR DEVOPMENT ON AONB/ GREEN FIELD SITES WHICH OTHERWISE WOULD HAVE BEEN LEFT INVIOULATE. THE NUMBERS ARE QUESTIONABLE

THE PROPOSED CHANGE AND PLAN IS THEREFORE UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4600 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Margaret Williams**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 28 **Agent Name:** Nash Partnership**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1. Overview

1.1. SPC24 states that ‘retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt within B&NES, with no strategic change to the boundaries other than removing land to meet the District’s development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram:

- D Land adjoining Odd Down
- D Land adjoining Weston
- D Extension to MoD, Ensleigh
- D Land adjoining East Keynsham
- D Land adjoining South West Keynsham
- D Land at Whitchurch

1.2. It is our belief that the decision to change the green belt boundary to the South West and East of the town ahead of land to the West of Keynsham at Lays Farm is unsound because it is not effective in meeting the wider aims of the Core Strategy or consistent with national policy.

1.3. It does not offer the best approach to maintaining the separate identity of the town and is therefore in conflict with this ambition of the Core Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol. In this regard it should also be regarded as not legal.

1.4. Evidence demonstrates it is a less sustainable location for development than Lay’s farm to the West of Keynsham, which should be named in SPC24 instead as a location for green belt land release.

1.5. The two areas covered in SPC24 which would have sites released from the Green Belt – the boundaries to the South West and East of the town - are discussed in turn below and in comparison to the alternative for releasing land to the West of Keynsham, specifically at Lays farm.

2. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the South West of Keynsham

2.1. All Green Belt sites considered for release in light of the revisions to the Core Strategy have been analysed as part of Arup's Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013). Within the conclusions and recommendations of this report, land to the South West of Keynsham is listed as a 'worst performing' development option. The report states that 'Land adjoining South West Keynsham has similar transport characteristics to the west of Keynsham. The development area is further from Keynsham town centre making it less accessible on foot and the east-west alignment of the area could make it difficult to integrate buses into the development so travel patterns are likely to be car dependent'.

2.2. Further to this assessment, the Arup Development Concept Options Report for this area – considered as part of the land south of K2 parcel – notes that 'The area is remote from the town and has limited vehicle and pedestrian connections to the neighbouring residential area....a regular bus service runs through the residential area to the north (Cedar Drive/Newland Road) though this is some distance from the site. No regular services run directly through or past the study area. Extension of these routes to serve the area may prove difficult due to limited access opportunities. The study area lies around 2km from Keynsham railway station'. It goes on to state that 'The study area lies around 1.7km from the town centre and has few tangible connections in this direction due to the layout of the existing residential area. Though adjacent to a primary school, the study area is over 500m from the neighbourhood centre on Queens Road. This poses issues regarding the social and environmental sustainability of future development and could lead to the creation of an isolated and cardominated environment.[...] The peripheral location means that additional bus services are less likely to come forward.

2.3. This is evidence that releasing green belt land at the South West of Keynsham ahead of land at the West of Keynsham (incorporating Lay's Farm) is a less sustainable option and should be considered contrary to paragraph 34 of the NPPF which states 'Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised'. In this regard the changes to the Core Strategy are unsound.

2.4. Further to these poor sustainable transport credentials, the Development Concept Options Report goes on to state that 'The study area is very constrained in terms of vehicle access opportunities. Access relies on the suitability of Charlton Road as there is insufficient capacity on Redlynch Lane (south/east) and no suitable access points from the north (the K2B scheme does not allow for a vehicle connection). If Parkhouse Lane is to be used as an access there will be a need to improve its capacity though through access to Keynsham centre would be unsuitable. The limitations on access and connectivity indicate that it may not be feasible or desirable to develop the entire area.' Given that the viability of access to the site has not been established, it is not sound plan-making practice to release the site from the Green Belt for housing development ahead of Lay's Farm, which is located in a more sustainable location for transport and has access arrangements already established through the trading estate.

2.5. Releasing land from the Green belt to the South West of Keynsham, as identified in the Green Belt Stage 1 report threatens encroachment into the gap between Queen Charlton and Keynsham which is essential in maintaining separate identities for each of these settlements. The green belt review stage 1 report notes that 'The Green Belt in this land parcel 'protects the individual character and strong urban edge of Keynsham and prevents the merger of Queen Charlton with Keynsham. It is noted that the western part of the land cell bounds provides the setting for the Queen Charlton Conservation Area'.

2.6. In a similar regard to heritage, the green belt review states that Green belt allocation here also 'protects the setting of Parkhouse Farmhouse, which is a Grade II listed building.' In this regard green belt which does not serve the function of protecting the setting of listed buildings should be developed ahead of Green Belt which does serve this function.

2.7. The green belt review identifies this parcel as serving a strong agricultural purpose which would be lost as a result of being released from the green belt for housing. Releasing land at the South West of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality'.

2.8. The green belt review notes that 'The stream that passes to the east of Queen Charlton is designated as a Site of

Nature Conservation Interest. It is reasonable to assume that Abbots Wood would have relatively high biodiversity value, although it is not currently designated'. The allocation of green belt land for housing development within the South West of Keynsham study area ahead of other areas with lower biodiversity constraints is not in pursuit of sustainable development, as is a requirement of paragraph 9 of the NPPF. This states that 'Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to): [...] moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature'. In this regard the changes to the core strategy should be considered unsound.

2.9. Further to the Green Belt review, B&NES commissioned Arup to produce a 'Development Concept Options Report' in light of the inspectors' requirement to make more housing land allocations which adds further evidence that land to the South West of Keynsham (assessed as part of the 'South of K2' parcel) is a more unsustainable location for release of green belt land than at Lay's Farm.

2.10. Firstly the report notes that 'the study area lies on the mid-slope of a gently sloping plateau falling towards Keynsham from the southwest. Within the boundary there is a change in level of around 30m from south-west to north-east, making the southern and western parts more exposed and visible.' This exposure and visibility renders the site unsuitable for release from the Green Belt due to notable potential impact of any development here on views and the local open countryside character. The report states that 'Development could have a significant impact on landscape character and views from surrounding areas from the east and south east, particularly across the Chew Valley'. These landscape character impacts are not present in potential development of Lay's Farm which should therefore be considered as a preferable location for release of green belt land for housing development.

3. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the East of Keynsham

3.1. Paragraph 6.6 of BNES/40 ('B&NES response to Inspector's note on proposed changes to the Submitted Core Strategy') states that 'At Keynsham the Council considers that at the location on the eastern side of the town there is no capacity for longer term development and therefore, the Placemaking Plan will not consider the identification of safeguarded land. This is because land in this location is of significant importance to the Green Belt. As set out in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review undertaken by Arup (available as part of the supporting evidence throughout the consultation period) land in this area is of high importance in Green belt terms as it lies directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt) and it prevents the merger of Bristol, Bath and Keynsham'. The parts of the green belt proposed for release for housing development serves the same function as this land and therefore, by extension of the council's own logic, should not be released for development and an alternative approach sought.

3.2. The potential locations for green belt release for housing development to the East of Keynsham fall within two areas analysed as part of the Green Belt stage 1 report – Land South East of Keynsham and Land North East of Keynsham. Both of these sites are described in the green belt review as being 'of high importance on the basis that [they] lie directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt). It prevents the merger of Bath and Keynsham, while acknowledging that the area of land remaining open between Bath and Keynsham (and Bath and Saltford) is wider than that remaining open between Bristol and Keynsham'. Maintaining a separation and separate identities between Bath and Keynsham is a key aim of the Core Strategy and therefore releasing green belt in this area is contrary to these aims and should be considered unsound. To the same end it notes that 'It is considered that the Green Belt does play a role in constraining the potential urban sprawl of Bristol (Oldland and Willsbridge) in a southerly direction towards Keynsham'. Therefore losing this Green Belt to housing would threaten the separate identities of Bristol and Keynsham secured by this designation. In this regard the removal of green belt designation here would have more significant adverse impact than removal at Lays Farm, where sprawl is more naturally restricted by the adjacent topography and proximity to other settlements.

3.3. The area to the East of Keynsham is identified in Arup's Development Concept Options Report as Agricultural Land Class 2 'very good agricultural land' and is therefore ill suited to release from the green belt ahead of other sites available which are likely to be of lesser agricultural quality. Releasing land at the East of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality'.

3.4. The site is also constrained by incorporating, or being near to a number of landscape and biodiversity designations which are not present at Lays Farm. The presence of Broad Mead Farm SNCI and the site's proximity to Stidham Farm SSSI/ Conservation Areas (Keynsham and Saltford) and the Cotswold AONB should all be considered as reasons for developing Lays Farm ahead of East of Keynsham. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF lists 12 key principles that plan making should adhere to, one of which is to 'contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework'. The release of land from the green belt at the East of Keynsham ahead of sites with lesser environmental value and designations such as Lays Farm should be considered contrary to the NPPF and therefore unsound plan-making practice.

3.5. The impact on the existing road network resultant from releasing land to the East of Keynsham is especially significant and certainly more so than allocating land at Lays Farm. The Development Concept options Report states that 'Any development in this area would have a significant impact on the A4 which already has issues with its capacity. This would necessitate road and junction improvements, particularly at the roundabout. Manor Road to the south is particularly narrow leading towards Saltford and it would not be desirable to introduce high volumes of traffic onto this road. Access from the west is possible via the existing residential development though capacity is limited'.

3.6. Within Arup's Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013), land to the East of Keynsham is classified as an averagely performing site for the location of development. In this sense it should not be considered suitable for development ahead of better performing sites.

4. Proposed Location – Lay's Farm, West of Keynsham

4.1. The main advantages of releasing land from the Green Belt to the West of Keynsham and specifically at Lays Farm have been discussed in contrast to the council's preferred sites for release above.

4.2. In addition to these comparative advantages, Arup's Development Concept Options Report dismisses development on a large part of Lay's Farm, which it suggests is the location of a large underground gas pipe 'protected by an HSE-regulated buffer zone which permits residential development within only the outer zone (beyond 70m either side of pipeline)'. This constraint is discussed as the primary issue with the site. However this assertion is incorrect. The pipeline is in a different location and according to its operators only has a 5m buffer zone. The pipeline is also of an aged nature and the operator would be willing to accept its re-location and replacement with a modern efficient structure. The pipeline does therefore not represent an issue of constraint against development.

4.3. The evidence base upon which the Core Strategy base is therefore unsound and as such the Core Strategy should also be considered unsound by default.

4.4. The Development Concept Options Report identifies a number of significant strengths in the Lays Farm site which are not identified at Land to the South West and East of Keynsham. It notes that the area 'has an existing vehicle access to Lays Farm which could be utilised and expanded for development. The southern part is directly adjacent to Charlton Road which gives opportunity for a new connection'. Similarly the study area is within walking distance of existing facilities in the Keynsham area including retail, primary schools and bus routes. Development has the opportunity to connect to these facilities via existing pedestrian routes.

4.5. There has been no visual impact assessment carried out on the impact development on the site would have on views towards Keynsham. Although the Development Concept Options Report states 'The area itself is visible from across the valley meaning development could have a strong visual impact' there is no evidence of this. The only areas of public road the site would be visible from outside of immediately adjacent neighbourhoods is Stockwood Vale and Stockwood Road. Due to the topography of the valley between these roads and the presence of a tree screen at the brow of the valley slope, it is likely that the impact of development at land to the West of Keynsham on views across Charlton Valley would be negligible or nil. The evidence presented as part of the base supporting the council's proposed changes to the Core Strategy should be considered unreliable, rendering the Core Strategy unsound.

5. Conclusions

5.1. In summary, in comparison to the Land to the South West and East of Keynsham, releasing Lays Farm from the Green Belt for development would:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- Have less of a threat on development encroachment towards, and impact on, the individual identities of Keynsham, Bristol, bath and Queen Charlton
- Have lesser impact on heritage assets
- Have a lesser visual impact on the natural landscape
- Have a lesser impact on biodiversity
- Use poorer quality agricultural land for development
- Be easier to accommodate sustainable transport and bus services; especially over land South West of Keynsham which is particularly isolated and suffering severe access issues.

5.2. As a result of these outcomes the Core Strategy could be considered compliant with national policy, consistent with the wider aims of the Corer Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol, effective at delivering these and therefore be considered sound and legal. In its current form the Core Strategy should not be considered to be either of these.

5.3. Furthermore, as demonstrated above, the evidence base reports produced for the council as a means to making decisions on the release of green belt following the Inspector’s Report on the Core Strategy is factually incorrect and cannot therefore be considered as a reliable source of information for sound plan-making.

Change to the policy requested:

: retaining the general extent of Bristol - Bath Green Belt within B&NES, with no strategic change to the boundaries other than removing land to meet the District’s development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram:

- D Land adjoining Odd Down
- D Land adjoining Weston
- D Extension to MoD, Ensleigh
- D Land adjoining East Keynsham
- D Land adjoining South West Keynsham
- D Land at Whitchurch

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;” The allocation at Odd Down will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4720 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Protect Bath & Victims of Fullers Earth

Agent ID: 173 **Agent Name:** Harrison Grant

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Development on the edge of Bath

Whilst we note the need for additional housing, we question whether the proposed development on the edge of Bath on land adjoining Odd Down Weston and MoD, Ensleigh, Lansdown is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The starting point for Bath & North East Somerset when considering changes to Green Belt boundaries is the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Part 9 of the NPPF provides guidance on the protection of the Green Belt. Paragraph 82 of the NPPF confirms that new Green Belt boundaries should only be established in "exceptional circumstances".

When proposing a new Green Belt, local planning authorities should:

- "demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate;
- set out whether any major change in circumstances have made the adoption of this exceptional measure necessary;
- show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development;
- demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with Local Plans for adjoining areas; and
- show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the Framework."

We question whether the strategic decision made to remove land from the Green Belt is the correct approach to follow given the criteria from the NPPF set out above.

Firstly, there is limited supporting evidence in the Core Strategy which shows that the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundary meet the requirements and aims of Green Belt policy. To be compliant, this requires a full and detailed consideration of the issues at hand in addition to setting out a fully justified case. This is not apparent on the documentation provided.

Secondly, if the Council continues with the extension to the Green Belt it is essential when submitting the Core Strategy for examination that it is seen as being "sound". That is to say that it is legally justified with the proposed plan being the most appropriate strategy when considered against all other reasonable alternatives, based on balanced and sound evidence.

Thirdly, if these proposals are pursued, it must be clearly demonstrated that the new boundaries take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development as required by paragraph 84 of the NPPF. In order to adhere to this, the Council must review the boundaries of those affected areas which would be covered by the Green Belt to ensure that sites earmarked for development represents development which meets the needs of the present demands without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

We support the submissions made on behalf of Bath Preservation Trust and the Cotswolds Conservation Board.

Change to the policy requested:

Changes Required

Before any changes to the Green Belt boundary are considered, the following points should be addressed:

- A detailed analysis of brown field sites within Bath and surrounding areas along with written consideration of the ability for development on such sites complete with details (if any) of why they cannot be developed if that is the case.
- A detailed analysis of how the proposals meet the Green Belt policy including details of all other reasonable alternatives to development in the Green Belt and how the Core Strategy fulfils the sustainability requirements of the NPPF.
- A detailed review of the Green Belt boundaries in the context of preparing the placemaking plans;

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Respondent Number: 67

Comment Number: 1

Respondent Name: Trevor John

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Submitted Core Strategy is not legally compliant/sound. The Odd Down plateau is a significant bat foraging area. The proposed development and access road from the east end of the site will have a significant effect on the bats and this can only be mitigated by development elsewhere, so clearly the Council has not properly assessed the impact of the proposals.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Delete the reference to land at Odd Down

Respondent Number: 67**Comment Number:** 3**Respondent Name:** Trevor John**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Submitted Core Strategy is not legally compliant/sound. The NPPF says that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt land at Odd Down is not needed, as sufficient homes could be built elsewhere by increasing the density on brown field sites and by utilising under occupied properties in central Bath e.g. flats above retail shops. Also, this land is AONB land and exceptional circumstances have not been put forward for its development.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete the reference to land at Odd Down

Respondent Number: 4469**Comment Number:** 3**Respondent Name:** Ralph Wynne-Griffiths**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not support the proposed change for the following reasons:

1. The change has been made to accommodate a change in the forecast number of new jobs and new houses that will be required before 2029. This change does not appear to be credible having regard to the other changes made to the forecasts of increased office accommodation and industrial work space. This would suggest that the actual numbers of new jobs and the need for new houses is likely to be less than those forecast.

2. If the forecast for the increase in the number of new jobs and new houses required was found to be sound, I would not support the change for the following reasons.

3. The change to include green belt land within the land for development at Odd Down is unsustainable and unsound:

(a) The fact that land between Odd Down and Southstoke is designated as part of the Cotswolds ANOB. Development of land within an ANOB is only permitted if it is in the local and national interest. This is not shown in the proposal for the change. It is not in the local or national interest for the following reasons.

(b) The setting of Bath as a World Heritage City: its green setting within a landscape bowl. Further development beyond the existing line of housing in Odd Down and in the other parts of the Green Belt will degrade the setting of the city and may even put its WH status in jeopardy.

© The existence of the Wansdyke which runs along the side of a large part of the land being considered, including up to the junction with Southstoke Lane and Midford Road. The setting of this ancient monument should be protected from any further development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

(d) The narrowness of the existing green belt separating the city from South Stoke.

(e) The importance of preserving and protecting the special character of the village of South Stoke.

(f) The effect of any development on the foraging area for the Greater Horseshoe Bat, reducing the available area and causing disturbance from noise and light.

4. Even assuming that the need for the change to the number of houses was found to be sound, that does not mean that the need for those extra new houses should be met. The above are all reasons why it would not be sustainable for Bath, particularly having regard to its unique status, to accommodate the additional housing required by building within the existing green belt.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy DW1, clause 4 should be deleted from the proposed Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 4524 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cardinal Close Residents

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC24 objection

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4621 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Dr Helen Geake **Respondent Organisation:** Portable Antiquities

Agent ID: 154 **Agent Name:** Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

If this area is removed from the Green Belt, a significant threat to the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Wansdyke will ensue.

Legal problems to the proposed change

The proposed change to the Core Strategy is incompatible with the Wansdyke's status as one of the country's most important Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monuments are protected from destruction or disturbance and the impact on the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument by development is also a material consideration in the planning system. In more up-to-date guidance, Scheduled Ancient Monuments are designated 'in order to secure their legal protection in the national interest, and to secure their long-term preservation in situ' (English Heritage guidance from DCMS, March 2010, p. 11). It is not justified to destroy part of this exceptionally important monument to build housing, and BANES's promise to 'protect and enhance the open landscape character of the area' are incompatible with building 300 homes, a school, shops and a road over it.

The only effective way to protect this monument is to leave it within the Green Belt. Any development in this area will have a serious impact on the landscape setting of the site. The current proposals to a change to the Core Strategy to include this

area will unavoidably conflict with the protection afforded to the monument by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Monuments Act, and contravene the UK's commitments to the protection of the historic environment set out within the Valletta Convention (1992).

The proposed changes are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. Under the NPPF, development should sustain or enhance the significance of a heritage asset, and these changes to the Core Strategy fail to accomplish this as they will destroy the open landscape context of the Wansdyke and physically destroy part of the monument itself. (NPPF PPS5 Practice Guide, June 2012, section 79.1).

It is also not sustainable development, as once the open landscape of the Wansdyke has been destroyed, it cannot be recreated. In addition, once the archaeological deposits of the monument itself have been dug away, they cannot be put back, and current understanding of the monument and methodologies to study it are tentative and under-developed (see below).

The proposed development area also lies adjacent to a conservation area and an UNESCO World Heritage Site, both designations which afford protection to the adjacent built environment. The loss of the open land and the impact of 300 new buildings and the associated infrastructure will inevitably diminish the historical context of the southern part of the city of Bath, and bring the UK's commitment to its Heritage Assets into question.

Significance of the Wansdyke

Recent research (Reynolds and Langlands 2006) has suggested a very different origin from the traditional view. Traditionally the Wansdyke has been seen as an immediately post-Roman earthwork, forming a boundary between post-Roman Bath and the Saxon precursor of Wessex. It seems more likely now that it should be dated to the late 8th century, when it could have been constructed by the Kingdom of Wessex, in similar political circumstances to those in contemporary Mercia, which famously constructed Offa's Dyke. Offa's Dyke is a thriving tourist attraction for day trippers and long-distance walkers; it just missed gaining World Heritage Site status itself in 2011, showing the importance of these long-distance boundaries.

The area which runs along the southern boundary of the Bath WHS and apparently ends close to the Cross Keys pub is of exceptional importance in understanding the monument. Beyond this to the east the route of the dyke is shadowy, until the more famous Eastern Wansdyke starts at Morgan's Hill near Calne. It is suggested that the stretch of Wansdyke along Odd Down was constructed by the Men of Somerset, and the eastern part by the Men of Wiltshire, resulting in the different character of the two stretches. But these hypotheses need testing. Topographically this is an important part of the western, Somerset Wansdyke - the last bit clearly visible. The junction between the 'known' and the 'unknown' is crucial and should not be lost to modern development at present, when we have not even formulated the right questions to ask of survey and excavation.

The boundary zone along the Wansdyke, to north and south of the monument, is also of exceptional interest. Its Roman towns (with the singular and remarkable exception of Bath, which may be significant) do not develop into medieval towns. The open landscape character of the dyke is thus particularly important in our appreciation and understanding of it and should be retained.

The Wansdyke therefore represents the creation of Wessex – which did not include Mercian Bath at that point – and shows us how early-medieval societies could come together to construct vast earthworks running over many miles.

Economic implications of the proposed changes

The proposed development would firstly entirely destroy the open landscape context (already gone to the north) and secondly remove one of the most potentially important parts of the dyke.

This neglect and destruction of visible archaeology (as well as the designations of AONB, Conservation Area, WHS and Green Belt) will spoil the 'brand' of Bath as a World Heritage Site and detrimentally affect its tourism economy.

Using the Wansdyke as a tourist attraction in its own right (as with Offa's Dyke) would improve the economy of suburban Bath, as well as other parts of North-East Somerset; destroying part of the monument in this way will not.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like the bullet point 'Land adjoining Odd Down' to be removed from SPC24. This will also require a number of other

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

minor changes throughout the document, to adjust the numbers of homes to be provided and to adjust the accompanying diagrams.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Insofar as Stage One of the Ove Arup Green Belt Review is concerned, we see nothing in its scope and methodology which takes it much beyond the (Buchanan Study and West of England Green Belt Reviews – Core Strategy Examination CD3/16 &17).

The limitations of the Stage One Study are therefore self-evident in that it does not consider the primary driving force behind undertaking the review in the first place i.e. promoting sustainable patterns of development.

Indeed, this is made clear in Section 7: What the Green Belt Review does not seek to do is balance Green Belt purposes with sustainability objectives and therefore reach conclusions on whether there should be amendments to the Green Belt boundaries.

Accordingly, we consider the approach to this review to be fundamentally flawed in that, on its own admission, it has been undertaken independently of the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence-based work assessing potential development options and therefore it does not set out recommendations on the extent to which some development in the Green Belt would promote sustainable development.

We also consider the partial/piecemeal and pragmatic approach to the Review, in combination with the partial/piecemeal approach to the SHMA to be fundamentally flawed in not having been undertaken at a strategic level, covering all parts of the Bristol and Bath Green Belt and the wider West of England strategic housing market area. Certainly, there has been no evidence of any meaningful joint working and co-operation with adjoining authorities and clearly the opportunity to rectify that now, before the resumption of the hearing sessions, has now been missed.

So called “consultation” with other WoE Planning Authorities on the methodology hardly corresponds to a proper strategic approach to this issue in the spirit of the duty to co-operate (NPPF Paragraph 182), in lieu of any formal arrangement for regional or sub regional strategic planning.

It is self evident, from examining the Review of Green Belt undertaken by Ove Arup, that no new work has been undertaken that could ‘satisfy the Council’ that there would be no need to adjust Green Belt boundaries during the remainder of the plan-period or for a reasonable period beyond, consistent with the requirements set out at paragraphs 83 to 85 of the NPPF. Indeed, proposed change SPC27 (and associated proposed change SP134 Paragraph 7.05 – Monitoring) which inserts an additional clause in Policy DW1, raises the prospect of just that happening in response to a 5 year review. The NPPF is unequivocal that LPAs should “satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period”. This fundamental flaw to such a crucial element of the Plan is reinforced by what appears more of an after thought at SPC172: and proposed new para 6.63A i.e. that: “the issue of safeguarding land will be considered in the Placemaking Plan”. This is a clear admission of there being an anticipated risk of ad hoc alterations being required during and

beyond the Core Strategy period; the very risk that Ove Arup indicated should be limited and we say should be avoided if at all possible through judicious identification now of safeguarded land. The Council’s approach risks undermining confidence in Green Belt as a strategic long term planning tool.

There is simply no support whatsoever in the NPPF for relegating/postponing the consideration of safeguarded land, which is a long-term issue of strategic importance, to a subsequent DPD.

It is clear from the NPPF that central to any review of Green Belt, indeed the whole purpose of reviewing Green Belt is “the need to promote sustainable patterns of development”. In BANES the Council, quite rightly in our view, has largely ruled out channelling development towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Moreover, given the obvious constraints on Bath as a World Heritage Site, the Somer Valley, Midsomer Norton, Radstock and the Rural Areas, the town of Keynsham is an obvious choice for consideration, for a variety of reasons which the Council has set out, even though it is ‘inset’ within the Green Belt.

The rejection of Redrow’s land at Lays Farm (See attached Site Location Plan and Site Analysis) on the grounds that a gas

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

pipeline runs through the central southern part of the site and that the “HSE buffer zone severely limits development” or “effectively limits development to a very minor area to the north west of the site” is simply wrong and wholly misleading (Ref: BANES Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2013).

We are clear that an old high pressure (steel) gas main runs across the site at a depth of approximately 1.2m. However, the route of this pipeline as shown on the (unnumbered) plan attached to the SHLAA, does not accord with the records held by the company who own and operate the pipeline, namely Wales and West Utilities Ltd (see attached W&WU Pipeline Plan). Moreover, the existing easement is only 7m and Wales and West has confirmed that it would require a no-build zone of 16m although a highway may be constructed across the main.

The impact of the existing pipeline on the development potential of the site is consequently minimal and certainly not such that would warrant disregarding it completely as a sustainable option. Moreover, it is feasible to divert the main, and Redrow have recently done just that elsewhere in Bristol, and by using modern materials it would further reduce any no-build easement to 6m.

The site, south of Lays Farm (Ref: Area 10 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L) is bound on two side by development and forms a far more logical addition to the built-up area of Keynsham than that proposed to be released from the Green Belt to the south (Ref: Area 13 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L). Development would project no further west than the existing Lays Farm Business Centre. Moreover, the submitted site analysis shows that the distance and the intervening topography ensure that the role of the remaining Green Belt separating Keynsham from Stockwood (identified as Stockwood Vale) would not be unacceptably eroded. In no sense would the release of this site result in the coalescence of Keynsham with Bristol.

It appears to us, from close examination of the SHLAA and the Green Belt Review, that the Council’s primary reason for not also identifying the land at Lays Farm for release from the Green Belt was based on incorrect information about the route and scale of any safeguarding associated with the gas pipeline.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Change to the policy requested:

Land at Lays Farm is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing (150 dwellings)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 4695 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Richard Hemmings

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I am appealing against the exclusion of Land in West Keynham, the land south of KEJUPARI Farm St Francis Rd BS31 2EB which I believe to be Area 9 Cell J in the document scspc_sa_annex_l.pdf, from the Core Strategy. This land represents an excellent opportunity to provide additional housing whilst retaining it’s identity as a community due to the natural boundary of Stockwood Vale. The land is also at very low risk of flooding and is within walking distance to Keynsham High Street, Broadlands Academy and other local amenities.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like the land mentioned in 7. to be included in the Core Strategy for the development of Keynsham

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Respondent Number: 4763 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Terrence Hiskens

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Economic Growth is proposed along the Western Corridor which is totally sustainable. Peripheral allocations within the Green Belt and on the edge of the City are not sustainable and will impact on sensitive locations. SPC 89 refers to local employment opportunities but nowhere is this explained with regard to scale and what type of built development this might entail.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4763 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Terrence Hiskens**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The five fundamental aims of the Green Belt should be preserved. The NPPF keeps the requirement to retain the fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The allocation of land at Weston is fundamentally opposed to this with development proposed in the open countryside.

Change to the policy requested:

Retain the existing boundary .

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Respondent Number:** 251 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Bovis Homes**Agent ID:** 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

8.1 We consider that the need for housing is such that all of the of sites proposed for housing will be required to meet the housing needs of B&NES, and many of the proposed allocations should be increased in size.

8.2 We do however question the evidence base that supports the proposed allocation of these sites.

8.3 Given the increase in housing numbers (albeit modest) within the Proposed Changes Core Strategy, we would have expected the Council to undertake a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal of the strategic distribution of growth; together with a comparative assessment of sites to ensure that the most sustainable form of development is achieved to meet this overall requirement. We do not consider that the SA fulfils this role. Instead it only appears to assess the individual merits of each site without having regard to the relative merits of accommodating higher amounts of development at any of the sites.

8.4 We do not specifically object to any of these allocations as we consider the housing need is such that all are needed, but we do not consider the evidence base is sufficient to demonstrate that each of the proposed allocations; and the spatial strategy overall is the most appropriate strategy when compared against all reasonable alternatives and as such the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

plan remains unsound. Specifically we have not seen sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposed distribution of growth is preferable to a larger allocation at Whitchurch.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton

Respondent Number: 222 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nicholas Pollock **Respondent Organisation:** Duchy of Cornwall

Agent ID: 126 **Agent Name:** Woolf Bond Planning LLP

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

3.0. Green Belt Review and providing for Housing Growth at Bath (including WHS Considerations): SPC18, SPC19, SPC24, SPC31, SPC42, SPC87, SPC88, SPC89, SPC90, SPC91 - Introduction

3.1. ID/8, which matter is summarised at Section 1 above, requires the LPA to undertake a review of the Green Belt's capacity to accommodate further development in a sustainable manner, if necessary following a review of the overall housing requirement to be met during the plan period.

3.2. The LPA Council has undertaken a review of the Green Belt and full details are set out in the "Green Belt Review Stage 1" Report prepared by Arup dated April 2013.

3.3. In assessing the additional technical reports undertaken by the Council as part of the evidence base to the proposed changes to the Core Strategy we have also considered the content at Appendix 1 to the March Committee and Annex L to the Sustainability Appraisal Report.

Providing for Housing Growth

3.4. In the context of the evidence base to the Core Strategy, including the assessment set out in the earlier report to Full Council upon the Significant Proposed Changes (2011), a 'sound' strategy would necessarily plan for additional development in and around Bath (where the need is the greatest).

3.5. As set out in our Matter 2 Statement for the Examination Hearings in January 2012, providing for an urban extension to Bath is necessary for the following reasons:

(i) Both the housing need and employment opportunities are at Bath

(ii) There are concerns about the timely delivery of sites within the Bath urban area, including those within the floodplain

(iii) The identified housing need cannot be met by providing for delivery elsewhere in the District, in particular:

- It is not possible to plan for growth on the edge of Bristol as BANES' own officers conclude that this does not represent the most sustainable option. The Inspector will also be aware of the associated traffic problems in planning for such a strategy. SPC18 clearly states that a review of the Green Belt at Whitchurch is not well placed for Bath.

- Significant development cannot be met at the rural villages due to inter alia, lack of sustainability including lack of employment opportunities.

- It cannot be met by increasing delivery within the Somer Valley as this part of the District is already expected to deliver some 2,700 dwellings at a rate of approximately 135dpa which equates to the historic build rate. Moreover, the identified development sites comprise former employment sites and further development will exacerbate commuting and travel times into Bath creating a less sustainable pattern of growth.

3.6. Against the above background, we remain concerned about the sustainability merits, including having regard to the overall planning balance which matter is, amongst other things, assessed in relation to landscape and policy designations as well as sustainability credentials, of the additional site allocations put forward in the Proposed Changes document which seek to plan for the increased housing requirement at the following locations:

Green Belt Review

3.7. Although the need for housing is at Bath, some 1,150 dwellings are proposed to be allocated at Keynsham, Whitchurch, Somer Valley and the Rural Areas.

3.8. The sites/areas proposed to be removed from the Green Belt in order to provide for housing growth are summarised at SPC24.

- 3.9. It is unclear how this dispersal strategy has been assessed in the CS and/or SA as representing the most appropriate strategy having regard to the alternatives, including providing for additional housing growth in the form of a review of the Green Belt to the south west of Bath at Twerton.
- 3.10. The additional site allocations are said to have been identified followed the LPA's review of the Green Belt boundary. They also include sites to be released from the AONB (at Odd Down, Weston and Ensleigh).
- 3.11. All three sites proposed for development on the edge of Bath are partly within the WHS and all are within the AONB. There is no evidence to suggest that English Heritage has been formally consulted and/or whether detailed studies have been undertaken in relation to the impact of the 'selected' sites on the setting of the WHS. In contrast, land West of Twerton is located outside the WHS boundary and a detailed Heritage Report has been commissioned which considers the acceptability of the site in this regard. Further information is set out at paragraph 3.29 onwards (see below). In addition, the site is also located beyond the AONB.
- 3.12. The Study Areas for the proposed allocations at Bath (broad boundaries shown for information only have been interpreted from the Council's Core Strategy Update consultation newsletter) together with the relevant landscape and policy designations are marked on the "Housing Allocations" Plan attached as Annex 1 to our submission.
- 3.13. Section 2.2 of the Arup Green Belt Study states that the review has been undertaken in conformity with the NPPF, including the content at paragraph 80 which sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt.
- 3.14. It is added that the five statutory purposes of the GB form the basis for the appraisal set out in chapter 5 of the report.
- 3.15. Page 6 of the report refers to the requirements at paragraph 83 of the NPPF with the report stating that: "...the Council should consider alterations (to the GB) with a very long timescale in mind to limit the risk of ad hoc alterations being required during and beyond the Core Strategy period".
- 3.16. The requirement at paragraph 83 of the NPPF is that: "...authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period".
- 3.17. NPPF paragraph 84 requires LPAs, when reviewing GB boundaries, to take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.
- 3.18. Page 6 of the Arup GB Study acknowledges that the Study only looks at wider sustainability issues at a basic level and that it needs to be considered alongside the Sustainability Appraisal. We address this matter in more detail below.
- 3.19. The conclusion reached in the GB review is ambiguous at best in that it fails to provide a scoring matrix and or clarify which of the sites/locations/land parcels represent the most appropriate location in providing for a review of the GB boundary having regard to the five roles set out in the NPPF. Moreover, and of material significance, is the fact that the GB review fails to consider the permanence of the GB boundaries beyond the plan period. This may be a result of their initial scope, although this matter remains unclear and requires clarification.
- 3.20. As part of the review of possible locations in providing for housing development as part of a review of the Green Belt adjoining Bath, the Council commissioned a report from Arup (CD4/ENV6) to assess the feasibility of building on slopes at West of Twerton and Odd Down. The report has not assessed the land at Weston which is much greater in gradient. The Inspector will no doubt wish to avail himself of the information and review the background to the Council's site selection leading up to and during the hearings.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.21. Annex L to the Sustainability Appraisal sets out an assessment of the alternative sites as well as an assessment of an alternative housing requirement (including a higher figure than the 12,700 now proposed).
- 3.22. Stage 2 sets out an assessment of the Bath environs, recommending areas 3ii, 4, 14 and 17 to be assessed in more detail through the stage 3 assessment (site specific assessments).
- 3.23. The proposed allocations at Keynhsam, Whitchurch, MOD Ensleigh, Odd Down and Summer Valley are assessed in the SA as is land west of Twerton.
- 3.24. The stage 3 assessments provide a critique of the merits of the sites against the SEA/SA objectives.
- 3.25. The assessments identify adverse impacts associated with certain of the proposed allocations including in relation to landscape considerations namely the AONB1.
- 3.26. Development, particularly at Odd Down and Weston will have related impacts upon the setting of the Bath World Heritage Site ("WHS").
- 3.27. Based upon the scoring matrix used to assess the suitability of land to the west of Twerton, the authors do not appear to have been provided with the site material previously submitted to the Examination which includes, but is not limited to, Annex A to our Issue 3 Statement concerning site specific matters nor Annex 3 to our submission upon the Significant Changes consultation, the content of which sets out an assessment of the site having regard to, inter alia, landscape and sustainability matters. These are significant considerations that do not appear to have been included in the SA, which material has been submitted, is in the public domain, should be on the Council's database and which is a material consideration of significant weight.
- 3.28. It is for the reasons set out above that we question the findings of the SA in relation to the site.

1 Paragraph 115 of the NPPF makes it clear that great weight should be given to conserving Areas of outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

World Heritage Site

3.29. In so far as it relates to the site specific considerations concerning the urban extension at Twerton, the conclusion in the SA is predicated upon English Heritage's objection to the site having regard to the perceived impact of development in this location on the World Heritage Site ("WHS") and the Council's interpretation of their objection.

3.30. In short, there is suggested to be a perceived threat or adverse impact on the Bath WHS and its setting which matter English Heritage have previously commented upon. The Council sought to summarise the English Heritage views in BANES11.

3.31. Following the Core Strategy Examination in early 2012, the Duchy of Cornwall wished to satisfy itself with respect to the implications of development at the West of Twerton site on the World Heritage City of Bath, and asked The Prince's Foundation to address questions of impact on the site and the setting through a study.

3.32. The Foundation instructed independent consultants, including Architectural Historians Gavin Stamp, Dan Cruickshank and the Landscape Architect Michael Lear to undertake an assessment of the evolution of the Bath World Heritage Site. In particular their Brief was larger than the Twerton site itself: it was intended to assess the evolution of the Bath WHS – the entire City – over time, to address issues of setting and landscape and to identify key issues which might affect the desirability or design of an urban extension.

3.33. The Heritage Report was published in 2012 and copies have already been made available to the Council and English Heritage (see paragraph 3.40 below).

3.34. The WHS is a designated heritage asset.

3.35. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF sets out the approach to assessing a development proposal on a designated heritage asset, stating: "Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use."

3.36. The Study provides a context for consideration of the West of Twerton proposals in relation to WHS considerations.

3.37. In considering the test thus defined by the NPPF the starting point, in appraising the suitability if the west of Twerton option, is to consider the extent to which there would be any adverse impact on the defined heritage importance of Bath and the WHS. For this reason the independent assessment referred to above concerning the Study of Bath has been commissioned and prepared on behalf of the Duchy.

3.38. The Heritage Study is a comprehensive review of the architectural and landscape character of Bath and its evolution at a citywide scale. This is appropriate and is the first time it has been done. The Setting Study looked at the area outside of the Site, and at Roman and Georgian Bath as have the Management Plans. The entire City is within the Site and this study is unique in focusing attention on the character and essential qualities of later development as well. The Prince's Foundation commissioned the consultants to undertake the study through LIDAR mapping, extensive photographic documentation of views and character, and examination of primary historic documents and ephemera.

3.39. The Heritage Study, along with the draft Setting Study, has important implications for the consideration of an urban extension to Bath. These are the following:

- Any sense of arrival into Bath through countryside is mitigated by the completely ordinary character of the twentieth century ribbon and light industrial development one finds along the roadside for two miles before entering any area of Georgian character.
- As a living city, it is appropriate for Bath to grow, and if it does it should strive to do so in a way that reflects continuity with the way that the World Heritage Site- the entire City- has grown and developed over the past three hundred years. Interestingly, it has been achieved to date through the individual actions of landowners and speculative developers, acting within a shared architectural language but without a central plan.
- The view from Kelston Park is a borrowed landscape, not a designed one, as it has been in separate ownership from the beginning. The view has altered considerably over time, with the introduction of railways and roads, the winding up of quarrying activities and development along the roundabout. The setting could be enhanced through restoring grazing patterns and field boundaries.

There are important clues in how to develop well that can be derived for studying the evolution of Bath: buildings on slopes with and across contours, the use of local stone cladding, vertical proportioning, and leaving hilltops open to capture views. These can be applied in any future development within or near to the World Heritage Site. In fact, doing so at the West of Twerton site could enhance a sense of arrival to Bath.

3.40. A hard copy of the Heritage Report has previously been made available to the Council and English Heritage. It is unclear from the Council's site assessment as to whether this document has informed their decision making.

3.41. As evidenced in documentation provided to English Heritage, land west of Twerton represents an opportunity to provide for a sustainable mixed use urban extension in the form of a new neighbourhood to provide for up to 2,000

dwelling together with employment provision (at a ratio of 1 job per dwelling), open space, community facilities and sustainable linkages to the city centre in a sympathetic manner, thus respecting the setting of the site.

3.42. The technical studies that have been undertaken to date, including that in relation to heritage considerations, have either been prepared in order to inform the masterplan approach or to confirm and support its acceptability including having regard to, inter alia, impact of the WHS.

3.43. The masterplan has evolved having regard to the aforementioned technical reports which include (the following list is not exhaustive):

- Landscape
- Heritage
- Urban design
- Archaeology
- Sustainability/Highways
- Flood and drainage
- Grounds conditions and stability
- Ecology
- Drainage

3.44. Against the above background the masterplan as now proposed:

- Addresses archaeology
- Preserves the hillside approach from the west by restricting development to below the plateau thus avoiding impact on the setting of Newton St Loe
- Preserves views to 7 acre wood from the WHS
- Creation of sustainable linkages between Bath Spa University at Newton Park and Bath through the site. There is also the potential to make existing bus routes more viable and the possibility of creating a future rail halt.

3.45. The position taken by English Heritage in 2010 was informed by the planning guidance current at the time together with the availability of information relation to the matter.

3.46. The NPPF now provides a new planning context, one which sees heritage as an element in an integrated approach to sustainable development, alongside other core planning principles. Authorities must plan to meet objectively identified needs unless adverse impacts demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

3.47. The Inspector has found that the 2010 Plan failed to meet housing needs, and any new examination must address the opportunity to meeting housing and related growth needs informed by the requirements of the NPPF.

3.48. Furthermore, the Heritage Study provides important new evidence which argues that the impact of development at this site is in keeping with the continued growth and evolution of Bath. It also but suggests qualities of development in Bath that can be taken on board to ensure that the character of the World Heritage Site is not degraded.

3.49. This minimisation of adverse impacts must be balanced against the positive way that a sustainable urban extension can address other core planning principles, including meeting identified need within a mixed tenure, mixed use community, providing amenities and service to the adjacent area of Twerton, enhancing existing public transport links to Newton Park, and meeting housing need without impacting on the AONB.

3.50. It is apparent from this analysis that the independent assessment of the origins and current importance of the heritage status of Bath would not be significantly or adversely affected by the proposed development West of Twerton. As regards the planning balance set out in the NPPF the potential benefits of the scheme in terms of providing additional housing and employment opportunities, together with the potential to revitalise the Twerton area are all then factors to be taken into account which can be considered in the context of the advice in the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Summary: Suggested Changes

3.51. In arriving at a higher annualised housing requirement figure, the LPA have commissioned a number of reports and have had to consider the perceived GB and WHS impacts together with the relative sustainability merits of the potential sites and then arrived at an overall planning balance.

3.52. If the inputs into the assessment have been erroneous from the outset, the then end result will be prejudiced and the conclusion will be unsound.

3.53. Against the above background, we are concerned about the Council's overall approach to assessing the sites to be identified for housing in meeting the increased housing requirement.

3.54. Our concerns may be summarised as relating to:

- The failure to undertake a robust and/or appropriate review of the GB in order to allow the boundaries to endure beyond the plan period, as required by the NPPF.
- The lack of a detailed comparative assessment of the potential allocation sites having regard to their respective impact on the WHS.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- The weight placed on the assessment of AONB impacts.
- The erroneous planning balance that has been applied as a result.

3.55. Should the Inspector be of the view that the Core Strategy fails to provide for sufficient flexibility in meeting identified housing needs and/or finds the Plan unsound in relation to the planning balance and judgments applied to the Green Belt Review and the subsequent site selection, the Duchy of Cornwall's land continues to be available to meet identified housing needs and can provide for a sustainable urban extension for around 2,000 dwellings together with associated employment and infrastructure provision as well as sustainable linkages to Twerton and beyond to the centre of Bath.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The policy fails to provide enough growth and economic development. A new station at Saltford Parkway could allow for larger numbers of housing between Keynsham and Saltford with its good bus links especially with the re-development of Frys Somerdale. With the loss of Frys there is a need for more employment land which could be provided in the Hicks Gate / Brislington Area as long as a green lung is kept between Keynsham, Stockwood and Whitchurch.

Change to the policy requested:

The policy doesn't provide enough housing in the Keynsham / Stockwood area. The former Frys factory rail alignment should be protected all the way to Keynsham station as a public transport corridor possibly bus or Parry People Mover (PPM).

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 39 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Robert Sackett **Respondent Organisation:** Greenway! Stakeholder Residents Forum

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

"Core Strategy Consultation: pollution impact from urban extensions
Greenway! Stakeholder Residents Forum
Traffic Committee: D. Thomas & R. Sackett

"The petrolled air of traffic-jams that lies visibly in the streets at the end of a hot afternoon, or tints the valley mist on autumn mornings, is probably no more offensive to the nose, though perhaps worse for the expectation of life, than the horse-dung of the Hanoverian City."

Donald Thomas, Henry Fielding: A Life, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1990

1.The Calor Survey

The extent of air pollution in Bath, from chronicle-exhaust fumes, specifically from nitrogen dioxide, was first revealed by a Calor Gas survey whose results were published in November 2003. This found that the city of Bath "beat congested parts of London, Glasgow and Bristol for levels of oxides of nitrogen." Only Oxford had a higher pollution rating than Bath in the study of 30 urban "hot-spots" across the UK.

The press headlined the fact that "pedestrians in Bath are inhaling exhaust pollutants equivalent to smoking more than two

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

packets of cigarettes a day." The council was obliged to declare the London Road, from Bathwick Street to Batheaston by-pass, an Air Quality Management Zone.

The permitted exhaust limit under European legal remains 40 parts of nitrogen dioxide per cubic meter of air. By the end of 2013, B&NES had been required to declare 51 Air Quality Monitoring Zones. In 36 of these air pollution from exhaust fumes remains stubbornly above the legal limit according to the council's latest figures. Some of these were particularly worrying and well within the zone of hazard to health. They included Broad Street which had reached 72 parts of NO2 per cubic meter at the end of 2012 - double the permitted level. At times, some levels had been far higher. Indeed, Dorchester Street, running through the new Southgate development, had reached 96 parts of nitrogen dioxide — almost two-and-a-half times the safety limit — in August 2012.

Such figures may be adjusted for "constant user." The severity of pollution may be understated by taking samples well above breathing height to protect the apparatus from vandalism. Plainly, however, such readings are a cause for decisive action.

2.Paving the Price

The number of those who pay the price in terms of ill-health varies from one source to another. Three years ago, Boris Johnson published research which showed that in London, currently Europe's most polluted capital city, 4,300 deaths a year were attributable to such air pollution by nitrogen dioxide fumes. Government figures put annual death-rate throughout the country at 29,000 at the same time. The House of Commons Audit in 2010 put the mortality figure at 51,500. Figures for sickness, according to recent research in London and Los Angeles, cover childhood asthma and congenital defects. As Dr Jonathan Grigg of Barts and the London School of Medicine pins it, children's lung function is liable to be reduced by such pollution to a level "internationally regarded as hazardous."

3.The Strasbourg Judgment May 2013

In 2012 the UK government was taken to the High Court by an environmental group. ClientEarth, for its failure to implement measures to bring pollution within the legal limit by the required date of 2010.

Only in three out of 43 areas did they appear to have done so. Indeed, the UK government proposed to spin out the process to 2025. On 1 May, the European Supreme Court ruled that UK government ministers were breaking the law and were "open to immediate enforcement action."

4.Urban Extensions

Against such a background, for many of those who live in Bath, the issue is not the building of urban extensions in itself. Indeed, where the new site is something like a former MOD complex, why would it be? The true objection is to ill-conceived extensions. One of the major difficulties must necessarily be the transportation of an increased population, with all its attendant services, in and out of the city. That in turn exacerbates problems of pollution which council after council, whatever its political complexion, has shown itself incapable of resolving.

Urban Extensions necessarily require that a plan for resolving the chronic environmental blight of transport difficulties must be put in place first.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Proposed Change to clause 4 of Policy DW1 is considered to be unsound for the reasons that it is not consistent with national policy; it is not positively prepared, justified or effective. There has been no joint working to produce a collaborative SHMA as stated in the NPPF para 159, and the Green Belt Review has sought to minimise the impact on the Green Belt in terms of removing land in order to meet the housing requirement. Clause 4 only identifies the locations, rather than the sites, it is considered that as the sites are critical to the delivery of the housing provision in the plan period

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

they should be allocated in the Core Strategy (NPPF para 47).

Change to the policy requested:

Policy DW1 Clause 4 should be revised to identify the sites in the Green Belt rather than the locations and cross reference should then be made to the specific policies which allocate the sites.

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 26 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton

Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

National agreements for the protection of World Heritage Sites must take precedence, and need to be stated to do so.

Change to the policy requested:

Bath and North East Somerset's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) identifies climate change as the first of its six key themes AFTER ITS OBLIGATION TO COMPLY WITH THE NATIONAL AGREEMENT TO THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION. Climate change is also a cross cutting objective of the Core Strategy. In the context of national targets the SCS commits the Council to providing leadership for a reduction of the area's CO2 emissions by 45% by 2029 from 1990 levels.

Respondent Number: 281 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy

Respondent Organisation: Natural England

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

General

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires planning policies and decisions to be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment and other characteristics of the area and to allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies.

Overall we consider that the process used to identify additional housing land has been reasonably comprehensive and underpinned by a number of new studies and evidence. We particularly welcome the recognition given in the Plan to the protection of Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the emphasis placed on the need for well planned, high quality green infrastructure, which we regard as being essential to achieving sustainable development.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell

Respondent Organisation: South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Even with the housing around Bath Western Riverside, Foothills Endsleigh and Warminster Road there is still a shortage of affordable housing and jobs which require urban extensions alongside good public transport. The rail corridor between Bath and Bristol can give you good economic growth.

Change to the policy requested:

We wish to see more housing land provided in and around Bath, Weston, Weston Village, Weston Riverside, Newbridge, and land to the East and West of Twerton towards Saltford and Odd Down on good public transport corridors especially in view of the new electric train services between Bristol, Keynsham and Bath.

Respondent Number: 1525 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:**
Respondent Organisation: South Stoke Parish Council
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Regarding proposals for the Odd Down Plateau, I would comment as follows:

I do not support the proposals for development in this area which I believe to be unsound for the following reasons:

1. The entire area is within the Green Belt and, as such, provides a very narrow strip between South Stoke and Bath. Any development of this area will cause coalescence between Bath and the South Stoke Conservation Area which will be contrary to one of the principle purposes of the Green Belt. The Council commissioned report by Arup makes this point and also voices concerns about the impact on archaeological remains and the Wansdyke Ancient Monument.
2. The site is within the Cotswold AONB. Bath's setting in this environment would be damaged by development in an AONB and could not be considered to be in 'Local and National Interest', the only criteria under which development could be permitted.
3. Access to the site from the B3110 at The Cross Keys will have have significant impact on the village of South Stoke, greatly reducing the effectiveness of any buffer between the village and development. In addition, the B3110 is already heavily used and the extra load will cause considerable disruption.
4. The area is important to wild life. Recognised by European experts in wildlife conservation as an important foraging area for the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat, it is also home to Skylarks which are becoming increasingly rare.

Change to the policy requested:
Respondent Number: 3152 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes

Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove land adjoining Odd Down, Weston and Whitchurch from proposed changes

Respondent Number: 4434 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ian Wheaton

Respondent Organisation: Network Rail

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Network Rail has been consulted by B&NES Council, on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy. Thank you for providing us with this opportunity to comment on this Planning Policy document.

Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure. In this regard, please find our comments below.

We note that a number of sites have been identified in order to increase the housing land supply within the B&NES area.

Level Crossings:

Development proposals' affecting the safety of level crossings is an extremely important consideration for emerging planning policy to address. The impact from development can result in a significant increase in the vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic utilising a crossing which in turn impacts upon safety and service provision.

As a result of increased patronage, Network Rail could be forced to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using a crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. This would be in direct conflict with strategic and government aims of improving rail services.

In this regard, we would request that the potential impacts from development affecting Network Rail's level crossings, is specifically addressed through planning policy as there have been instances whereby Network Rail has not been consulted as statutory undertaker where a proposal has impacted on a level crossing. We request that a policy is provided confirming that:

• The Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

☒☒Schedule 5 (f)(ii) of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) order, 2010 requires that...
 “Where any proposed development is likely to result in a material increase in volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (public footpath, public or private road) the Planning Authority’s Highway Engineer must submit details to both Her Majesty’s Railway Inspectorate and Network Rail for separate approval”.

☒☒Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and

☒☒The developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4544 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Hans Sauer

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

You should preserve your historical and natural beauty and heritage, and not destroy it.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Withies Farm Landowners’ Group,

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

For reasons detailed in relation to SPC19, this policy is unsound since it fails to give proper strategic direction relating to the review and re-adjustment of Green Belt boundaries.

Criterion 4 endorses the concerns raised in relation to SPC19 in that it indicates an intention that the Green Belt boundaries will be adjusted only insofar as it is necessary to remove land to meet the development needs identified in the Plan. Such an approach would be unsound since it would be inconsistent with national policy, and contrary to the requirement for the Plan to be positively prepared and justified.

When undertaking the necessary review of Green Belt boundaries the guiding principle must be to set boundaries that are capable of enduring. To this end the boundaries must be set such as to permit flexibility to accommodate contingencies during the Plan period, and having regard to potential development requirements beyond it. For reasons set out in representations to SPC19, this is likely to have particular implications when reviewing and adjusting the Green Belt boundaries at Keynsham, which is a sustainable location having much fewer environmental constraints than the environs of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy DW1 (4) should be amended as follows:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

4: retaining the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES, whilst making necessary adjustments to the detailed boundaries to ensure they are capable of enduring beyond the plan period by removing sufficient land to enable current and possible longer-term development requirements to be met, and in particular in the following broad locations identified on the Key Diagram:

- .
- .
- .
- Land east of Keynsham and west of Saltford
- .

Respondent Number: 4691 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: GD Baird Will Trust, Mackay, Mason and

Agent ID: 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC24

Plan Reference: Policy DW1, clause 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

It is a significant concern that the Council has only undertaken a partial Green Belt review that is still 'on-going' and the establishment of the Green Belt boundary is delegated to a lower order DPD (the Placemaking Plan). As discussed above, the Council has yet to fully assess all sites that have been put forward for development as appears to be the case with our client's sites at Minster Way and Horseshoe Walk. This runs contrary to the Inspector's advice and guidance within the NPPF.

Further to the completion of the initial Core Strategy Hearing Sessions in early 2012, the Inspector made clear his concerns regarding the lack of a comprehensive Green Belt review in his note: 'Preliminary Conclusions on Strategic Matters and Way Forward' (ID28):

"The NPPF (83) makes clear that any review of Green Belt boundaries should have regard to their intended permanence in the long term so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. It is therefore essential that there is a proper assessment of long term needs." (Paragraph 4.4)

This advice is endorsed by Paragraph 83 of the NPPF:

"Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy." (Emphasis added)

Having regard to the Inspector's advice and given the strategic role of the Core Strategy and the strategic importance attributed to the Green Belt within the NPPF, the Council should have undertaken a comprehensive Green Belt Assessment to inform the Core Strategy. The assessment should have objectively assessed all available sites prior to informing the Core Strategy however as discussed above, this has not occurred and the Council's SHLAA confirms smaller parcels of land promoted for development have yet to be assessed.

In addition, the Council is now consulting on changes to the Core Strategy despite the fact that the ARUP Green Belt Review Report (April 2013) confirms two further elements of the Green Belt Review work are on-going to establish potential additions to the Green Belt and recommendations on 'detailed boundary changes'. Indeed the aforementioned report was only published on the 23rd April despite consultation on the proposed Core Strategy modifications commencing on the 28th March.

This piecemeal approach to reviewing the Green Belt conflicts with the guidance within the NPPF and undermines the sustainability credentials of the Core Strategy. Our clients contend that the plan is therefore not justified as there is no robust evidence confirming that it is the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives (Paragraph 182, NPPF).

8. Please state the change to the policy or supporting text you are requesting. Please refer to the guidance note for more details.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Please expand this box or attach a separate sheet if you require more space.

Change to the policy requested:

Given the primacy of the Core Strategy (Local Plan) in local planning policy terms and the importance afforded to Green Belt within the NPPF (Paragraphs 79-92), it is submitted that the Council should complete its Green Belt review prior to proposing amendments to the submitted Core Strategy. This comprehensive review should assess all potential sites proposed for release from the Green Belt before establishing amendments to the Green Belt Boundary within the Core Strategy as advocated by Paragraph 83 of the NPPF.

Respondent Number: 4712 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC24**Plan Reference:** Policy DW1, clause 4**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Support in principle of Change reference SPC24 (Page No. 20 of the Draft Core Strategy) ... removing land from the Green Belt in order 'to meet the Districts development needs at the following locations identified on the Key Diagram', in addition to our site which is to be considered separately in a Place Making Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC25**Plan Ref.: Policy DW1****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 821 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Porter **Respondent Organisation:** Cam Valley Wildlife Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC25**Plan Reference:** Policy DW1**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

I support changes SPC 25, SPC 149, SPC 168.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4520 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill

Respondent Organisation:**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC25**Plan Reference:** Policy DW1**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

The remains of the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Wansdyke passes through the Northern edge of the South

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Stoke/Odd Down plateau and would be seriously compromised by any further destruction, as has already occurred at the western end and would further impair public access to this ancient monument. I consider on these grounds that any development permitted would be unsound .

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC26

Plan Ref.: Policy DW1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4692 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Grainger plc

Agent ID: 123 **Agent Name:** Savills (L&P)

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC26

Plan Reference: Policy DW1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We do not include within these representations a detailed critique of the overall strategic housing requirement or the broad distribution strategy for the scale of growth proposed. These matters are addressed in the representations on behalf of the Hignett Family Trust by Peter Brett Associates and we do not therefore wish to repeat or duplicate these arguments. Nevertheless, Grainger do support the proposed increase in the strategic housing requirement and consider that additional land should be identified for residential development in order to address this need.

To address the strategic housing requirement, Grainger strongly support the reference in Clause (4) of Policy DW1 to the removal of land from the Green Belt adjoining Odd Down. For the reasons outlined later in these representations and in those to Policy B3A, the land at Odd Down is considered to be an entirely suitable and sustainable location for strategic growth. The land represents a clearly defined and logical extension to the built up area. It is well contained by the existing landscaping and the scale of development responds appropriately to the topography of the site and the surrounding areas.

Furthermore, the site benefits from many positive attributes, it is well related to services and facilities, including public transport provision, schools, shops and employment opportunities. In the context of the significant constraints impacting upon the development potential of land surrounding Bath, the site is undoubtedly the most suitable location for strategic scale growth.

Given its suitability and sustainability, it is considered that the land adjacent to Odd Down is appropriate for a greater scale of growth than proposed in the Core Strategy. The scale proposed and the rationale for this is provided in our representations to Policy B3A.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC27

Plan Ref.: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick

Respondent Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Proposed Change to Policy DW1 (last paragraph) refers to the review of the Core Strategy around every five years. In other parts of the Core Strategy reference is made to an early review of the Core Strategy being programmed for around 2016 to co-ordinate with the other West of England districts. Given the issues in the area and the duty to co-operate it is considered necessary to reflect this in Policy DW1. An early review, by 2016 is essential. Bristol's Core Strategy must be reviewed by 2016 and it is vital that the four West of England authorities work together to properly address the housing needs within the West of England HMA.

Change to the policy requested:

"The Core Strategy will be reviewed in 2016 to co-ordinate with other West of England Districts."

Respondent Number: 184**Comment Number:** 4**Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis**Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst we are supportive of requirements to regularly review Plans, this is on the basis that the Plan is fit for purpose. There are still a number of deficiencies in this Plan and we consider a comprehensive Local Plan backed up by an evidence base which includes a SHMA with a proper objective assessment of housing needs and a comprehensive Green Belt Review is required.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 269**Comment Number:** 12**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol**Agent ID:** 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.63 The proposed change to Policy DW1 states that the Core Strategy will be reviewed around every five years.

1.64 This is a direct contradiction to proposed change SPC22 which states that an early review of the Core Strategy will take place in 2016, to co-ordinate with the other West of England authorities.

1.65 An early review, by 2016 is essential. Bristol's Core Strategy must be reviewed by 2016 and it is vital that the four West of England authorities work together to properly address housing needs within the West of England HMA.

1.66 Despite the fact that Bristol City Council states that it does not have any unmet need to be met outside of its boundaries, this is based upon it's currently adopted housing target. The Inspectors report for Bristol's Core Strategy recognised that the housing 'requirement' in the Core Strategy did not equate to its need and that the balance would have to be met outside Bristol's boundaries. In addition, the housing requirement is to be reviewed by 2016.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1.67 Consequently, while Bristol City Council states that it has no housing need to be met outside its boundaries, this is not due in reality to there not being any additional need during the plan period and misunderstands how Bristol's Core Strategy housing target was arrived at.

1.68 By 2016 Bristol's housing target must have been reviewed and all of the available evidence, including the DCLG 2011-based household projections, indicates that a much higher housing target than currently proposed is required to meet needs arising in Bristol.

1.69 A review of BANES Core Strategy must therefore take place in 2016 to take account of the findings of the West of England SHMA and Bristol's Core Strategy review.

1.70 Such a review should not however be relied upon as a means of adopting the Core Strategy now with an unsound housing target. As stated by the Inspector of the North Warwickshire Borough Core Strategy in a recent advice letter dated 22 April 2013: "A plan which cannot be shown to be seeking to meet the objectively assessed needs of an area cannot be sound and, consequently, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to defer housing matters to an early review of the Core Strategy".

1.71 The Core Strategy should therefore be delayed until the results of an NPPF compliant West of England Joint SHMA are available.

Change to the policy requested:

The BANES Core Strategy housing target must be reviewed by 2016, in line with Bristol's commitment to review its housing target in 2016 and therefore take account of the results of the joint West of England SHMA. Needs not being met within Bristol's boundaries must be met by its neighbouring authorities, including BANES.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC27 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1.63 The proposed change to Policy DW1 states that the Core Strategy will be reviewed around every five years.

1.64 This is a direct contradiction to proposed change SPC22 which states that an early review of the Core Strategy will take place in 2016, to co-ordinate with the other West of England authorities.

1.65 An early review, by 2016 is essential. Bristol's Core Strategy must be reviewed by 2016 and it is vital that the four West of England authorities work together to properly address housing needs within the West of England HMA.

1.66 Despite the fact that Bristol City Council states that it does not have any unmet need to be met outside of its boundaries, this is based upon it's currently adopted housing target. The Inspectors report for Bristol's Core Strategy recognised that the housing 'requirement' in the Core Strategy did not equate to its need and that the balance would have to be met outside Bristol's boundaries. In addition, the housing requirement is to be reviewed by 2016.

1.67 Consequently, while Bristol City Council states that it has no housing need to be met outside its boundaries, this is not due in reality to there not being any additional need during the plan period and misunderstands how Bristol's Core Strategy housing target was arrived at.

1.68 By 2016 Bristol's housing target must have been reviewed and all of the available evidence, including the DCLG 2011-based household projections, indicates that a much higher housing target than currently proposed is required to meet needs arising in Bristol.

1.69 A review of BANES Core Strategy must therefore take place in 2016 to take account of the findings of the West of

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

England SHMA and Bristol's Core Strategy review.

1.70 Such a review should not however be relied upon as a means of adopting the Core Strategy now with an unsound housing target. As stated by the Inspector of the North Warwickshire Borough Core Strategy in a recent advice letter dated 22 April 2013: "A plan which cannot be shown to be seeking to meet the objectively assessed needs of an area cannot be sound and, consequently, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to defer housing matters to an early review of the Core Strategy".

1.71 The Core Strategy should therefore be delayed until the results of an NPPF compliant West of England Joint SHMA are available.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4692 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Grainger plc

Agent ID: 123 **Agent Name:** Savills (L&P)

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Grainger support the inclusion of a clear review mechanism for the Core Strategy within Policy DW1. It is extremely important for local authorities with complex and overlapping housing market areas to work closely with their neighbours in determining the scale of housing growth and the appropriate spatial strategy.

In order to ensure the effectiveness of the review mechanism, it is essential that this ties in with the adopted timescales within the Bristol and North Somerset Core Strategies. Failure to do so would render a comprehensive approach extremely challenging and present difficulties for the adjoining authorities to comply with the legal Duty to Cooperate and henceforth to properly plan for future growth. Whilst the supporting text helps in this regard, the policy itself suggests a timescale for review which would not be consistent with neighbouring authorities. It is recommended that the text of the Policy is brought into line with the supporting text and specific reference is made to the comprehensive review in 2016.

Whilst we support the inclusion of a review mechanism, this does not obviate the need to plan properly through the current Core Strategy. There are, we consider, a number of shortcomings in the current Core Strategy which should be rectified. It is our view that these shortcomings are capable of being addressed through the Main Modifications process in order to enable a swift adoption of the Core Strategy prior to the comprehensive review alongside neighbouring authorities as proposed in Policy DW1. Further details of the Main Modification we consider appropriate are provided in our representations.

Change to the policy requested:

Modify the wording of the review mechanism contained within Policy DW1 to ensure consistency with neighbouring authorities for the timetabled review of Local Plans in 2016.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Proposed Change to Policy DW1 (last paragraph) refers to the review of the Core Strategy around every five years. In other parts of the Core Strategy reference is made to an early review of the Core Strategy being programmed for around 2016 to co-ordinate with the other West of England districts. Given the issues in the area and the duty to co-operate it is considered necessary to reflect this in Policy DW1

Change to the policy requested:

“The Core Strategy will be reviewed in 2016 to co-ordinate with other West of England Districts.”

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt

Respondent Organisation: Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

29) The response to the Inspector’s query (BNS/40) provides a wholly inadequate response in respect of NPPF paragraph 83 and whether B&NES can be confident that the Green Belt boundaries can endure beyond the plan period. The Green Belt Review acknowledges the need, reflecting on page 6 that:

“the Council should consider alterations with a very long timescale in mind to limit the risk of ad hoc alterations being required during and beyond the Core Strategy period.”

30) The response provides a brief critique of the current Green Belt releases identifying only two potential options for safeguarding land at Whitchuch and south of Keynsham. There is no analysis of whether any other Green Belt locations have been scoped for safeguarding potential; a fundamental flaw in the approach.

31) This is an essential requirement for this Core Strategy to fulfil. Even against a wholly inadequate housing requirement and the identification of the MOD sites it has been found that significant Green Belt releases are required. There is no suggestion that there is a latent supply of brownfield or non-Green Belt greenfield land that can meet the long term needs of the Bath and Bristol HMAs within B&NES.

32) It is inevitable that further Green Belt releases will be necessary not just at the end of the plan period but long before, even if this CS were to be found sound. RPS does not accept that this plan should be found sound, however, in the event that it was, it must be a pre-requisite of Policy DW1 that a comprehensive review will be required during 2015 following the publication of the new West of England SHMA. The review will need to have begun even before the placemaking plan is adopted (scheduled for summer 2015). The Core Strategy must be in a position to respond rapidly to a change in circumstances and it is entirely unequipped to do so. The placemaking plan will not help; it could only do so if further locations for contingency were identified in the Core Strategy that it could then develop further.

33) The fact that a comprehensive review will be critical within one year of adoption of the CS demonstrates just how inadequate the current policies are. Given the failings of the LPA in the past and present to adequately deal with the needs of the HMAs there is no reason to believe that it will act responsibly and review the plan when new evidence (and its own policy) requires it. This is exemplified at additional paragraph 7.05a of the composite version which states that the review won’t be for at least five years from adoption.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4639 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Lands Improvement

Agent ID: 156 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whilst Lands Improvement fully acknowledges and supports the fact that the Core Strategy should be continuously monitored, we are concerned that SPC27 seeks to abdicate responsibility for meeting the full and objectively assessed needs of the area to a subsequent review.

We also consider that Examination Documents ID/31 and BNES/40 demonstrate why this is an ill- conceived approach. BNES/40 is the Council's response to the issues raised by the Inspector in ID/31. The Inspector has asked the Council to explain how its proposed changes to the Green Belt have taken into account the 3rd sentence of NPPF paragraph 83; that is to say, that the revised boundaries are capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

Whilst the Council's response at paragraph 6.2 (of BNES/40) states correctly that the detailed boundaries of the Green Belt will be formalised in the Place Making Plan, it should be clear that the general locations are first defined in the Core Strategy; that is to say, the Place Making Plan can only consider revisions in those locations identified in the Core Strategy. It is unclear how additional development in the Green Belt will be accommodated should the five yearly review referred to in SPC27 demonstrate a need for additional new development.

It is therefore of critical importance that the Core Strategy is based on the most appropriate targets and objectives from the outset. Other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement set out our great concerns on the strategy as currently drafted including in respect of the quantum of development proposed and its distribution within the plan area.

Change to the policy requested:

- The identification of additional development at Whitchurch, South East Bristol for approximately 3,500 dwellings, the potential for which is recognised in the SHLAA and the details of which will be confirmed through the Placemaking Plan; and
- Consequential changes as set out in other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement including in respect of the quantum of development proposed and its distribution within the plan area.

Respondent Number: 4650 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Geoff Davis & Ms Tania Rodrigues **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC27 **Plan Reference:** Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Core Strategy provides for Five Yearly reviews. However, it is UNSOUND as it does not reflect the democratic wishes of the electorate as clearly demonstrated at the B&NES Special Council meeting, where it was quite apparent that Councillors wished there to be a policy of 'Brown Field First' when considering developments. Such a policy statement does not exist within the document and one is required. It is clear that developers will prefer to develop Green Field sites first, as they are easier and more profitable. Also, as was made clear by planning officers at the consultation events, because there is a development backlog, the Green Field sites will inevitably be brought forward first, because the time scale for these is much shorter.

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy requires a policy statement that protects Green Field sites from development until sufficient progress has been made developing Brown Field sites. The Five Yearly review mechanism provides the logical place for such a revision to be drafted, and so meet the democratic wishes of the people of Bath and North East Somerset.

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC27

Plan Reference: Policy DW1 (Last para only)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC27

1.67 The proposed change to Policy DW1 states that the Core Strategy will be reviewed around every five years.

1.68 This is a direct contradiction to proposed change SPC22 which states that an early review of the Core Strategy will take place in 2016, to co-ordinate with the other West of England authorities.

1.69 An early review, by 2016 is essential. Bristol's Core Strategy must be reviewed by 2016 and it is vital that the four West of England authorities work together to properly address housing needs within the West of England HMA.

1.70 Despite the fact that Bristol City Council states that it does not have any unmet need to be met outside of its boundaries, this is based upon its currently adopted housing target. The Inspectors report for Bristol's Core Strategy recognised that the housing 'requirement' in the Core Strategy did not equate to its need and that the balance would have to be met outside Bristol's boundaries. In addition, the housing requirement is to be reviewed by 2016.

1.71 Consequently, while Bristol City Council states that it has no housing need to be met outside its boundaries, this is not due in reality to there not being any additional need during the plan period and misunderstands how Bristol's Core Strategy housing target was arrived at.

1.72 By 2016 Bristol's housing target must have been reviewed and all of the available evidence, including the DCLG 2011-based household projections, indicates that a much higher housing target than currently proposed is required to meet needs arising in Bristol.

1.73 A review of BANES Core Strategy must therefore take place at 2016 to take account of the findings if the West of England SHMA and Bristol's Core Strategy review.

1.74 Such a review should not however be relied upon as a means of adopting the Core Strategy now with an unsound housing target. As stated by the Inspector of the North Warwickshire Borough Core Strategy in a recent advice letter dated 22 April 2013: "A plan which cannot be shown to be seeking to meet the objectively assessed needs of an area cannot be sound and, consequently, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to defer housing matters to an early review of the Core Strategy".

1.75 The Core Strategy should therefore be delayed until the results of an NPPF compliant West of England Joint SHMA are available.

Change to the policy requested:

The BANES Core Strategy housing target must be reviewed by 2016, in line with Bristol's commitment to review its housing target in 2016 and therefore take account of the results of the joint West of England SHMA. Needs not being met within Bristol's boundaries must be met by its neighbouring authorities, including BANES.

Change Ref. SPC28**Plan Ref.:** Diagram 4**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 4532 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Silverwood Partnership Ltd / JE Sheppard & Sons**Agent ID:** 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC28

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Policy CP13 – Infrastructure Provision

Whilst no objection is made to the principle of this policy, there is no reference to the guidance contained within CIL Regulations particularly Regulation 122 and the need for such contributions to be fair, reasonable and proportionate to the development.

Change Required

Reference needs to be made within Policy CP13 or the supporting text to the CIL Regulations and to the fact that contributions would only be requested when clearly justified.

Policy 28 Infrastructure Requirements

There is no objection of this policy, in principle, which requires infrastructure needs for and arising from development. However, it must be demonstrated that the requirement complies with the guidance in NPPF and the Community Infrastructure Levy 2010 (CIL) Regulation 122 i.e. that it is reasonable, necessary and proportionate to the development being proposed.

Concern is therefore raised to the requirements within this policy to fund specific and essential infrastructure and provision not in the Regulation 123. It is unclear what is meant by these phrases clearly if the Policy is seeking contributions not sanctioned by NPPF or CIL, then there is no justification for the funding sought.

There is no objection in principle to the provision of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Schedule. It is considered that such a document can provide certainty with regards the likely infrastructure improvements that need to take place and how they should be funded. However, such a document must be realistic and prepared in open discussion with the developers who will deliver the scheme. All too often the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Schedule is prepared with no discussion with developers, rendering it worthless.

Finally, support is given to the recognition that independent viability testing is at times an essential part of the development process. It is however, not necessary for every scheme to submit an independent viability assessment. The policy should also recognise that some payments may not be capable of being made but that the scheme's implementation is essential and so payments are not required.

Recommendations

- i.The requirement for an independent viability assessment on every scheme should be deleted;
- ii.Infrastructure Delivery Plans and Schedules should be prepared in consultation with developers;
- iii.Full definitions of specific and essential infrastructure to be provided;
- iv.Recognition should be given that some development may be not be able to fund all of the required infrastructure provision and deferred or no payments will be required.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC29

Plan Ref.: Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 93

Comment Number: 1

Respondent Name: Mrs Jacqui Ashman

Respondent Organisation: Highways Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC29

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions . These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements .

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Proposed additional strategic development

The Agency acknowledges the changes shown in the Key Diagram which reflects the revised housing figures . Generally the Agency is supportive of growth that will benefit the economy as long as there is the infrastructure in place to support development or that there will be by the time development becomes operational. As there are no specific development site boundaries or proposals at this stage for the strategic areas where the Green Belt is being altered to accommodate the development , the Agency cannot comment on specifics .

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 276 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett**Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust**Agent ID:** 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC29

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Key Diagram shows the total and the split of employment and housing numbers across the district. The figures should be adjusted to take advantage of the capacity on land adjoining Odd Down. This location is capable of accommodating up to 1000 dwellings.

The Inspector together with the Council will need to decide how the additional capacity at Odd Down should be made up and subsequently amend the Key Diagram.

The HFT propose that the capacity could be made up from:

1. relocating proposed housing in FZ 2/3 in Bath (Policy B1&2)and Keynsham (Policy KE2)
2. providing additional housing need at Bath, including affordable housing and a Care Village (Policy DW1)

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

3. relocating proposed housing from Green Belt site at Weston (Policy B3 B) to Odd Down
4. relocating proposed housing from Green Belt sites at Keynsham (Policy KE1 and KE3 & KE 4) to Odd Down
5. relocating proposed housing from Green belt site at Whitchurch RA 5
6. A combination of any of these changes above resulting in a further 700 dwellings being located at land adjoining Odd Down .

The reasoned justification is given in the earlier representations given by HFT to the dCS and to the PCdCS and to this PC CS 2013.

Change to the policy requested:

The key Diagram 4 should be modified as follows:

The number of homes at Bath should be increased by up to 700 dwellings to 7700 new dwellings.

The key should identify the land adjoining Odd Down (and others) with the same yellow strategic location designation as Somerdale and Bath Riverside. The key should identify the scale of development at odd down as 1000 homes.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 234 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Agent ID: 27 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC29

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Housing Requirement

Other representations submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey demonstrate that the Core Strategy continues to fail to meet the full, objectively assessed residential needs of the area. Taylor Wimpey instructed consultants to review this need using PopGroup modelling. This concluded that the current approach of the Core Strategy would result in a substantial un-met need of up to 6,500 dwellings in the period to 2031 and that the true need for BANES was up to 1,030 dwellings per annum. Taylor Wimpey therefore considers that there is a need to substantially increase the level of new housing identified in the Core Strategy and that the Somer Valley represents an opportunity for doing so. This includes the land at Monger Lane, Midsomer Norton which lies outside of the Green Belt and has been demonstrated by both the SHLAA and the planning application to be an appropriate and sustainable site for development.

Change to the policy requested:

1. An increase in the overall housing requirement for the District as sought in other representations submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey;
2. A reassessment of the level of development appropriate for the Somer Valley; and
3. The identification of specific appropriate sites including land at monger Lane, Midsomer Norton.

Respondent Number: 4712 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC29

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Without prejudice to assessment of SP23, Support the principle of the Change reference SPC29 (Page No. 21 of the Draft Core Strategy), to 'amend the housing and employment figures for Bath, Keynsham, the Somer Valley and Rural Areas'. – amends RC11.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC31

Plan Ref.: Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC31 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change to the policy requested:

PHSV support the identification of South West Keynsham as an appropriate location for a strategic Green Belt release. However, the indicative location shown on the Changes to Diagram 4 is misleading because it only shows land to the South of Keynsham, not to the South West of Keynsham. As in the case of comments on proposed changes at Odd Down, we consider Part 1 Local Plan should identify a specific boundary for comment in order to enable housing development to be brought forward.

Respondent Number: 246 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE **Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC31 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Please see Combe Hay Parish Council's detailed comments relating to SPC 88.

Change to the policy requested:

In Diagram 4 – delete the blue star at the Land Adjoining Odd Down.

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC31 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;" The allocations at Odd Down and Weston will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Respondent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC31

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;” The allocation at Odd Down will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Respondent Number: 4524 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:**
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Cardinal Close Residents

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC31

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC31 objection

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Respondent Number: 4721 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Respondent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC31

Plan Reference: Diagram 4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

Exclude the proposals to amend the general extent of the green belt at Weston. The proposals to develop land in the green

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

belt at Weston are unsound.

Respondent Number: 4723	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name: Jacquie Murray & Robert Black	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC31		Plan Reference: Diagram 4	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:
Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:
Exclude the proposals to amend the general extent of the green belt at Weston. The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Respondent Number: 4763	Comment Number: 5	Respondent Name: Terrence Hiskens	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC31		Plan Reference: Diagram 4	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:
The five fundamental aims of the Green Belt should be preserved. The NPPF keeps the requirement to retain the fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The allocation of land at Weston is fundamentally opposed to this with development proposed in the open countryside.

Change to the policy requested:
Delete Weston proposal from diagrams and maps.

Change Ref. SPC34 **Plan Ref.: Table 3**
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 470	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Rob Withey	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC34		Plan Reference: Table 3	
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:
I would question the reference made to broadband speed.
The words used “adequately fast” means nothing, the Europeans haved agreed a speed of 24mbps, so why don’t we?
This technology will help businesses and will attract new ones!
It will allow more people to work from home as well.
I would like to see not only all existing homes and businesses upgraded but also a condition be made for all new developments.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC37

Plan Ref.: Para 2.03

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC37

Plan Reference: Para 2.03

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

As a World Heritage Site, Bath is committed to upholding the World Heritage Convention, an agreement entered into by central Government. The Local Authority does not therefore have the authority to undermine this Government undertaking, though it has in the past made plans and decisions that contravene the obligations in the Convention. It is important therefore that the Core Strategy recognises a key element in the Inscription for Bath so that the damage done in the past is not continued into the future.

The Inscription recognises the scale of buildings and the spaces that form part of the World Heritage landscape as being important contributions to the “homogeneous appearance” of the Site. The desire for additional housing should not be at the expense of the qualities that give Bath its character. The Core Strategy goes somewhat towards this with the introduction of a building heights strategy, but there is a need to restrict the opportunities for the excuse of exceptional reasons to be used to circumvent endorsed policy. For instance there is an adopted Supplementary Planning Document for the Western Riverside that specifically restricts buildings to a maximum of six stories, but that did not stop permission being granted for a nine-storey building as a “landmark” building; when the six-storey blocks are already at least three storeys higher than anything around them and make their own very conspicuous landmark.

Change to the policy requested:

This raised its international profile as a tourist destination and has sharpened debate about how Bath should change and develop change and development should be managed to retain its homogeneous character and what 'sustainability' means for the city and its future.

Change Ref. SPC38

Plan Ref.: Bath Strategic Issues 2

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC38

Plan Reference: Bath Strategic Issues 2

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We do not agree with the re-writing of the wording on the Bath World Heritage Site in the para BATHS WHS status and environmental challenge are not an obstacle to economic growth if is part of strong band on incentive to and enable economic growth. Wording removed and replace by prosperity.

Change to the policy requested:

Our concern is that the policy is too restrictive on the WHS on economic growth especially with the need for regeneration of Western Riverside North Slove and Southern Quay area around Avon site car park and the waterfront would like strong

warding (WORDING?) on regeneration and economic growth along the line NP policy Framework.

Change Ref. SPC39

Plan Ref.: Bath Strategic Issues 7

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 197 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Bray **Respondent Organisation:** Railfuture Severnside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC39 **Plan Reference:** Bath Strategic Issues 7

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

We consider the amended sentence “The city imports workers from beyond its boundaries, particularly from the market towns of West Wiltshire” to be incomplete. Towns in North Wiltshire, notably Corsham and Chippenham, also provide large numbers of commuters travelling similar distances into Bath. We see no logical reason for not including the North Wiltshire towns in this policy statement, particularly as the lack of a railway station at Corsham contributes to congestion on the A4, although investment in electrification and the Greater Bristol Metro project will present opportunities to provide one.

Change to the policy requested:

In our view the sentence needs further amendment to read “The city imports workers from beyond its boundaries, particularly from the market towns of North and West Wiltshire.”

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC39 **Plan Reference:** Bath Strategic Issues 7

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Since the Core Strategy was drafted, the MOD has moved almost its entire workforce, some 5,000 employees, to Abbey Wood. As a result, the figures quoted are out of date. Most of the MOD employees living in Bath now commute to Bristol, and with children in Bath schools are unlikely to do otherwise. On the other hand, commuters from Wiltshire and towns to the south of Bath who were MOD employees will now be travelling to Bristol rather than Bath, cutting down the imported workers (and their retail spend).

There is probably insufficient time to establish accurate revised figures within the Core Strategy timescale so the best available solution is to note that the statistics are out of date.

Change to the policy requested:

When assessed before the transfer of the MOD to Abbey Wood, there was a significant imbalance between the resident workforce and jobs in the city. The main place of employment for about 30% of the resident workforce was outside Bath and the city imported many workers from beyond its boundaries, particularly from the market towns of West Wiltshire. As a result of the MOD transfer, those commuting out can be expected to increase and those commuting in to decrease.

Respondent Number: 4607 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** JC & PA Elliot-Newman and

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC39

Plan Reference: Bath Strategic Issues 7

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

It is incorrect that the 'imported' workers are 'particularly from the market towns of West Wiltshire'.

Such workers would not be approaching Bath from the North and the West.

Heavy congestion is experienced daily on the A4 and A36 from the West, on Newbridge Road and the Upper and Lower Bristol Roads. Use of the Park and Ride Site at Newbridge is evident.

Also from the A46 / M4 junction to the north of Bath, particularly in the lanes linking Lansdown and the A420 junction at Tog Hill; the expanded Park and Ride Site on Lansdown; through the narrow and frequently single lane traffic routes of Weston High Street, Weston Lane, Weston Park and Weston Road, as well as on Combe Park and onwards towards the City Centre.

Heavy congestion at the Windsor Bridge on both sides of the river causes long tail backs in all directions.

Access on all routes to the RUH – the only Hospital in Bath with an Accident and Emergency treatment facility – is very problematic.

This was evident on 7th May, when an Ambulance and the following Police vehicles were separately badly blocked by opposing two way traffic on the single vehicle width available carriageway on Weston Road, near the Priory Hotel. The same blockage occurred earlier in the day to the local 20C bus.

No reference has been found to any transport link improvements, nor to the very obvious need to establish a roundabout at the access to and from the Newbridge Park and Ride site

Change to the policy requested:

Correction and re-evaluation of the statement made in SPC39, plus resultant linked changes in the reasoning behind the Core Strategy

Respondent 4612 **Comment** 2 **Respondent****Number:****Number:****Name:****Respondent** The Elms Weston Bath**Organisation:** Management Co**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC39

Plan Reference: Bath Strategic Issues 7

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

It is incorrect that the 'imported' workers are 'particularly from the market towns of West Wiltshire'.

Such workers would not be approaching Bath from the North and the West.

Heavy congestion is experienced daily on the A4 and A36 from the West, on Newbridge Road and the Upper and Lower Bristol Roads. Use of the Park and Ride Site at Newbridge is evident.

Also from the A46 / M4 junction to the north of Bath, particularly in the lanes linking Lansdown and the A420 junction at Tog Hill; the expanded Park and Ride Site on Lansdown; through the narrow and frequently single lane traffic routes of Weston High Street, Weston Lane, Weston Park and Weston Road, as well as on Combe Park and onwards towards the City Centre.

Heavy congestion at the Windsor Bridge on both sides of the river causes long tail backs in all directions.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Access on all routes to the RUH – the only Hospital in Bath with an Accident and Emergency treatment facility – is very problematic.

This was evident on 7th May, when an Ambulance and the following Police vehicles were separately badly blocked by opposing two way traffic on the single vehicle width available carriageway on Weston Road, near the Priory Hotel. The same blockage occurred earlier in the day to the local 20C bus.

No reference has been found to any transport link improvements, nor to the very obvious need to establish a roundabout at the access to and from the Newbridge Park and Ride site

Change to the policy requested:

Correction and re-evaluation of the statement made in SPC39, plus resultant linked changes in the reasoning behind the Core Strategy

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC39

Plan Reference: Bath Strategic Issues 7

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whilst the issue of community (COMMUNTING?) being the private car, bus or Greater Bristol Rail Network from Warminster, Westbury, Trowbridge, Bradford on Avon, Avoncliffe, and Freshford is correct 30% of the work force.

Change to the policy requested:

The Bath policy fails in Transport and Rail use terms reflect the economic and housing growth both in Western Wiltshire / North Wilts including Chippenham, Corsham / Melksham and Rail link and proposed new station at Corsham. Improvement in Melksham rail corridor between Westbury, Melksham, Chippenham, Corsham and Bath or community from Frome, Westbury, Wells, Shepton Mallet, Street / Glastonbury to Bath or Radstock, Midsomer Norton by Bus services. The policy needs to reflect Bath City Region's role.

Change Ref. SPC41**Plan Ref.: Bath Strategic Issue 13 (now 14)****Development Location: Comment on general development locations**

Respondent Number: 4520 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC41

Plan Reference: Bath Strategic Issue 13 (now 14)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The plateau is a favoured foraging area for the very rare and protected Horseshoe Bat. Development would be very detrimental to this European endangered species. For this reason I object to development and I consider it unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC43**Plan Ref.: Para 2.06****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 265	Comment Number: 5	Respondent Name: Mr Patrick Hutton	Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog
-------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC43

Plan Reference: Para 2.06

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Too much importance is being placed on 'The Future for Bath'. This document was never given a proper public consultation and as a result it remains unadopted. It contained some absolute horrors as far as preserving the character of the World Heritage Site is concerned, so its reference here is in direct conflict with SPC42.

Change to the policy requested:

In 2006 the Council published though did not offer for public scrutiny 'The Future for Bath' in which it attempted to define the essence of the city ...

Change Ref. SPC44**Plan Ref.: Para 2.07****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 265	Comment Number: 6	Respondent Name: Mr Patrick Hutton	Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog
-------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC44

Plan Reference: Para 2.07

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Because 'The Future for Bath' inaccurately defined Bath, the claim for an “authentic development programme” is untrue. To those who understand Georgian urban planning, recent developments are neither distinctive nor authentic: The DNA of Bath, using the terminology of SPC43, or “Bathness” as it is referred to in the local press, is a combination of scale, rhythm, proportion and a limited palette of materials, and all of these have to be present and accurately reflected for authenticity. Southgate has the wrong vertical proportions and the wrong horizontal alignments, and the Western Riverside is just an exercise in cramming as many too-tall recurring cube designs into a given land area as possible with no heed paid to scale, rhythm or proportion. The use of Bath stone does not automatically make a development compatible with the Outstanding Universal Value.

Similarly, because there is no Design Code defining a minimum design life for developments, the claim for “enduring” developments lasting “well into the future” is also untrue. Southgate Shopping Centre will last about 30 years, Western Riverside about 50 years, which are pale shadows of the 200+ years life expectancy of the Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian traditional building methods. Much of that which has been built since about 1960 has to be considered disposable in that it will not last a century. This means that for the foreseeable future there will never be views of Bath from any of the popular viewing points that doesn't include building sites with cranes.

Change to the policy requested:

The Bath spatial strategy has been prepared against the background of this regeneration agenda in the hope that it contributes to the realisation of a distinctive and authentic development programme for the city. As an international cultural asset, well considered and high quality growth needs to be a key principle guiding the overall level, type and design of new development. The strategy prioritises the creation of enduring developments, places and neighbourhoods over 'planning by numbers' in order to deliver relatively short term targets. Subject to suitable Design Codes being defined it

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

seeks to shape development that will be appreciated and used well into the future and to deflect ill-conceived proposals that might be rejected within a generation.

Change Ref. SPC46**Plan Ref.: Vision for Bath****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC46

Plan Reference: Vision for Bath

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC 46
 SPC 85
 SPC 150
 SPC 171
 SPC 183
 SPC 184
 and to the omission of Planning Policies NE.1 and NE.2 from the list of "Saved Policies" from the 2007 Local Plan

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC46

Plan Reference: Vision for Bath

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Objection

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC46

Plan Reference: Vision for Bath

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Objections

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:****Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton**

Respondent Number: 828	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 149 **Agent Name:** Martin Bailey**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC46

Plan Reference: Vision for Bath

Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1) Whilst mentioned earlier in the draft Core Strategy, the concept of the Enterprise Area appears to be introduced in this proposed change, paragraph 2.09. Whilst it is of considerable significance, it is rather meaningless unless it is defined:

- What exactly is it?
- What is its extent?
- Who has defined it?
- What is its purpose?
- What is the vision for the Enterprise Area in the Core Strategy?

The Enterprise Area is now a key part of the Vision & Spatial Strategy for the City of Bath. Therefore, it is essential that these matters should be briefly explained early in paragraph 2.09

2) Related to the above comment, it is to be noted that, whilst the intention manifestly has been to replace the term “Western Corridor” with “Enterprise Area”, this has not happened universally in the Composite Core Strategy Document (March 2013), for example paragraph 2.04 item 11 (page 26) refers to Western Corridor). There are numerous other examples.

3) Also related to this comment, Diagram 6 (showing the Central Area and Enterprise Area) has no cross reference in the text and needs to appear earlier.

Change to the policy requested:

Add an additional paragraph in 2.09 to introduce the Enterprise Area and address the basic questions itemised above. Bring forward diagram 6 to this location and cross refer to it.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226	Comment Number: 8	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Radstock Action Group
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC46

Plan Reference: Vision for Bath

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Yet again this amended section reveals the willingness of the authority to consider Bath as separate from the rest of the area. We note the addition of ‘Where possible the built environment will evolve in a more energy and resource efficient manner appropriate to the Bath context’. Whilst we entirely support this principle, we regret that the authority shows no intention to apply such worthy positions to the rest of the communities.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Change Ref. SPC47**Plan Ref.: Diagram 5****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC47

Plan Reference: Diagram 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Diagram 5 Bath Spatial Strategy shows the location of strategic development at Bath.

The diagram should indicate the broad location of Odd Down and add an appropriate note to define the scale of housing and of jobs and the provision of a Care village.

The figures should be adjusted to take advantage of the capacity on land adjoining Odd Down. This location is capable of accommodating up to 1000 dwellings.

The Inspector together with the Council will need to decide how the additional capacity at Odd Down should be made up and subsequently amend the Diagram 5.

The HFT propose that the capacity could be made up from:

1. relocating proposed housing in FZ 2/3 in Bath (Policy B1&2)and Keynsham (Policy KE2)
2. providing additional housing need at Bath, including affordable housing and a Care Village (Policy DW1)
3. relocating proposed housing from Green Belt site at Weston (Policy B3 B) to Odd Down
4. relocating proposed housing from Green Belt sites at Keynsham (Policy KE1 and KE3 & KE 4) to Odd Down
5. relocating proposed housing from Green belt site at Whitchurch RA 5
6. A combination of any of these changes above resulting in a further 700 dwellings being located at land adjoining Odd Down .

The location is capable of supporting a further 500 new jobs as part of a mixed use development. The need for a Care Village is set out by HFT. This would be of significant scale so as to be strategic in terms of bath's needs for an elderly population.

The reasoned justification is given in the earlier representations given by HFT to the dCS and to the PCdCS and to this PC CS 2013.

Change to the policy requested:

The Diagram 5 should be modified as follows: Insert

The land adjoining Odd Down is released from the Green Belt in order to provide for 1000 homes, at least 500 jobs and a Care Village.

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC47

Plan Reference: Diagram 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;" The allocations at Odd Down and Weston will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name: Mrs Deborah Bensley	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC47		Plan Reference: Diagram 5	
Development Location: Comment on general development locations			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;” The allocation at Odd Down will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Respondent Number: 4524	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Cardinal Close Residents
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC47		Plan Reference: Diagram 5	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

SPC47 objection

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Respondent Number: 4721	Comment Number: 8	Respondent Name: Mr & Mrs Ziemniak	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC47		Plan Reference: Diagram 5	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

Please see changes sought

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

SPC47 Indicate areas where land will be released from the Green Belt to accommodate additional dwellings and employment floorspace.

The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston area of land adjoining Weston to be excluded from these areas are unsound.

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC47 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 5

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC47 Indicate areas where land will be released from the Green Belt to accommodate additional dwellings and employment floorspace.

The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston area of land adjoining Weston to be excluded from these areas are unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4763 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Terrence Hiskens **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC47 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 5

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The five fundamental aims of the Green Belt should be preserved. The NPPF keeps the requirement to retain the fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The allocation of land at Weston is fundamentally opposed to this with development proposed in the open countryside.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete Weston proposal from Diagram 5.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 283 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Prior Park College & Paragon School

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** St Catherine's Court

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC47 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support: **Change to the policy requested:**

Diagram 5 – Bath Spatial Strategy:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The College and Paragon School objects to the Bath Spatial Strategy diagram. Despite revisions to indicate the location of the strategic housing allocations at Ensleigh and Odd Down, the changes do not take the opportunity to identify or define the College site, which is currently designated as a major developed site within the Green Belt. We would also a new designation for the Paragon Site for the reasons stated above. Other major institutions such as the University of Bath and Bath Spa University are identified. The College seeks clarity on the future of the designation, and requests that the College is identified as a major developed site in the Green Belt.

Change Ref. SPC49**Plan Ref.: Diagram 5****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading **Respondent Organisation:** Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC49

Plan Reference: Diagram 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We note the proposed changes to diagram 5 showing the extended area for flood mitigation measures, in light of the findings of the Bath Flood Risk Management Project (Black & Veatch, February 2013). We support this change, but have some concerns whether the diagram is detailed or specific enough to sufficiently safeguard land required to deliver required flood mitigation measures (e.g. improved conveyance areas). As these measures are critical to delivery of regeneration along the river corridor, we would recommend the diagrams show the safeguarded areas more specifically. We consider this important to ensure any proposals coming forward along the river corridor do not compromise the preferred approach put forward in the Black & Veatch report.

Change to the policy requested:

Using Appendix D of the Bath Flood Risk Management Project as a basis we would recommend the diagrams supporting the plan be amended to show the safeguarded areas for required flood risk management works more accurately.

For information the text in the key on Diagram 5 also still refers to a 'flood storage facility'. This text should be updated to reflect the preferred approach to flood risk management.

Change Ref. SPC50**Plan Ref.: Diagram 5****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 228 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Websper **Respondent Organisation:** Pulteney Estate Residents' Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC50

Plan Reference: Diagram 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

(a) SPC72, SPC50, SPC61 - Central Area Boundary (was Ref 17 (pages 33,37,38,39) Diagrams 5,6,7 and 8 (i)) PERA supports the BANES amendment to the Central Area boundary such that it will not encompass the Recreation Ground/North Parade Road. However, the Central Area boundary is still proposed as drawn along the river walkway between Pulteney Bridge and North Parade Bridge (on the EASTERN side of the river).

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

This boundary still leaves open the introduction of unspecified commercial ‘mixed-uses’, “associated uses”, or ‘active frontages’ along the river as part of an extended Central Area. Again such a proposal is seen as UNSOUND, as commercial uses have not been justified in the Draft Core Strategy.

BANES has claimed in its notes to Ref 17 that concerns about “a wide range of commercial uses” is unfounded. It has come to light since that BANES and Arena 1865 is proposing 1,858 sq m (20,000 sq ft) of city centre commercial activities, including bars, restaurants, retail units, and as previously noted “banqueting facilities”, on the river frontage part of the Recreation ground site; and a hotel and conference centre development. Such proposals have not been justified in the Core Strategy and is contrary to the evidence given previously to the Inspector by BANES.

PERA’s view is that only a limited and appropriate level of ancillary uses is needed to protect local residents from the possibility of increased nuisance from intensification of use. The levels of commercial uses Arena 1865 and the Recreation Ground Trustees (BANES) are proposing will create unacceptable nuisance to local residents.

Change to the policy requested:

The amended Recreation Ground boundary is UNSOUND. To avoid any ‘creep’ of city centre uses on the Recreation Ground riverside, and to protect local residents amenity, that the boundary is amended to be on the west bank of the river.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Respondent Number: 309 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Rachael Hushon **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC50 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 5

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I support the BANES amendment to the Central Area boundary such that it will not encompass the Recreation Ground/North Parade Road. However, the Central Area boundary is still proposed as drawn along the river walkway between Pulteney Bridge and North Parade Bridge (on the EASTERN side of the river).

This boundary still leaves open the introduction of unspecified commercial ‘mixed-uses’ along the river as part of an extended Central Area encroaching into a residential neighbourhood. This boundary creep could lead to the introduction of bars, clubs, hotels, and retail uses, along the ‘active river frontage’. Again such a proposal is UNSOUND, as commercial uses have not been consulted upon or justified in the Draft Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

No reference to the “east” side of the river in this policy is now needed

Change Ref. SPC51**Plan Ref.: Policy B1(1)****Development Location: Comment on general development locations**

Respondent Number: 4520 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC51 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1(1)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The South Stoke/Odd Down plateau is within the southern extension of the AONB which has the highest rate of protection against urban development unless there is an overwhelming and proven national or local need. This is not proven and therefore should be considered both unsound and of dubious legality .

Change to the policy requested:
Respondent Number: 4692 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:**
Respondent Organisation: Grainger plc
Agent ID: 123 **Agent Name:** Savills (L&P)
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC51

Plan Reference: Policy B1(1)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We acknowledge the importance attached to the preservation of the natural and built environment and the significance of these considerations in planning for the future growth of Bath. Indeed, the combination of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage Site present challenges for the Local Planning Authority in planning to deliver the strategic scale of growth required to meet the needs of the City. However, it is essential that the Authority respond positively to the challenge and carefully balance the preservation of natural and historic environmental assets with the achievement of equally important social and economic objectives.

Bath is a significant city in the south west and an important economic base for the sub-region. It has a major role to play in supporting the Government's and West of England Local Economic Partnership's ambitious plans for economic growth. Similarly, Bath has a large resident population and is an attractive location to live. It is incumbent upon the local planning authority to put in place plans which seek to address the housing needs of the local population and also to support economic growth objectives. These vital social and economic objectives are supported not only by the NPPF but also various Ministerial Statements, the 'Plan for Growth' and the Chancellors recent Budget Announcement.

The often competing nature of the social, environmental and economic objectives can create tension and it is therefore imperative that where there is an opportunity to delivery social and economic objectives but with only limited impact on the environment, then it is wise for the Local Planning Authority to take full advantage. It is our view that further growth can indeed be accommodated at Bath without any significant compromise to the natural or historic environment through the extension of the allocation of land adjacent to Odd Down.

The increased scale of housing growth proposed at Odd Down would support the delivery of open market and affordable housing on a suitable and deliverable site. It would also benefit the local economy directly through on-site employment provision and increased activity in the construction sector. The additional growth, details of which are provided in other representations, would therefore be entirely consistent with the overarching objectives and strategy for Bath within B1, and would add further benefits for the local community and economy without significant harm to natural or historic environmental assets.

Change to the policy requested:

Allocate additional land for development adjacent to Odd Down.
See representations to Policy B3A for details.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations
Respondent Number: 281 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy

Respondent Organisation: Natural England
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC51

Plan Reference: Policy B1(1)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Development on the edge of Bath

Bath has been identified as the most sustainable location for new development options, as judged against the SA/SEA social and economic objectives. Nonetheless the Plan assessment documents acknowledge that all options will involve green field development and could result in adverse impacts, including on landscape, ecology and heritage interests.

Two of the sites identified for development on the edge of Bath are located within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB). The NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs which, along with National Parks and the Broads, have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape. The NPPF is also clear that major development in these designated areas should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest.

We are satisfied that the Council is aware of the special consideration that must be given to allocating development within an AONB and that the assessments undertaken to support the Plan have demonstrated a need for some development within the AONB; however we would strongly advise that further assessment will be needed to determine the extent to which detrimental effects on the AONB could be moderated.

Based on the assessments undertaken to date and our knowledge of the proposed Bath sites, we consider that the land at Twerton and lower slopes at Weston are the most sensitive in landscape terms and where proposed development would be most likely to result in the greatest adverse impacts on the Cotswolds AONB.

We are pleased to note that Bath and its environs are clearly recognised as being particularly sensitive in the Plan and we strongly agree. However, although the impacts of development options on landscape and biodiversity are likely to be most significant for sites on the edge of Bath, we are largely satisfied that the Council has undertaken an evidence led assessment of alternative locational and site options, in accordance with the NPPF, and that the rationale for the preferred options is clear and reasonable.

Notwithstanding this and as advised above, we also consider that the site assessments would benefit from a more detailed appraisal of the effects of development on the purposes and the special qualities of the Cotswolds AONB and we strongly advise that this work is done ahead of the Placemaking Plan to help determine the capacity for new housing within individual proposal sites. We would expect the AONB landscape assessment and guidelines and the Management Plan will be particularly relevant. We also suggest the AONB team and Conservation Board would be well placed to advise further and we would also welcome the opportunity to input to such an assessment.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref.** SPC53**Plan Ref.:** Policy B1 (2)(a) - (e)**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 276 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett**Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust**Agent ID:** 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC53

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (2)(a) - (e)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Economic Development Policy B1 2

The changes to this part of the policy are very confusing and on the whole provide an unhelpful picture showing continued decline in all areas of employment space while advocating a net increase in jobs of 7000 over the plan period. This does not seem sound and does not support the thrust of the LEP and the Bath Initiative that are seeking higher levels of economic growth particularly at Bath.

a) Error : The Composite draft contains different figures for planned jobs in Bath compared to the schedule of changes (only 5200 jobs instead of 7000 jobs). The correct figures are a net increase of 7000 homes. The continued change in dates and the starting point in actual jobs means the policy is hopelessly confused and will not deliver the economic growth progress recommended by the LEP and Policy DW1.

The changes suggest an actual net loss of 1500 jobs 2006-2011 against a planned net increase of 1425 jobs over the same period (draft CS 2011) i.e. a net loss of 2925 jobs against target. The overall target in 2029 is therefore reduced from 67400 in 2026 to 67200 in 2029. In effect, the changes to the CS propose a net increase of only 5500 new jobs between 2006 and 2029 in Bath. A far cry from the LEP expectations.

The Council therefore need to address the continued net reduction in jobs in the City (MOD will not help this target) and bring forward employment sites instead of closing them. The overall provision of employment in Bath will need to be much higher to meet LEP targets, probably in the region 10,000--11,000 new jobs, if the losses in 2006--2011 are taken into account as well as MOD losses 2011--2013.

b) The proposed increase in the stock of office premises to accommodate the expansion of knowledge intensive and creative employment sector is a net decline of 37,000m2 of space between 2006 – 2029 (240,000m2 > 213,000m2). How can this achieve economic growth and regeneration?

C) The proposal to reduce the net additional increase in office premises to 40,000m2 is unsound given the original enabling development figure of 85,000--100,000m2 (SCS 2006--2026). The so--called managed release of 15000-- 30,000m2 (SCS) in fact resulted in a loss of 67,000m2 between 2006--2011, according to the Council's figures. Therefore the policy of a release of a further 10,000m2 just makes the proposed development and a net increase of office /employment space less likely to be achieved. HFT recognize that this policy is reliant on the delivery in the Central Area and Enterprise Area where competing housing needs have continued to result in a year on year net loss of employment space. The area is also subject to high risk from flooding (see rep SPC 57). The Council will need to secure delivery of jobs as a priority as opposed to homes.

D) HFT support the thrust of the changes at para d however the policy should indicate the level of contribution that mixed--use, out of centre development can achieve. HFT recommend that policy wording should propose a target of 10,000 m2 of new employment at such sites with reference made to MOD sites, land adjoining Odd Down and Weston.

E) The importance of industrial floor space to the Bath mixed economy is not just realized by the retaining of land at Newbridge Riverside area. The strategy of a net increase in jobs cannot sit with such large contraction in industrial space 73,000m2 (2006-2026). The need to secure industrial /commercial sites such as Twerton Riverside if the decline is to be stopped.

Change to the policy requested:

A Correct error: The Composite draft contains different figures for planned jobs in Bath compared to the schedule of changes (only 5200 jobs instead of 7000 jobs). The correct figures are a net increase of 7000 homes.

The Council need to address the continued net reduction in jobs in the City (MOD will not help this target) and bring forward employment sites instead of closing them. The overall provision of employment in Bath will need to be much higher to meet LEP targets, probably in the region 10,000--11,000 new jobs, if the losses in 2006--2011 are taken into account as well as MOD losses 2011-2013.

B and C The strategy must provide for a larger amount of employment space to come forward than is proposed. The Council should reinstate the original target of 85,000--100,000m2 over the plan period in order to have any chance of delivering the net increase in jobs at Bath and deliver the requirements of the LEP.

D The contribution from mixed-use out-of-centre development should be at least 10,000m2 and wording should be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

inserted into para d to this effect. Locations such as MOD sites and Odd Down should be added to the policy wording.

E The need to secure further industrial /commercial sites such as Twerton Riverside if decline is to be stopped means that Twerton Riverside should be added to Newbridge Riverside in this policy.

Respondent Number: 4692 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Grainger plc

Agent ID: 123 **Agent Name:** Savills (L&P)

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC53

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (2)(a) - (e)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

With regards the housing clause within Policy B1, we support in principle the identification of land adjoining Odd Down for residential development. However, we object to the proposed scale of growth. In place of the reference to 300 dwellings, we therefore advocate the identification of land for 1,000 dwellings, alongside a care home and employment development over the duration of the plan period.

In representations to Policy B3A we explain in greater detail why we consider the land at Odd Down to be appropriate for an allocation of 1,000 dwellings and how this scale of growth could be accommodated without detrimental impact on important planning considerations.

Notwithstanding the merits of the site and the benefits that an increased allocation would provide, we also consider that an increase in the allocation is necessary to:

- (i) support the delivery of the strategic housing requirement; and
- (ii) ensure changes to the Green Belt boundary support the long-term growth needs for B&NES.

Strategic Housing Requirement

We have concerns that the scale of growth proposed on large sites in the Central Area and Enterprise Area (3,000 dwellings) represents an extremely ambitious, if not unrealistic target. There are many constraints to the redevelopment of brownfield land within the Central Area and Enterprise Area which have precluded redevelopment during previous years, despite the much stronger economic conditions. The challenges in managing flood risk and remediation are but two of the many constraints affecting a large number of potential development opportunities within this area. These constraints challenge not only deliverability, but also the ability to achieve an appropriate architectural solution which responds to the unique character of central Bath.

We therefore have significant doubts as to whether the Central Area / Enterprise Area is capable of accommodating the scale of growth envisaged on suitable sites, consistent with the planning objectives set out within the Local Plan. Whilst we do not object in principle to the redevelopment of sites in such locations, the likelihood of delivering 3,000 new dwellings during the plan period is highly questionable and this should be addressed within the Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan.

Green Belt

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear at paragraph 83 that “authorities should consider their Green Belt Boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period”. This sentiment is further reiterated in paragraph 85 which states that “when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should: ... satisfy themselves that Green Belt Boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period”.

The proposed changes to the submitted Core Strategy include revisions to the Green Belt boundary, however, these are relatively minor in the context of the overall scale of growth proposed and will not in our view endure beyond the plan period, as envisaged by the NPPF. The local planning authority recognise in Policy DW1 that it is necessary to review the Core Strategy on a five yearly basis, a key component of which will be a review of the strategic housing requirement. The relatively minor changes to the Green Belt boundary do not in our view fully tackle the growth needs of Bath for the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

duration of the Local Plan and ignore the potential implications of periodic Local Plan reviews every five years.

Given that the Green Belt boundary is to be redrawn at this stage in order to accommodate the scale of growth proposed within this Local Plan, it is highly likely that additional Green Belt releases would be needed to allow for growth in the future. Putting to one side the concerns we have outlined above regarding the deliverability of brownfield land within the urban area, such land is a finite resource. The Council has sought to maximise the supply from this source and it is therefore reasonable to conclude that opportunities for new housing from brownfield redevelopment sites will have diminished as a result.

The NPPF is very clear about the need to plan for the long-term, beyond a single plan period. In view of the above it is almost inconceivable that there would not need to be a further release of land from the Green Belt in 2029, if not before following one of the planned periodic reviews. A Green Belt review has been completed and detailed landscape, transport and environmental capacity studies undertaken of the key locations to be removed from the Green Belt. The assessment of the land adjacent to Odd Down for example clearly demonstrates the suitability of a wider area which could accommodate approximately 750 dwellings. There is no reason not to take the necessary long-term decisions now and put in place plans which have a reasonable chance of preserving the openness of the remaining Green Belt land.

Change to the policy requested:

We recommend that additional land be identified on the edge of Bath at Odd Down to accommodate an increased scale of housing growth.

The land adjoining Odd Down is an entirely appropriate location to provide additional housing growth and embed greater flexibility into the delivery strategy. For the reason outlined in other representations, we consider the land capable of accommodating up to 1,000 dwellings without any detrimental impact upon important planning considerations. Allocating the land for the appropriate scale of growth at this stage will enable the comprehensive masterplanning of the area and implementation of infrastructure capable of supporting the larger scale growth proposed. It will also ensure that further releases of land from the Green Belt are not required in this location in future.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 820 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** St James's Investments and Tesco UK Stores

Agent ID: 55 **Agent Name:** Terence O'Rourke Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC53 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (2)(a) - (e)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Our client supports the economic changes to Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy, which clearly set out the council's target to increase jobs and modern employment space over the plan period. The revised figures already show the loss of jobs and employment space that has occurred since 2006 (to 2011) within the city, further emphasizing the need to stimulate new growth and employment.

Our client also supports the revised wording of bullet 'd' which states 'Focus new office development within and adjoining the city centre and enable appropriate levels of business space in mixed-use out-of- centre development sites'. To achieve this objective the council will need to support appropriate employment led redevelopment proposals that come forward on the limited number of sites in and around the city centre.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 828 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Deeley Freed Estates Ltd**Agent ID:** 149 **Agent Name:** Martin Bailey**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC53

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (2)(a) - (e)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Restructuring of the nature stated in Policy B1 (2) 'Economic Development' and at the scale indicated is supported. However, the terminology used in subsection (d) of the draft policy does not provide a clear basis for investment decisions. It needs to be revised to do so in order to ensure that development can be delivered without unreasonable and unnecessary delays – in accord with the principles in NPPF paragraphs 6, 21, 150 and 154.

In sub-paragraph (d):

- The word “enable” is used without any indication of how the Council intends to enable development;
- The term “appropriate levels of business space” is meaningless and is open to wholly subjective interpretation;
- The phrase “business space in mixed use out of centre development” is unhelpful and potentially confusing given that business use includes Class B1(a) offices – a main town centre use as defined in the NPPF paragraph 23 and Annex 2. Is the policy that offices are to be encouraged within mixed-use out-of-centre sites alongside research and development business (Class B1(b)) and light industrial business (Class B1©)?
- The latter two issues are especially important given that the policy (sub-paragraph (d)) provides for a substantial contraction in the demand for industrial floorspace.

Change to the policy requested:

Rephrase Policy B1(2) (d) to provide clear and reasonable guidance on the Council’s policy objectives for Business Use by type and broad location .

Change Ref. SPC54**Plan Ref.: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)****Development Location:** Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Respondent Number:** 4560 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** IM Properties Ltd & Linden Homes**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Policy B1 (3 a-b) (Document reference SPC54)

We believe that the redevelopment as outlined in policy B1 for the Ensleigh MOD Site is potentially unachievable and would result in overdevelopment given the site, scale and site specific issues across the combined sites. National Planning Policy Framework requires densities and development to be considered against its site specific considerations (NPPF paras. 47 & 58). It is our professional view that even if the site is developed at a significant density (circa 30 units per acre) to meet the housing numbers proposed, this would be contrary to the local environment and lead to an unacceptable form of development, we do not consider there is sufficient physical capacity to accommodate the scale of development proposed, without detrimental harm to the natural environment or an extension of the allocation as proposed.

We appreciate that the Council is seeking to maximise the amount of housing delivered on brownfield land to avoid releasing Green Belt land. However, the Council must take a balanced approach between the delivery of housing numbers and the provision of development set out in this policy to achieve a high quality, sustainable mix of development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

If the Council's overarching objective is to secure maximum housing on previously development sites, we challenge the aspiration to deliver employment development at this site in parallel. Based on the Council's employment study does not have a shortage of employment land in the City. The proposes provision as set out in the policy will not actively contribute to the Employment Land Supply and instead potentially dilute the Council's Core Strategy employment policies to deliver new employment at Bath Western Riverside (Core Strategy Policies B1 and B3). Based on advice from GVA's National Markets Team (dealing with office and industrial agency) there is no active commercial interest in letting space in this location and it is deemed commercially unrealistic in the short to medium term. Retention of this aspiration will sterilise development on the site.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: The quantum of housing units as set out in policy B1 is reduced to deliver a more realistic and appropriate level of development across the site; and reference to employment is deleted from the policy.

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 93 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Jacqui Ashman **Respondent Organisation:** Highways Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions . These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements .

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Proposed additional strategic development at Bath

The Agency understands that comments are sought only on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy, and acknowledges the addition to the housing land supply of approximately 720 dwellings to 2029 over three sites . Generally the Agency supports the focus of development at Bath from a sustainability perspective in order to take advantage as far as possible of existing services and infrastructure. As there are 7000 new homes proposed to 2029 it is important that impacts on the SRN are dealt with using a holistic approach to provide any necessary comprehensive mitigation.

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

For the reasons given in the comment to SPC15, there should be no automatic assumption that housing will be built on the Odd Down and Weston green belt land.

The reason why so many commute into Bath is historically because housing is so much cheaper outside Bath that anybody wanting a family home with a good sized garden found the nearby Wiltshire towns much better value for money than comparable properties in Bath. Since the widespread conversion of family homes into student accommodation, the availability of family homes has reduced considerably and the presence of high concentrations of students acts as a deterrent against any that do come onto the market. Nothing in the Core Strategy changes this scenario, with the emphasis being given to building flats rather than houses with gardens.

Out-commuting will increase now that the MOD no longer has its sites in Bath. Part of the MOD incentive for staff to move is subsidised commuting, so there is unlikely to be any significant transfer of dwellings to accompany the transfer of job location.

One of the attractions of Bath in the past has been its abundance of niche market independent shops, most of which have now abandoned the city for the nearby Wiltshire towns where shop rents are more reasonable, and Bath is now mostly the chains and franchises that can be found in any shopping mall. Niche market independent shops attract visitors and need to be encouraged, and there is nothing in the Core Strategy that distinguishes them from the general description "retail".

The universities currently have a policy that only students in their first year are accommodated on campus forcing second and third year students into accommodation off-campus, and this needs to change. Conditions attached to any future planning permissions for developments on campus can force this issue.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete all references to Weston Green Belt and Odd Down Green Belt as housing expectations.

To the extent that it is possible after the transfer of MOD staff to Abbey Wood, achieve a better balance between the overall number of jobs in the city and the resident workforce. A sufficient increase in competitively priced housing delivery and the associated growth of the labour force will reduce the need for labour to be imported from neighbouring locations. Economic diversification should reduce the need for a significant number of non-MOD workers to out-commute to other areas.

Enable small to medium sized comparison retail development that improves the shopping offer and actively encourage niche market independent shops to enhance the reputation of the city centre.

Enable the provision for additional on-campus student bed spaces at the University of Bath and at Bath Spa University, and through planning controls ensure that students who wish to can reside on campus for the duration of their course, facilitating growth in the overall number of students and/or shrinkage a slowdown in the growth of the private student lettings market.

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

The Bath Spatial Strategy shows the proposed location and scale of strategic development at Bath. Policy B1 3 a---b is amended by SPC54.

Part a)

The proposed objective of increasing the housing stock at Bath by the release of land at the edge of the City is welcomed by HFT however the overall extent of housing planned for Bath is inadequate, does not take sufficient account of the shortfall and/or backlog prior to 2006 and 2011, the impact of student housing, affordable housing need across the city, economic growth (net 7000 jobs increase) and demographic changes including ageing population.

The proposed scale of housing at Bath has been determined in this Core Strategy change not by the overall needs of the City but by the Council's assessment of its capacity through the SHLAA. The SHMA and other evidence of the Council indicate that the overall housing need at Bath is in excess of 8000 dwellings but have chosen to provide for over 1000 dwellings on green field, Green Belt locations elsewhere to the west near Keynsham and Whitchurch. The soundness of this distribution of housing away from Bath is called into question however it appears to be based in part upon assessment of the acceptable capacity at Odd Down. Reps SPC 88 address the capacity at this location in greater detail.

Shortfall and Backlog

If there was any doubt about the need for housing at Bath, then the examination of the SOCG BNES/32 shows how far the continued failure to provide for housing over the last ten years has resulted in a substantial backlog of housing supply and a large Five Year Supply figure. The agreed position was a Local Plan backlog of 851 homes (most of which occurred in Bath) and SCS 2006---2011 shortfall of 783 homes. The dCS proposed 300 dwellings /year at Bath, with an expectation of 1500 homes delivered---between 2006---2011. Actual delivery was 886 dwellings i.e. a shortfall of 614 homes. 78% of the total shortfall during this period was therefore at Bath. The amount of backlog across the district prior to 2006 is 851 dwellings however the amount attributed to Bath is not available from Council records. A conservative estimate would be at least 50% or 425 homes and if the pattern in the preceding years was a more accurate representation, then 78% or 667 homes was the scale of the backlog at Bath.

Consequently, HFT consider that between 1040 and 1280 homes represents the shortfall and backlog at Bath. This figure should be added to the current housing target of 7000 homes giving a total of 8040 ---8280 homes, i.e. 8100 homes.

The land adjoining Odd Down can make a substantial contribution to that shortfall and backlog.

The proposed development on land adjoining Odd Down, Policy B3A, cannot address the increased demands from all these areas in full, but the location can make a more valuable contribution to meeting those needs than so far proposed by the Council, as part of a mixed use scheme. Consequently HFT say that the scale of housing and of jobs should be adjusted to take advantage of the capacity on land adjoining Odd Down. This location is capable of accommodating up to 1000 dwellings, an increase of 700 dwellings , and up to 500 jobs including the provision of a Care village.

The Inspector together with the Council will need to decide how the additional capacity at Odd Down can be justified and subsequently amend the policies including B3A, as appropriate . The other relevant policy changes are shown in brackets.

The HFT propose that the capacity could be made up from:

1. relocating proposed housing in FZ 2/3 in Bath (Policy B1&2)and Keynsham (Policy KE2)
2. providing additional housing need at Bath, including shortfall and backlog, affordable housing and a Care Village (Policy DW1 Policy B1)
3. with 1 above, relocating proposed housing from Green Belt site at Weston (Policy B3 B) to Odd Down
4. relocating proposed housing from Green Belt sites at Keynsham (Policy KE1 and KE3 & KE 4) to Odd Down
5. relocating proposed housing from Green belt site at Whitchurch RA 5
6. A combination of any of these changes above resulting in a further 700 dwellings being located at land adjoining Odd Down .

In addition, the location is capable of supporting a further 500 new jobs as part of a mixed use development. This scale of development and the need for a Care Village is set out by HFT in its Rep SPC88 and SPC 186 together with supporting Reps from Tetlow King/Guinness and Savills/Graingers .

Further reasoned justification is given in the earlier representations given by HFT to the dCS and to the PCdCS and to this PC CS 2013.

The suggested amendments to Policy B 3 (a) – (b) are shown as alternatives in section 8 below, depending on the amendments sought by the Inspector or Council the following revised wording is offered :

Other relevant reps by HFT are SPC 57 Flood Risk, SPC 88.

Student Accommodation

The Council state in the schedule of changes, that the changes in SPC 54 “reflect that SHLAA identified supply is 6000-6,500 and intent to count off-campus student cluster flats towards supply”. HFT believe this approach to be misleading and will require clarification from the Inspector how student accommodation should be addressed in the overall need for Bath. In

ID/28 the Inspector raises these issues and to date there is little clarity from the Council.

The Council proposes other changes at para 7 Higher Education namely “ Enable the provision for additional on-campus student bed spaces at the University of Bath and at Bath Spa University, facilitating growth in the overall number of students and/or shrinkage a slowdown in the growth of the private student lettings market.

HFT made representations in 2011 which are just as relevant today and extracts are set out below:

Off---campus Accommodation.

The Councils assessment of the existing off---campus accommodation since 2006 is inaccurate and unreliable. BANES 31 refers to the Unite cluster flats on Lower Bristol Road as 641 bed spaces which is correct. This however cannot be translated into an average of 3.3 bed spaces per cluster flat.

Information on Charlton Court, 345 bed spaces shows that cluster flats are as follows : 7 x 3 bed, 49 x 5 bed , 5 x 6 bed. The balance are single beds or studios not cluster flats. We anticipate a similar situation at Waterside Court, where the tradition of larger cluster flats exists.

We conclude that there may be as little as 100 cluster flats on the Lower Bristol Road, not the 200 units as stated.

The impact of the closure of Somerset Place (139 units) in 2009 needs to be taken into account in computing the net gain in accommodation provision.

It is accepted that the BWR outline consent provides for up to 345 bed spaces however the precise timing and deliverability of this is still uncertain. Assuming it can be taken into account in the overall housing provision to 2026/28, we suggest that the likely level of cluster flats will be approximately 70 units rather than 104 assessed by the Council.

Overall, we suggest that the Core Strategy /SHLAA could accept the additional supply of ‘150 cluster flats’ off--- campus for the period 2006---2026/28 to add to the net housing supply figures.

In accepting this proposition, the Council will need to demonstrate how it has addressed the housing requirements particularly in Bath, generated by the growing student population pre---2006, 2006---2011 and going forward (including on---campus provisions) 2011--- 2026/28.

It is our assessment that the demand from growth in the student population from 1996 to date has been broadly equivalent to the net additional housing stock in Bath over that same period, if affordable housing and specialist housing numbers are removed.

Further, in comparing the overall requirement for bed spaces generated by the growth in student population in Bath from 1996--- 2011, with the provision of equivalent bed spaces in net new housing in Bath during the same period, (less affordable and specialist housing types), results in a substantive backlog or shortfall in bed space or put another way, ‘demand from students alone has outstripped supply of homes during this period’.

Planned future growth at Bath University will at best be met by new supply on---campus accommodation, together with an off---campus site at BWR until 2021. Thereafter, the continued growth in student accommodation will need to be accommodated by private housing as no provision is made for on or off---campus accommodation to meet this need. This has not been taken into account in the Core Strategy.

These assessments albeit worrying are conservative. They assume that students in Bath occupy private households with an average of 4.5 students per household. They assume that neither university will continue to grow at the same rate as the last 5 to 10 years and indeed that Bath Spa will suddenly cease growth altogether until 2028. The assumption is also that part---time students at either University make no demands on accommodation in Bath.

As can be deduced, the net contribution from off---campus specialist student accommodation is extremely modest during this period 2006---2026/28.

A direct comparison of demand for bed spaces compared to supply of new spaces through new private housing in Bath, less 30% affordable housing, will show that even modest growth in student population going forward to 2028, will have a significant impact on net housing stock and bed spaces.

The Council cannot simply state that their requirements, including a ratio of 1.39 homes to jobs takes account of the student growth.

Firstly, it does not address students in any significant way compared to the population balance between university students and non---students in Bath, approximately 1 to 4. It does not address the backlog of growth in student accommodation, pre 2006 and 2006---2011.

Because of the major population component assumed in the reduction in family size units in a city such as Bath, a disproportionate amount of the overall non---economic household growth for Banes (5000---6000 units according to the Council) will come from Bath. This has nothing to do with students but existing families and elderly and ageing population. The Council’s employment target of net additional jobs is 5700 in Bath. This amounts to a gross figure of nearly 8000 new jobs.

There is simply no accommodation within these headline figures for addressing a growing prosperous university sector, other than at the expense of existing private housing.

4. The Relationship between Population, Labour Supply and Employment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The Council have inserted the following words in red in this policy 4 a) which HFT consider undermines one of the fundamental objectives of the Core Strategy and calls into question the seriousness of the strategy.

A: At the margin of delivery, Achieve a better balance between the overall number of jobs in the city and the resident workforce.

Change to the policy requested:

Amend Policy B1 3)(a)---(b) as shown in red Housing

(a) Enable the development of about 6,000 7,000 new homes within the city, increasing the overall stock of housing from 40,000 to 46,000 47,000. The following distribution of housing will be planned for.

Large sites in the Central Area and Enterprise Area – 2550 3,000

Large sites in the outer neighbourhoods, including former MoD land – 2,000. Small scale intensification distributed throughout the existing urban area ---1,000 Land adjoining Weston --- 300

Land adjoining Odd Down – 1000 300

Extension to MoD, Ensleigh --- 120

SPC 54

Policy B1 3)(a)---(b)

Housing

(a) Enable the development of about 6,000 7,000 new homes within the city, increasing the overall stock of housing from 40,000 to 46,000 47,000. The following distribution of housing will be planned for.

Large sites in the Central Area and Enterprise Area – 2550 3,000

Large sites in the outer neighbourhoods, including former MoD land – 2,000.

Small scale intensification distributed throughout the existing urban area ---1,000

Land adjoining Weston --- 300

Land adjoining Odd Down – 1000 300

Extension to MoD, Ensleigh --- 120

Respondent Number: 278 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cotswolds Conservation Board

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. The Cotswolds Conservation Board ('the Board') was established by Parliament in 2004.

The Board has two statutory purposes :

- a) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and
- b) To increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.

In fulfilling these roles, the Board has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of people living in the AONB.

2. The Board considers the proposed change to Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

"Housing

(a) Enable the development of about 6,000 7,000 new homes within the city, increasing the overall stock of housing from 40,000 to 46,000 47,000. The following distribution of housing will be planned for.

Large sites in the Central Area and Enterprise Area – 3,000

Large sites in the outer neighbourhoods, including former MoD land – 2,000.

Small scale intensification distributed throughout the existing urban area -1,000

Land adjoining Weston - 300

Land adjoining Odd Down – 300

Extension to MoD, Enleigh - 120”

to be unsound.

3. The sites at Weston and Odd Down are within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. AONBs are statutorily designated under Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) in order to conserve and enhance their natural beauty.

4. Section 85 (1) of the CROW Act states:

“In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.”

5. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.9”

6. Footnote 9 states:

“9 For example, those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.”

7. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states:

“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

8. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states:

“116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

9. The Board is of the view that in proposing the use of Green Belt land at Weston and Odd Down for development the Council has given insufficient weight to

a) The location of these sites within the Cotswolds AONB

b) The statutory purpose of the designation of the AONB

c) Consideration of the restriction of development highlighted by footnote 9 of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

D) The “highest status of protection” given to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB compared to sites outside the AONB rejected by the Council; and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

e) The lack of any clear indication as to how the detrimental effect on the environment of the proposed release could be moderated.

10. With respect to point (e) it noted that the Council proposes under paragraph 2.15 of the plan to prepare a "Placemaking Plan" to indicate how development of these sites could occur. The Board submits that in the absence of such a Plan it cannot be demonstrated that the detrimental effect on the environment can be moderated.

11. With respect to paragraph 10, the Board would wish to draw the Inspector's attention to paragraph 21 of the Secretary of States letter dated 13th February 2013 with respect to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 78) Appeal by Fay & Son Ltd Highfield Farm, Tetbury, Gloucestershire GL8 8SD (Appeal Reference APP/F1610/A/11/2165778) which states:

"The Secretary of State agrees that the primary concern about the impact on the AONB is the loss of fields to housing development (IR14.53). Despite the visual improvements that would result from the landscaping proposals, and to some extent moderate the impact of the new buildings, he agrees that the loss of open fields must inevitably have a detrimental effect on the landscape and environment."

12. The Board is therefore of the view that the proposed use of AONB sites does not meet the tests as required by the CROW Act and the NPPF, which are

a) does the change conserve and enhance the AONB? And

b) does the change give the highest status of protection to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB?.

13. The Board therefore suggests that the amendment to Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b) is deleted to remove reference to the sites at Weston and Odd Down in order to make the Plan sound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Board therefore suggests that the amendment to Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b) is deleted to remove reference to the sites at Weston and Odd Down in order to make the Plan sound.

Respondent Number: 4547 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martin Davis

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

THE DISTRIBUTION/ ALLOCATION OF HOUSING TO MoD SITES SHOULD BE INCREASED TO 2600, WHERE IT IS BELIEVED THEY ONCE WERE. THIS WOULD OBIVIATE THE NEED TO DEVELOP AND BUILD ON AONB/ GREEN FIELD SITES AT ODD DOWN AND WESTON WHICH ARE OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE TO THE SETTING OF BATH AS A WORLD HERITAGE SITE

THE PROPOSED CHANGE AND PLAN IS THEREFORE UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4607 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: JC & PA Elliot-Newman and

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

No consideration has been given to expanding the housing stock to the East of the City Centre, other than the stated redevelopment of the former Warminster Road MOD site.

Section 6 of SPC54 – Shopping, indicates by the absence of any comment, that there is no scope for expanding the neighbourhood retail facilities in Weston or on Chelsea Road, yet the Proposed changes to the Core Strategy allow for an additional 300 homes at Weston

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4612 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: The Elms Weston Bath Management Co

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

No consideration has been given to expanding the housing stock to the East of the City Centre, other than the stated redevelopment of the former Warminster Road MOD site.

Section 6 of SPC54 – Shopping, indicates by the absence of any comment, that there is no scope for expanding the neighbourhood retail facilities in Weston or on Chelsea Road, yet the Proposed changes to the Core Strategy allow for an additional 300 homes at Weston

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4692 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Grainger plc

Agent ID: 123 **Agent Name:** Savills (L&P)

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

With regards the housing clause within Policy B1, we support in principle the identification of land adjoining Odd Down for residential development. However, we object to the proposed scale of growth. In place of the reference to 300 dwellings, we therefore advocate the identification of land for 1,000 dwellings, alongside a care home and employment development over the duration of the plan period.

In representations to Policy B3A we explain in greater detail why we consider the land at Odd Down to be appropriate for an allocation of 1,000 dwellings and how this scale of growth could be accommodated without detrimental impact on important planning considerations.

Notwithstanding the merits of the site and the benefits that an increased allocation would provide, we also consider that an increase in the allocation is necessary to:

- (i) support the delivery of the strategic housing requirement; and
- (ii) ensure changes to the Green Belt boundary support the long-term growth needs for B&NES.

Strategic Housing Requirement

We have concerns that the scale of growth proposed on large sites in the Central Area and Enterprise Area (3,000 dwellings) represents an extremely ambitious, if not unrealistic target. There are many constraints to the redevelopment of brownfield land within the Central Area and Enterprise Area which have precluded redevelopment during previous years, despite the much stronger economic conditions. The challenges in managing flood risk and remediation are but two of the many constraints affecting a large number of potential development opportunities within this area. These constraints challenge not only deliverability, but also the ability to achieve an appropriate architectural solution which responds to the unique character of central Bath.

We therefore have significant doubts as to whether the Central Area / Enterprise Area is capable of accommodating the scale of growth envisaged on suitable sites, consistent with the planning objectives set out within the Local Plan. Whilst we do not object in principle to the redevelopment of sites in such locations, the likelihood of delivering 3,000 new dwellings during the plan period is highly questionable and this should be addressed within the Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan.

Green Belt

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear at paragraph 83 that “authorities should consider their Green Belt Boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period”. This sentiment is further reiterated in paragraph 85 which states that “when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should: ... satisfy themselves that Green Belt Boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period”.

The proposed changes to the submitted Core Strategy include revisions to the Green Belt boundary, however, these are relatively minor in the context of the overall scale of growth proposed and will not in our view endure beyond the plan period, as envisaged by the NPPF. The local planning authority recognise in Policy DW1 that it is necessary to review the Core Strategy on a five yearly basis, a key component of which will be a review of the strategic housing requirement. The relatively minor changes to the Green Belt boundary do not in our view fully tackle the growth needs of Bath for the duration of the Local Plan and ignore the potential implications of periodic Local Plan reviews every five years.

Given that the Green Belt boundary is to be redrawn at this stage in order to accommodate the scale of growth proposed within this Local Plan, it is highly likely that additional Green Belt releases would be needed to allow for growth in the future. Putting to one side the concerns we have outlined above regarding the deliverability of brownfield land within the urban area, such land is a finite resource. The Council has sought to maximise the supply from this source and it is therefore reasonable to conclude that opportunities for new housing from brownfield redevelopment sites will have diminished as a result.

The NPPF is very clear about the need to plan for the long-term, beyond a single plan period. In view of the above it is almost inconceivable that there would not need to be a further release of land from the Green Belt in 2029, if not before following one of the planned periodic reviews. A Green Belt review has been completed and detailed landscape, transport and environmental capacity studies undertaken of the key locations to be removed from the Green Belt. The assessment of the land adjacent to Odd Down for example clearly demonstrates the suitability of a wider area which could accommodate approximately 750 dwellings. There is no reason not to take the necessary long-term decisions now and put in place plans which have a reasonable chance of preserving the openness of the remaining Green Belt land.

Change to the policy requested:

We recommend that additional land be identified on the edge of Bath at Odd Down to accommodate an increased scale of housing growth.

The land adjoining Odd Down is an entirely appropriate location to provide additional housing growth and embed greater flexibility into the delivery strategy. For the reason outlined in other representations, we consider the land capable of accommodating up to 1,000 dwellings without any detrimental impact upon important planning considerations. Allocating the land for the appropriate scale of growth at this stage will enable the comprehensive masterplanning of the area and implementation of infrastructure capable of supporting the larger scale growth proposed. It will also ensure that further releases of land from the Green Belt are not required in this location in future.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 67 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Trevor John **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

The Submitted Core Strategy is not legally compliant/sound. The NPPF says that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt land at Odd Down is not needed, as sufficient homes could be built elsewhere by increasing the density on brown field sites and by utilising under occupied properties in central Bath e.g. flats above retail shops. Also, this land is AONB land and exceptional circumstances have not been put forward for its development.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete the reference to land at Odd Down

Respondent Number: 246 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE **Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Please see Combe Hay Parish Council's detailed comments relating to SPC 88.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete – "Land adjoining Odd Down – 300" And Delete – "and at Odd Down Green Belt"

Respondent Number: 4524 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cardinal Close Residents

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

SPC54 objection

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4621 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Dr Helen Geake **Respondent Organisation:** Portable Antiquities

Agent ID: 154 **Agent Name:** Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

If this area is proposed for development, a significant threat to the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Wansdyke will ensue.

Legal problems to the proposed change

The proposed change to the Core Strategy is incompatible with the Wansdyke's status as one of the country's most important Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monuments are protected from destruction or disturbance and the impact on the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument by development is also a material consideration in the planning system. In more up-to-date guidance, Scheduled Ancient Monuments are designated 'in order to secure their legal protection in the national interest, and to secure their long-term preservation in situ' (English Heritage guidance from DCMS, March 2010, p. 11). It is not justified to destroy part of this exceptionally important monument to build housing, and BANES's promise to 'protect and enhance the open landscape character of the area' are incompatible with building 300 homes, a school, shops and a road over it.

The only effective way to protect this monument is to leave it within the Green Belt. Any development in this area will have a serious impact on the landscape setting of the site. The current proposals to a change to the Core Strategy to include this area will unavoidably conflict with the protection afforded to the monument by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Monuments Act, and contravene the UK's commitments to the protection of the historic environment set out within the Valletta Convention (1992).

The proposed changes are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. Under the NPPF, development should sustain or enhance the significance of a heritage asset, and these changes to the Core Strategy fail to accomplish this as they will destroy the open landscape context of the Wansdyke and physically destroy part of the monument itself. (NPPF PPS5 Practice Guide, June 2012, section 79.1).

It is also not sustainable development, as once the open landscape of the Wansdyke has been destroyed, it cannot be recreated. In addition, once the archaeological deposits of the monument itself have been dug away, they cannot be put back, and current understanding of the monument and methodologies to study it are tentative and under-developed (see below).

The proposed development area also lies adjacent to a conservation area and an UNESCO World Heritage Site, both designations which afford protection to the adjacent built environment. The loss of the open land and the impact of 300 new buildings and the associated infrastructure will inevitably diminish the historical context of the southern part of the city of Bath, and bring the UK's commitment to its Heritage Assets into question.

Significance of the Wansdyke

Recent research (Reynolds and Langlands 2006) has suggested a very different origin from the traditional view. Traditionally the Wansdyke has been seen as an immediately post-Roman earthwork, forming a boundary between post-Roman Bath and the Saxon precursor of Wessex. It seems more likely now that it should be dated to the late 8th century, when it could have been constructed by the Kingdom of Wessex, in similar political circumstances to those in contemporary Mercia, which famously constructed Offa's Dyke. Offa's Dyke is a thriving tourist attraction for day trippers and long-distance walkers; it just missed gaining World Heritage Site status itself in 2011, showing the importance of these long-distance boundaries.

The area which runs along the southern boundary of the Bath WHS and apparently ends close to the Cross Keys pub is of exceptional importance in understanding the monument. Beyond this to the east the route of the dyke is shadowy, until the more famous Eastern Wansdyke starts at Morgan's Hill near Calne. It is suggested that the stretch of Wansdyke along Odd Down was constructed by the Men of Somerset, and the eastern part by the Men of Wiltshire, resulting in the different character of the two stretches. But these hypotheses need testing. Topographically this is an important part of the western, Somerset Wansdyke - the last bit clearly visible. The junction between the 'known' and the 'unknown' is crucial and should not be lost to modern development at present, when we have not even formulated the right questions to ask of survey and excavation.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The boundary zone along the Wansdyke, to north and south of the monument, is also of exceptional interest. Its Roman towns (with the singular and remarkable exception of Bath, which may be significant) do not develop into medieval towns. The open landscape character of the dyke is thus particularly important in our appreciation and understanding of it and should be retained.

The Wansdyke therefore represents the creation of Wessex – which did not include Mercian Bath at that point – and shows us how early-medieval societies could come together to construct vast earthworks running over many miles.

Economic implications of the proposed changes

The proposed development would firstly entirely destroy the open landscape context (already gone to the north) and secondly remove one of the most potentially important parts of the dyke.

This neglect and destruction of visible archaeology (as well as the designations of AONB, Conservation Area, WHS and Green Belt) will spoil the 'brand' of Bath as a World Heritage Site and detrimentally affect its tourism economy.

Using the Wansdyke as a tourist attraction in its own right (as with Offa's Dyke) would improve the economy of suburban Bath, as well as other parts of North-East Somerset; destroying part of the monument in this way will not.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like 'Land adjoining Odd Down – 300' removed from SPC54 under section (a). Under section 6(e), I would like 'and at Odd Down Green Belt' removed. These changes will also require a number of other minor changes throughout the document, to adjust the numbers of homes to be provided and to adjust the accompanying diagrams.

Respondent Number: 4687	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Cllr Katie Hall	Respondent Organisation: Councillor for Lyncombe ward
--------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Wansdyke

The Wansdyke is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. This protects it against development on or near it that might cause actual or visual harm. The B&NES-commissioned study from Arup refers to the damage to the Wansdyke near Sulis Meadows. To repeat this damage to one of the last remaining publicly accessible sections of the Wansdyke would surely be unsound.

Traffic and Transport links

An access road across this land from the B3110/Southstoke Lane junction opposite the Cross Keys would cause significant damage to the AONB, the Wansdyke and the bat foraging area.

In addition, when taken in conjunction with the proposed 700 new homes on the former MOD site at Foxhill, this would cause immense pressure on neighbouring roads.

AONB

All of this site is in the Cotswold AONB. Major development within an AONB can occur only if it is in the national and local interest. The draft Core Strategy offers no evidence to support this. In fact it makes specific mention of the importance of the AONB (and green belt, see below), to the World Heritage Site setting of Bath.

The proposed amendment is in conflict with B&NES policy and is therefore unsound.

Green Belt

All of this site is in the Green Belt. There is a presumption against development in the Green Belt unless there are very special circumstances. These do not exist in this case. Secondly, a key purpose of green belts is to protect against 'coalescence'. The boundary between Southstoke and Bath is already very narrow, as noted by the recent council-commissioned Arup study on the Bristol/Bath green belt.

The proposed amendment is in conflict with B&NES policy and is therefore unsound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

World Heritage Site

Unesco makes specific reference to the landscape setting of the City of Bath. The AONB and the Green Belt are essential to this. To put the World Heritage designation at risk would damage the local tourist economy. This is not sustainable development therefore is surely unsound.

Bat Foraging

The Greater Horseshoe Bat is known to forage on a large part of this land. Light and noise pollution from the proposed development, or an access road could cause harm to this threatened species.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Respondent Number: 4611 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Sheila Sparrow

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: 153 **Agent Name:** ST8 Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Policy B1 is supported to the extent that it identifies land adjoining Weston as having potential for development and the adjustment of Green Belt boundaries accordingly.

However, the Plan should allow for flexibility in terms of delivery of the site and acknowledge that individual parcels of land may be appropriate for development on a solus basis and that development will not necessarily be delivered on a comprehensive basis.

The Weston Lower Slopes provide opportunities for the early release of various parcels of land that could make an immediate contribution to alleviating the Council's shortfall in housing land supply and redressing the backlog from the previous Plan periods. The Plan should have sufficient flexibility to allow such development to come forward immediately.

Change to the policy requested:

The policy should incorporate clarification to allow for small parcels of development to come forward immediately to address the shortfall in housing land supply and backlog from previous local plan periods.

Respondent Number: 4721 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

Delete:

Land adjoining Weston – 300 and identify alternative locations for the new homes.

Amend:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

e: enable the provision of neighbourhood retail services at Ensleigh, Warminster Road, Foxhill, Weston Green Belt and at Odd Down Green Belt

To read:
e: enable the provision of neighbourhood retail services at Ensleigh, Warminster Road, Foxhill, and at Odd Down Green Belt

The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound. Furthermore, any proposal to develop “neighbourhood retail services” in the area would undermine the existing retail units on Weston High Street.

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:
Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:
Delete:
Land adjoining Weston – 300 and identify alternative locations for the new homes.
Amend:
e: enable the provision of neighbourhood retail services at Ensleigh, Warminster Road, Foxhill, Weston Green Belt and at Odd Down Green Belt
To read:
e: enable the provision of neighbourhood retail services at Ensleigh, Warminster Road, Foxhill, and at Odd Down Green Belt
The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound. Furthermore, any proposal to develop “neighbourhood retail services” in the area would undermine the existing retail units on Weston High Street.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)
Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:
1) For reasons set out in response to Policy DW1, the plan is not sound for a host of reasons. The CS fails to establish the needs within the District for the Bath HMA or the Bristol HMA.
2) Nevertheless, it does seek to provide a locational strategy that seeks to meet only the requirements of the Bath HMA. It does not do so by identifying land outside of the HMA. If the CS were to persist with the current strategy then all development not already committed should be focused in the Bath HMA, leaving Bristol HMA ‘for another day’. Such an approach cannot of course be sound but it does highlight that the CS is a mixed solution that fails to meet the needs of anywhere. It fails to grapple properly with meeting the needs of Bath through further Green Belt releases preferring instead to distribute development to obscure parts of the District that by its own admission bear little relation to the Bath HMA.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

1) Further Green Belt releases are required in Bath as the most sustainable location within the Bath HMA. The needs of the HMA should not be met in other housing market areas.

Respondent Number: 283 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** St Catherine's Court **Respondent Organisation:** Prior Park College & Paragon School

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** St Catherine's Court

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change to the policy requested:

Policy B1 – Bath Spatial Strategy:

Despite the changes and revisions proposed for the Core Strategy, the document is wholly silent on any proposed strategy for identifying or accommodating demand for new, expanded or enhanced primary and secondary education facilities, despite extending such an approach to the two higher education institutions.

Respondent Number: 384 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Georgina Clampitt-Dix **Respondent Organisation:** Wiltshire Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Housing

Wiltshire Council fully supports the approach and strategy to identifying the housing and employment requirement contained in the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy.

The increase in housing requirement from 11,000 (averaging 550 per annum) to 12,700 (averaging 706 per annum) new homes provides more than sufficient accommodation to provide for the projected employment growth which has increased from 8,700 to 10,170 new jobs over the revised plan period. The plan period has been revised as part of the proposed changes from a period of 2006 to 2026 to 2011 to 2029 to ensure that the plan is compliant with the requirements in paragraph 157 of the NPPF that requires local authorities to preferably draw up local plans over a 15 year time horizon.

This has resulted in revised projections being prepared in the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment report (produced in March 2013) that supports the housing requirement laid down in the Local Plan. The SHMA doesn't appear to make any specific reference to how household size has been factored into the projections and this may benefit from clarification.

The updated SHMA has identified housing market areas (HMAs) across B&NES. These HMAs are those upon which the plan ultimately relies. The HMA which is adjacent to Wiltshire includes the eastern part of B&NES, a small bit of Mendip and a small bit of North Wiltshire. This HMA is considered broadly consistent with those identified in Wiltshire. This aligns with paragraph 47 of the NPPF and demonstrates that the two Core Strategies are consistent in this regard.

The approach taken seeks to balance employment and housing growth by focussing on the regeneration of urban and central areas, supported by well planned strategic Greenfield sites, in order that B&NES can meet the overall housing and employment needs of the area. This approach is supported.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Wiltshire supports the ambitions of B&NES of reducing in-commuting by enabling a shift in self containment levels from 70% to 80% whilst ensuring that the overall employment offer at Bath is improved, by providing an ambitious level of housing. This reflects the sub-regional role of Bath, which is a major strategic employment centre in the region, and ensures the sub region remains a competitive and an attractive location to live and work. This approach is broadly in conformity with that identified in the Wiltshire Core Strategy and responds to previous consultation responses and ongoing joint working with Wiltshire Council.

On balance and taking account of the evidence presented in the SHMA Update report, Wiltshire Council support the quantum of housing being proposed in the B&NES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy. The increase in the housing requirement better reflects the sub-regional role of Bath.

Wiltshire Council supports the revised housing requirement and considers that this better reflects the sub-regional role of Bath.

Wiltshire Council looks forward to continued positive engagement with B&NES to ensure that strategic issues can be addressed in a co-ordinated way.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 820 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Terence O'Rourke Ltd **Respondent Organisation:** St James's Investments and Tesco UK Stores
Agent ID: 55 **Agent Name:** Terence O'Rourke Ltd
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Our client supports the housing changes to Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy, which acknowledge the increased demand for housing within the city by increasing the proposed targets. In particular, the policy now provides a target of 3,000 new homes within the 'Central' and 'Enterprise Area' of Bath.

In order to achieve these numbers the council will need to take a positive approach to new housing development, in line with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Change to the policy requested:

None

Respondent Number: 828 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Martin Bailey **Respondent Organisation:** Deeley Freed Estates Ltd
Agent ID: 149 **Agent Name:** Martin Bailey
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The importance attributed in the proposed changes to large sites for new housing in the Central Area and Enterprise Area in Bath highlights two matters:

- i) The imperative of defining the Enterprise Area (please see Deeley Freed representation on SPC46); and
- ii) The lack of guidance in the Core Strategy regarding the intentions for Western Riverside within the Enterprise Area and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

the weakness involved in merely carrying forward Local Plan Policy GDS.1/B1.

Substantial areas in Western Riverside adjoining Upper Bristol Road and Lower Bristol Road lie outside the area for which outline planning permission has been granted to Crest Nicholson. The importance of securing investment in regenerating these areas is clear, for example from paragraphs 5(a) and (b) of Policy B1 "Bath Spatial Strategy". To ensure that such investment is attracted to these locations, the Council's intentions for this area – and the importance attributed to it – need to be made explicit in the Core Strategy. This now appears as a significant omission in the light of the proposed changes.

The omission highlights the lack of attention being paid to these locations. For example, land at Midland Road North-East facing the river is capable of delivering much-needed residential development immediately, in accord with policy, but appears to be accorded no priority.

(Comments on the SHLAA, in which the immediate deliverability of this site appears not to have been fully appreciated, are being made separately to the Council.)

Change to the policy requested:

In the paragraph under the heading "Western Riverside" (page 37 of composite version of the Core Strategy 2013) the Council's intentions for Western Riverside – in the context of the Enterprise Area – need to be made explicit, perhaps summarising the current policy and certainly cross-referring to it (together with the BWR SPD) more fully.

Respondent Number: 3152	Comment Number: 6	Respondent Name: Cllr Nicholas Coombes	Respondent Organisation:
--------------------------------	--------------------------	---	---------------------------------

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.

The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove land adjoining Odd Down and Weston from proposed changes.

Increase density and consequently housing numbers in central area and outer area (including MoD sites)

Respondent Number: 4474	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Ediston Properties Ltd
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy B1 (page 28) – Bath Spatial Strategy:

We note here that the ‘shopping’ and ‘public’ realm components of the strategy remain largely unchanged. No particular views are expressed in relation to the additional comment referenced ‘6d – focus additional convenience retail floorspace on commitments within and on the edge of existing centres’. Bath Western Riverside East is identified as a key development opportunity within the city centre and this scheme can deliver much wider potential benefits to the immediate area.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:**
Respondent Organisation: Withies Farm Landowners’ Group,
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy B1 is insufficiently justified and may not be effective since a number of its provisions are of questionable deliverability over its period.

In order for there to be clarity in the policy, there needs to be a detailed breakdown, either in the Plan or its Appendix, of the large sites on which the Council is relying to deliver the major share of development in the City of Bath.

Notwithstanding the optimism placed on the constraints of the Windsor Road Gas Holder and the Bath Upstream Flood Compensation Scheme being resolved, there remains a considerable degree of uncertainty regarding the deliverability of either, and the timescales for doing so. This is reflected in the Inspector’s Note (ID/31) of 25 March 2013. It therefore needs to be made clear in the Plan what allowance is being placed on sites which are potentially affected by these potential constraints, and the contingencies that are in place should the constraints not be resolved.

It is also far from certain that the portfolio of sites on which the Council is relying to deliver the additional quantum of homes at Bath, will yield the required capacity given the spatial strategy for the city and the weight given to protecting the World Heritage Site and its setting and to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in the Cotswolds AONB. Most particularly in this respect is the reliance placed on land adjoining Weston to deliver 300 dwellings. It is clear from the site analysis that this area is particularly sensitive having regard to the sloping nature of the terrain and its landscape status. Having regard to SPC89 and new Policy B3B that it is thereby proposed to introduce to secure this allocation, it is clear that little environmental assessment work has been undertaken to date. In undertaking the assessments required by the policy criteria there would appear to be a significant risk that the potential of the site is found to be undeliverable having regard to policy prerogatives of the Bath Spatial Strategy. Whilst this area is considered to have some potential for development on the lower slopes, this would seem to be more appropriately established through the Place-Making Plan. In the context of the spatial strategy, the considerable amount of assessment work yet to be undertaken, and the uncertainties relating to the extent of land availability, it would seem inappropriate to identify this area in the Core Strategy at the present time.

The same concerns regarding constraints and capacity also pertain to the other two edge of Bath development sites, that have similar levels of assessment yet to be undertaken and that are the subject of policy criteria (Policy B3A and B3C). However, it is not considered that the constraints affecting the sites at Odd Down or Endsleigh are as likely to impact upon their capacity such as to raise fundamental questions concerning their suitability and appropriateness for inclusion as strategic sites that will contribute significantly to delivering the development requirements of the District.

Finally the reliance on 1,000 dwellings to be delivered from ‘small scale intensification distributed throughout the urban area’, would seem to be a windfall allowance by another name. It is not considered appropriate to identify such non-specific capacity in a strategic planning policy document and contributes further to the uncertainty surrounding deliverability of the allocated capacity at Bath, particularly having regard to the environmental protection of priorities which are at the core of the spatial strategy for the city.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

The policy needs to be revisited to:

- Provide greater clarity on the composition and deliverability of the identified housing capacity having regard to the environmental protection priorities of the spatial strategy.
- Omit the contribution of land adjoining Weston from Policy B1.
- Explain and justify the capacity from 'small scale intensification distributed throughout the urban area'.
- Identify an alternative strategy for accommodating the requirement in the event of the failure to resolve the constraints represented by the Windsor Road Gas Holder and Bath Upstream Flood Compensation Scheme.

Respondent Number: 4641 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** David Vernalls

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The revised Core Strategy proposes an additional 720 houses for Bath which due to lack of other options have been proposed for land which is currently greenbelt.

However it is far from clear that this addition to the available land is reasonable in the unique context of Bath, practical in terms of the infrastructure of Bath, or actually likely to be taken up.

Bath is a unique city – the only full city to have a UNESCO World Heritage accreditation. That in itself should justify consideration of special treatment in the understandable search for expanded living space in the UK. It is not a city which can simply have a couple of extra housing estates tacked on to its perimeter without losing something more important than just Greenfield space. Bath has become what it is (and what was recognised by UNESCO) because of its historic nature and its constrained site which has resisted the siren call of urban sprawl. That has had positive and negative impacts – residents often lack amenities that similar sized populations would take for granted such as out of town multi screen cinemas, larger shopping facilities (e.g. DIY or furniture stores), but in return the restrained nature of the city has meant it has stayed a “big village”. This intrinsic nature needs to be respected. Dumping an additional % of its current housing stock on it will undoubtedly change its nature – that much is to be accepted within the original 6280 home sites. Adding further numbers in itself will be damaging, but changing the shape and nature of the city by removing decades established boundaries will leave Bath with less of a sense of its place.

In terms of practicality, Bath is not capable of significant increases in size whilst transport in particular remains a serious issue. At present Bath is not of sufficient size (nor has the space to accommodate) a metro or tram system, which means that other than the private car the options are a fiercely over priced bus service, walking or cycling. The latter two are constrained by the hilly nature of the topography – walking or cycling home up some of the hills would test even the fittest. With no option to control bus fares, promoting further population growth within the boundaries due to additional housing has the potential to create utter gridlock.

The real question is whether these additional homes are actually required or likely to be built. Allocating square metres of land to housing does not make a home, any more than allocating land to employment makes jobs. We need to establish what is likely to actually be built in terms of totals to see whether we need the additional 720. Clearly offering 720 greenfield sites alongside 6280 brownfield sites is likely to mean that the greenfield ones get built first and any shortfall happens on the brownfield sites. Therefore the additional numbers should only be provided if we are going to see more than 6280 actually built.

The 2011 census lists a total of 38,958 dwellings for the Bath city electoral wards. The original 6280 building plots represents a 16% increase on the number of dwellings in Bath, whereas the extra will take that up to nearly 18%.

The actual rate of delivery will depend largely on available finance. Mortgage lending has been constrained in recent years

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

but Government finance is now being made available to help this. Mortgage advances in March 2013 totalled £11.6bn (aided by previous Government lending assistance). Bath's share of that based on proportionate population would be $83,000/62.6m \times £11.6bn = £15.4m$. With the average house price in Bath currently at £280,000 we would be looking at around 55 transactions in Bath itself. That would in turn suggest just short of 10,000 transactions over the 15 year cycle of this plan.

We know that of the proposed 6280 total around 40% (less in some areas) will be affordable homes – some of these will be on sale and need mortgage finance. If we therefore assume 30% of 6280 are excluded as being built for rent by social landlords we might see 4400 built for sale. In order to achieve that, we would need to see 44% of all mortgage advances in Bath over the 15 year period being made for new build properties, or we would need to see significant expansion in mortgage lending. Given that larger properties will form part of the portfolio built, every one of these sold will create a knock on transaction involving a pre-owned house. This alone would exhaust the available mortgage pool. That is before the fact that new build properties are often more expensive per square metre than comparable pre-owned houses, which means that at any given time new build purchases will form a limited proportion of the total market. First time buyers are currently representing around 20% of the market, so even if they bought all new builds from these sites to the exclusion of other options they'd only buy 880 properties – the remainder would need to be by people moving on which would mean 3520, plus at least a further 3520 in relation to people buying their current property. $880+3520+3520$ gives a total of nearly 8000 out of a total of 10,000 potential transactions that can be funded. That means that only 20% of transactions would be purely involving pre-owned properties, when its clear that 80% of the market is made up of people moving around from one home to another.

Significant expansions in mortgage lending is probably unlikely – banks are already being asked to strengthen balances sheets (which generally means cutting lending so that a better balance of loans to deposits and security is achieved). Pushing down house prices via massive building programmes nationwide will further undermine bank balance sheet security. The house numbers being proposed for Bath are relatively modest increases against current stocks compared to other places in the UK. Building all these homes and depressing house prices will cause a balance sheet crisis which will force lending to dry up, starving constructors of funds and buyers of mortgages. In short the supply side will self limit to prevent further damage being caused by excess building.

Approaching this from another direction, the number of properties sold within the BA1 and BA2 postcodes (i.e. Bath city) in the last 12 months was 1264 (figures from Rightmove). That suggests a normal transaction rate over the 15 year period of this Strategy of around 19,000 transactions. Trying to get another 7000 transactions into that would represent a 37% increase in activity with no obvious explanation why this sort of ramping up is going to be sustained in terms of demand or finance.

Economically therefore, it is extremely unlikely that the level of house building being postulated will actually happen. That being the case opening up green belt land for development and allowing developers the choice to neglect infill in a unique city like Bath is utterly inappropriate. This is already happening where Crest have plenty of sites to finish on Western Riverside but are now involved in an appeal over greenbelt land at Saltford – an opportunistic move whilst the Core Strategy remains unfinished. This makes it very clear that any chance to go for greenfield will be taken before the brownfield sites get finished. In short I strongly believe that we will never see all 6280 homes built, let alone the further 720 to make the new total and as such these additional plots should not be added to the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

1. Preferably reduce the proposed development quota to match the brownfield land available given that this is unlikely to prove insufficient.
2. Enshrine in the Strategy that only once all brownfield development has been completed can applications for development on Greenfield sites be contemplated and any applications made in advance of this time will be rejected as being non compliant with the Core Strategy.

Respondent Number:	4650	Comment Number:	6	Respondent Name:	Mr Geoff Davis & Ms Tania Rodrigues	Respondent Organisation:	
---------------------------	------	------------------------	---	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Large Sites in the Central Area and Western Riverside have had the number of homes reduced from 3,500 to 3,000. This reduction seems to be the primary reason for creating new Green Field sites by taking land from the Green Belt, and further detracts development away from the Brown Field sites in the centre of the city.

Change to the policy requested:

The figure of 3,500 should be restored and the Green Belt / AONB areas removed from consideration.

Respondent Number: 4704 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Warminster Road Developments**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 165 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

WRD is encouraged to see that draft Policy B1 now includes reference in the 'shopping' element of the policy to "enable the provision of neighbourhood retail services at Ensleigh, Warminster Road, Foxhill, Weston Green Green Belt and at Odd Down Green Belt".

The indicative proposals for the redevelopment of the Warminster Road MOD site currently include circa 500 sq m of Class A1 retail floorspace, which will be suitable for 'neighbourhood retail services'.

This will help meet the retail needs of the existing population in the Warminster Road area, as well as the new residents of the redeveloped MOD site at Warminster Road.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4704 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Warminster Road Developments**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 165 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC54

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (3)(a)-(b)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

As confirmed to B&NES Council by Pegasus Planning Group, the former MOD site at Warminster Road is now in control of Warminster Road Developments.

The revised wording of the policy refers to the Concept Statement, which according to the words of the policy set out the Council's aspirations in terms of what each former MOD site is expected to deliver.

It is considered that the Concept Statement makes a number of assumptions regarding the development of the Warminster Road site, which are not realistic. For example, the Concept Statement states that the site could deliver circa 100 no. dwellings.

Baseline studies for the redevelopment of the site indicate that this number would represent a significant under-delivery of the site, and it could reasonably deliver circa 250 no. dwellings, plus a care home and circa 500 sq m of Class A1 retail floorspace.

WRD is encouraged to see that the policy does not identify a specific number of units for the Warminster Road site, but simply states that the MOD sites collectively "can deliver well in excess of 1000 new homes".

The Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies that the Warminster Road site could deliver 120 no.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

units within the first five years.

On the basis that a full application is scheduled to be submitted in August 2013, and therefore determined by Christmas 2013, it is fully expected that the total site could be developed and completed within this five year period. The site can therefore contribute fully to the Council's five year housing land supply.

WRD is also encouraged to see that either the Placemaking Plan and/or Development Management process will refine the optimum housing capacity of the MOD sites and consider their overall prospect in more detail. For the Warminster Road site, this will be established by the Development Management process through the submission of a planning application. In the case of the Warminster Road site, given its size, it is considered that the Development Management process is the most appropriate method for determining the capacity for the site.

For the Council's purposes, a Scoping Request under the Environmental Impact Regulations will shortly be submitted by WRD for the following:

- Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of approximately 250 no. dwellings;
- Buildings up to 4 no. storeys in height;
- The construction of a care home (approximately 75no. beds);
- The construction of approximately 5,000 sq ft of Class A1 (retail) floorspace;
- Up to 2 no. vehicular accesses from Warminster Road;
- 1 no. primary vehicular access with 1 no. secondary access for emergency vehicles.

Continued / .

... / continued

This will be based on a Concept Plan which identifies the site parameters and constraints and the resultant developable areas.

This Concept Plan (Drg No. 5688/sk05) is enclosed.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC55

Plan Ref.: Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 228 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Websper

Respondent Organisation: Pulteney Estate Residents' Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC55

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

PERA welcomes the changes to remove "associated uses" which are not appropriate to the location from Policy B1. The term "stadium" falls in with PPG 17 guidelines and reflects existing uses. PPG17 states (Section 11), that "open spaces and sites of sports and recreational facilities ... of particular value to the community, should be recognised and given protection by Local Authorities through appropriate plan policies".

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4638 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Rosemary Carne**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC55

Plan Reference: Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The site specific development policy for a stadium on the Recreation Ground is unsound.

It is completely disingenuous of BANES Council to be progressing any plans for the Recreation Ground Trust land at this time when it is under review and subject to: 1. A consultation for a Charity Commission Scheme and 2. A wanted progress of application for it to be PROPERLY AND FORMALLY classified as a Town Green. BANES Council should cease continuing to include such an 'unsound' site allocation in the Draft Core Strategy.

I consider BANES Council and the Trustees to be in breach of trust for not declaring a conflict of interest in the future of the Recreation Ground Trust land by including this 'site specific development policy for a stadium' on the Recreation Ground Trust land when the two above initiatives are being progressed. If BANES Council insists on including plans for a stadium it should be on a 'non site specific' basis' and be within approved and consulted upon policies.

Furthermore, The Recreation Ground Trust land is part of the River Valley Flood Plain and I see no proof that the correct procedure has been followed and it has not been subject to the "sequential" test for development. BANES have not submitted any adequate justification for development at this location. BANES Council should investigate a more suitable location to accommodate 'a stadium' giving proper consideration to the number of visitors/vehicles/noise and nuisance this commercial venture would cause and give more consideration to their Pulteney Estates area electorate. The recreation Ground Trust land is sited in a largely residential location with residents having rights as designated by the 1922 Covenants and other restrictions in the Recreation Ground Trust, Bath objectives.

It is disgraceful that whilst residents local to the Bath Recreation Ground trust land are currently being threatened with a hostile apparently vexatious harassment legal action by Bath Rugby that BANES Council is adding to the stress of residents with this devious looking attempt to change the core strategy for what appears to be prudential private gain.

The use of the term "Sporting, cultural and leisure stadium" is too non specific, wide ranging and open to unrestricted commercial activities which could give ungovernable disturbance.

In putting forward such proposals the Council has a clear conflict of interest which should be declared and would appear to be showing preferential treatment in its role as an 'alleged' joint venture developer with "Arena 1865 Ltd" - an offshore company registered in the Bahamas. Constituents should be able to expect their voted Council to be open and impartial and give proof of several quotations - and publish the merit of their chosen 'contractor' - before signing 'heads of agreement terms' with any company. The apparent lack of transparency in the apparent conduct of the Council would appear to be below the standards expected by their electorate.

This too wide ranging proposal is supported by PPG17 which states (Section 11), that "open spaces and sites of sports and recreational facilities ... of particular value to the community, should be recognized and given protection by Local Authorities through appropriate plan policies".

No sequential flood test has been conducted prior to this proposal. A site specific risk assessment must demonstrate "No flood within the lifetime of the development without increasing the risk of flood elsewhere". I would like proof this has been conducted.

Change to the policy requested:

"Enable the development of a stadium with ancillary uses."To regard a Stadium proposal as a 'sui-generis' use for outdoor sports and recreation use only and for this to be non-site specific pending a more detailed justification in accordance with an approved Core Strategy.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Respondent Number: 309	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name: Mrs Rachael Hushon	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC55 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

The site specific development policy for a stadium on the Recreation Ground is unsound. The continued inclusion of such an ‘unsound’ site allocation in the Draft Core Strategy pre-empts the proper consideration and consultation on any detailed and specific stadium plans for the BANES area. The proper process would be non site specific and then to progress within approved and consulted upon policies. The site of the Recreation Ground, is part of the River Valley Flood Plain and should be subject to the “sequential’ test for development . BANES has not submitted any adequate justification for development at this location.

The use of the term “Sporting, cultural and leisure stadium” is too vague. In putting forward such proposals the Council has not been objective as a planning authority, has possibly been impartial in its role as a joint venture developer with Arena 1865 Ltd. It is too wide ranging in terms of possible land uses. This term should be deleted in favour of simply “stadium”. Cultural and leisure could mean any intensity and commercialisation, and is too vague. This view is also supported by PPG17 which states (Section 11), that “open spaces and sites of sports and recreational facilities ... of particular value to the community, should be recognised and given protection by Local Authorities through appropriate plan policies”.

No sequential flood test has been conducted prior to this allocation. A site specific risk assessment must demonstrate No flood within the lifetime of the development without increasing the risk of flood elsewhere. I don’t believe this has been conducted.

Change to the policy requested:

“Enable the development of a stadium with ancillary uses.”To regard a Stadium proposal as a ‘sui-generis’ use for outdoor sports and recreation use only and for this to be non-site specific pending a more detailed justification in accordance with an approved Core Strategy.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: The Bath Society
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC55 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

With regard to Annex 3 part 1 page 106 policy B1 (8) - i) has (b) been deleted (a) left in, in error ?
 ii) re para 2.12 , the reference to page 56 is ‘unhelpful’.
 iii) Just over a year ago we wrote to Inspector Emerson as follows :-
 Sir,
 Thank you for your invitation to comment on the above. We refer to the Ministerial Foreword to the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular para 11 :- “ Planning must be a CREATIVE exercise in finding ways to ENHANCE and IMPROVE the places in which we live our lives.”
 This reinforces the significance of the “POLICY AIMS” (in Table 1 FLOOD ZONES). In the context of the Recreation Ground in Bath, we respectfully draw your attention to pages 4 & 5, where for FZ 3a & FZ 3b “developers AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

should seek opportunities to

- i) reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems;
- ii) RELOCATE EXISTING development to land in zones with a lower probability of flooding;
- iii) create space for flooding to occur by RESTORING FUNCTIONAL FLOODPLAIN and FLOOD FLOW PATHWAYS and by identifying, allocating and safeguarding open space for flood storage.”

These aspirations reach much further than merely allowing replacement of existing buildings.

We submit photographic evidence of flooding on the Recreation Ground (P1 & P2, the Cricket Ground (P3), flooded entrance to the Pavilion and Sports Centre Car Park (P4) and towpath (P5) in year 2000 when the City itself was not flooded – ie when the Recreation Ground served as FUNCTIONAL FLOODPLAIN and protected the City Centre. PPS25 Practice Guide emphasised that the definition of the functional floodplain allows flexibility to make allowance for local circumstances and should not be defined on rigid probability parameters.

Furthermore, your attention is once again respectfully directed to CD4/FR1 page 9 which describes Flood Hazard (esp para 4) “In the Bath Recreation Ground fast flowing water (>1m/s) is expected to coincide with deep water (>1.75 m). This combination is considered “dangerous for all”. Flow within the main channel of the River Avon is also considered “dangerous for all”. The ‘Flood Risks to People Guidance Document’ Technical Report FD 2321/TR (DeFRA/EA 2006) states that for a velocity of 0.5 m/s the depth of flood water only needs to be 0.75 m for it to be considered “dangerous for some”.

Unsurprisingly, B&NES original SFRA published in 2009 confirmed the Recreation Ground as FZ 3b although subsequently the Environment Agency agreed to re-designate this area as 3a (DC3/28). The justification for this alteration remains obscure (despite many objections and unanswered enquiries).

That is history, but if we can now return to the present and the recently published Technical Guidance, Table 1 “Appropriate uses in Flood Zone 3b” list is surely relevant. The paragraph detailing “Flood Risk vulnerability” in Table 2 categorises “drinking establishments, night clubs and hotels” as More Vulnerable.

Furthermore, the Notes to Table 2 state “Buildings that combine a mixture of uses should be placed into the higher of the relevant classes of flood risk sensitivity”. (DeFRA/EA FD 2321/TR2)

This would surely apply to any proposal to replace the present rugby ground with a more extensive MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT as suggested in CD6/E2.2 Policy B1 section 8 PC 16 (and its variants) which should then be judged inappropriate according to the Highly Vulnerable criteria.

Should the Environment Agency be invited to again review its designation of the Flood Zoning of the Recreation Ground, which flooded both via water tables and over topping (2000), and given the new NPPF and its Technical Guidance of 2012 ? Should not B&NES re-consider Policy B1 section 8(b) ? Should B&NES delete it altogether in the interest of “ Soundness of the Core Strategy” ?

David Dunlop Chairman LoRARA and Vice Chairman The Bath Society “

We had no reply to this letter and no one answered our concerns which remain and we believe Policy B1 (8) (b) is therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

We suggest once again that Policy B1 8 (b) is deleted

Respondent Number: 227 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** London Road Area Residents Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC55 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

With regard to Annex 3 part 1 page 106 policy B1 (8) - i) has (b) been deleted (a) left in, in error ?

ii) re para 2.12 , the reference to page 56 is ‘unhelpful’.

iii) Just over a year ago we wrote to Inspector Emerson as follows :-

Sir,

Thank you for your invitation to comment on the above. We refer to the Ministerial Foreword to the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular para 11 :- “ Planning must be a CREATIVE exercise in finding ways to ENHANCE and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

IMPROVE the places in which we live our lives.”

This reinforces the significance of the “POLICY AIMS” (in Table 1 FLOOD ZONES). In the context of the Recreation Ground in Bath, we respectfully draw your attention to pages 4 & 5, where for FZ 3a & FZ 3b “developers AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES should seek opportunities to

- i) reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development, and the appropriate application of sustainable drainage systems;
- ii) RELOCATE EXISTING development to land in zones with a lower probability of flooding;
- iii) create space for flooding to occur by RESTORING FUNCTIONAL FLOODPLAIN and FLOOD FLOW PATHWAYS and by identifying, allocating and safeguarding open space for flood storage.”

These aspirations reach much further than merely allowing replacement of existing buildings.

We submit photographic evidence of flooding on the Recreation Ground (P1 & P2, the Cricket Ground (P3), flooded entrance to the Pavilion and Sports Centre Car Park (P4) and towpath (P5) in year 2000 when the City itself was not flooded – ie when the Recreation Ground served as FUNCTIONAL FLOODPLAIN and protected the City Centre. PPS25 Practice Guide emphasised that the definition of the functional floodplain allows flexibility to make allowance for local circumstances and should not be defined on rigid probability parameters.

Furthermore, your attention is once again respectfully directed to CD4/FR1 page 9 which describes Flood Hazard (esp para 4) “In the Bath Recreation Ground fast flowing water (>1m/s) is expected to coincide with deep water (>1.75 m). This combination is considered “dangerous for all”. Flow within the main channel of the River Avon is also considered “dangerous for all”. The ‘Flood Risks to People Guidance Document’ Technical Report FD 2321/TR (DeFRA/EA 2006) states that for a velocity of 0.5 m/s the depth of flood water only needs to be 0.75 m for it to be considered “dangerous for some”.

Unsurprisingly, B&NES original SFRA published in 2009 confirmed the Recreation Ground as FZ 3b although subsequently the Environment Agency agreed to re-designate this area as 3a (DC3/28). The justification for this alteration remains obscure (despite many objections and unanswered enquiries).

That is history, but if we can now return to the present and the recently published Technical Guidance, Table 1 “Appropriate uses in Flood Zone 3b” list is surely relevant. The paragraph detailing “Flood Risk vulnerability” in Table 2 categorises “drinking establishments, night clubs and hotels” as More Vulnerable.

Furthermore, the Notes to Table 2 state “Buildings that combine a mixture of uses should be placed into the higher of the relevant classes of flood risk sensitivity”. (DeFRA/EA FD 2321/TR2)

This would surely apply to any proposal to replace the present rugby ground with a more extensive MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT as suggested in CD6/E2.2 Policy B1 section 8 PC 16 (and its variants) which should then be judged inappropriate according to the Highly Vulnerable criteria.

Should the Environment Agency be invited to again review its designation of the Flood Zoning of the Recreation Ground, which flooded both via water tables and over topping (2000), and given the new NPPF and its Technical Guidance of 2012 ? Should not B&NES re-consider Policy B1 section 8(b) ? Should B&NES delete it altogether in the interest of “ Soundness of the Core Strategy” ?

David Dunlop Chairman LoRARA and Vice Chairman The Bath Society “

We had no reply to this letter and no one answered our concerns which remain and we believe Policy B1 (8) (b) is therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

We suggest once again that Policy B1 8 (b) is deleted

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton

Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC55 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The status and operating parameters for the Recreation Ground were specified in a High Court Order in 2002 and the council was made Trustee and is bound by them. Any attempt to vary these without an application to the High Court for permission to do so places the council, as Trustee, in contempt of court. This is regardless of any opinion expressed by the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Charity Commission.

The council may be able to obtain such a variation, but it is by no means a certainty because nothing has changed since 2002 that would have a material effect on the Judgement; and spending Council Tax money trying to do so for what is to the Trust a non-essential development designed only to benefit a private company, would lead to accusations of maladministration.

Any development on the Recreation Ground would fall foul of one of the constraints above. It cannot be acceptable for any activity which would be unlawful to have a place in the Core Strategy, and all references to developments on the Recreation Ground must be deleted.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete all reference to development opportunities on the Recreation ground, specifically:

“At the Recreation Ground, and subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints, enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure stadium.”

Respondent Number: 297	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Bath Rugby Club / Arena 1865
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 41 **Agent Name:** Boyer Planning (Central and South)

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC55 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Charity Commission Process

3.7 The Trust is overseen by the Charity Commission, which is an independent body with responsibility to ensure charity law is followed. The Commission can scrutinise any decision made by the Charity. If necessary it can intervene, should it consider that the Trust Board has made a decision that is not in the best interests of the Charity.

3. Arena 1865 Ltd – BANES Proposed Changes March 2013 | Recreation Ground, Bath

3.8 Therefore, the Charity Commission will need to formally approve any proposal which is agreed between the Board of Trustees and Arena 1865 Ltd. before the proposals can be taken forwards to the planning stage.

3.9 On 30 November 2012, the Charity Commission published a ‘Scheme’ which was the subject to public consultation. Details of the scheme were available on the Recreation Ground website¹ (see extracts at Appendix 3) and via the Charity Commissions website.

3.10 The Scheme will enable the Recreation Ground Trust to take forward its plans for the Rec. These include granting Bath Rugby a lease for a new arena and taking over additional recreational land at Lambridge.

3.11 The Charity Commission received 1868 representations on the Scheme. Of these, 1624 (87%) were in support and 244 (13%) objected to it. This picture is very similar to the results of the public consultation exercise carried out in 2011, when 85% of respondents agreed with the Trust's proposal.

3.12 The formal consultation closed in February 2013, and an independent reviewer is now considering the matter. We understand that a decision is likely before the EiP reconvenes.

3.13 It is considered that Annex 2 of the Council’s report to Full Council held on 4th March 2013 (our Appendix 4) sets out a fair representation of the current position with respect the Trust / Charity Commission. We draw the Inspector’s attention to paragraph 2.5 of this report, which states that:

“The Council can give in-principal planning policy support to the improvement and expansion of the existing stadium, in manner that reflects the draft Scheme. The situation of a sporting arena close to a city centre and in good reach of public transport facilities accords with the NPPF. In the Bath situation – there are other issues in respect of companion land uses and unique design challenges to be addressed.”

Town and Village Ground application

3.14 Although we do not consider that it is material to the Core Strategy process, the Inspector should be made aware that an application that has been lodged by Jack Sparrow Esq (dated 11th November 2012) seeking to register the Recreation Ground as a new town or village green (TVG) pursuant to s.15(2) of the Commons Act 2006. An extract of the application is included at Appendix 5 for the inspector's information,

3.15 The Council, as Trustee, has objected to this application, along with the Rugby Club, as have a number of third parties, on the grounds that it does not meet the requirements of the Commons Act. There has been some support for the application. A copy of the objection from the Council is found at Appendix 6.

3.16 The Council has now instructed an independent barrister to assess the arguments for and against and advise it, in its capacity as registration authority. It is possible that a public inquiry may be held or the matters dealt with through the exchange of written representations. As such, a decision is not expected until later in the year but it is going through its due process.

1 <http://www.bathrec.co.uk/future-of-the-rec/>

The 1922 covenants

3.17 A further matter that the Inspector should be aware of is that Bath Rugby is proposing to apply to the High Court to seek a declaration that the covenants attached to the 1922 deed of conveyance of the Recreation Ground are unenforceable. The Club has been advised that the 1922 covenants are unenforceable, and the matter will be considered by and decided upon by the High Court.

3.18 A letter was sent out on 11th March 2013 together with a guidance note on this matter (see Appendix 7), and advice was also given through a website². Full details on this matter are included within that information and are not repeated here, as they are not material to planning policy formulation. It is hoped that this will provide clarity on this legal matter.

2. <http://www.bathrugby.com/1922covenants/>

4. CURRENT PROPOSALS AND PROCESS

4.1 In the context of what is covered within Chapter 2, it is considered helpful to reaffirm the Club's proposals for the Recreation Ground once the legal matters highlighted above have been resolved. The Inspector will note that there has been considerable progress with these matters since the EiP recessed, and the Club and the council are confident that they will be resolved in the near future.

The proposals

4.2 For funding and organisational reasons, it appeared inefficient for Bath Rugby to be contemplating the construction of the proposed arena. Consequently, the development will be carried out and managed by Arena 1865 Ltd, a specially formed, staffed and funded company.

4.3 Arena 1865 Ltd currently proposes that the Board of Trustees of the Recreation Ground agree in principle to the following proposals:

- The Trust will grant Arena 1865 Ltd, for on-lease to Bath Rugby a further 6,348 sq. metres on the Recreation Ground (taking the total area occupied by Bath Rugby from 16,107 sq. metres to 22,455 sq. metres giving them the potential to improve and enlarge their facilities);
- Arena 1865 Ltd will, in return, donate Lambridge playing fields to the Trust – an area of approximately 45,500 sq. metres;
- As Lambridge would then be owned by the Recreation Ground Trust, this land would be maintained for the people of Bath as an open space for recreational activity.

4.4 Furthermore as part of the proposal, our clients will be party to a new lease with an enlarged curtilage at the Rec with

new lease terms. We note that this point has been agreed in principle by the Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Recreation Ground Bath, as stated in the Minutes of a meeting of the Trust held on 29th September, 2011 (as approved at the subsequent meeting held on 1st December 2011), but this legal matter still needs to go through due process and Charity Commission process, as we detailed in Chapter 3.

4.5 It is proposed that with the extra 6,348 sq. metres of floorspace at the Rec, Arena 1865 Ltd will be able to develop a replacement arena with a final capacity envisaged to be around 18,000. This will be achieved by extending the South Stand further into the Rec, with the pitch moving slightly eastwards. This will allow a new North Stand to be developed which is currently used as the Club House. A new West Stand would be constructed with active frontage uses facing onto the river, and is intended to enhance this area and be befitting of its setting.

4.6 The East Stand of the new arena will remain removable (as it is currently) so that the Rec can still be managed as an open space during the summer months. However, the East Stand will become a modern, modular and possibly roofed seating area which will allow the flexibility needed so that it can be modified for cricket/music and other sporting uses. The playing surface in particular will remain under the control of the Rugby Club so that they can maintain the top class surface required for Premiership rugby and first class cricket.

4.7 The Rugby Club's former training facility at Lambridge is proposed to accommodate any potential displacement of activities which the proposed arena would create, as well as creating new opportunities for recreational, sporting and cultural events and uses.

4.8 The Inspector can be assured that the necessary processes are being undertaken and that there is a reasonable prospective that these steps will be concluded within the next year, which will enable a planning application to subsequently be submitted following full community engagement.

Policy context

4.9 Since the Core Strategy was originally published, and indeed since the EiP last sat, there have been some updates to national planning policy which are considered pertinent to this matter.

NPPF (March 2012)

4.10 The NPPF was published last year and has a number of statements of note to our client's proposals. As stated above, the Council recognise that the proposals fully accord with the NPPF. In terms of supporting a new arena at the Rec, paragraph 70 of the NPPF states that:
"To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; (our underlining)

4.11 It is considered that the Council's proposed allocation does just that. Similarly, paragraph 73 is also relevant as it notes that "Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities." It is considered that our client proposals will assist in meeting those intentions.

4.12 Notwithstanding the fact that the Recreation Ground is well established as an existing sports stadium, the NPPF is unequivocal (at paragraph 23 and within Annex 2; Glossary) that 'intensive sports and recreation uses' are considered main town centre uses and that their needs are 'met in full'. The NPPF therefore full endorses the Council's proposed allocation at this site.

4.13 It was noted that at the EiP some concern was expressed by third parties about our client's proposals. As conveyed previously, once clarity is secured on legal matters, a robust community engagement strategy is intended which will look at detailed design and technical matters which would need to be addressed through a planning application submission. It is considered that it will be necessary to consider the current contribution of the Rec to the WHS, and how a proposal could result in betterment to the urban form and the wider community.

4.14 We respectfully draw the Inspector's attention to paragraph 137 of the NPPF, which states that:

"Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably."

Change to the policy requested:

2.5 We propose amendments to the Council's current wording of policy B1(8) (see Appendix 8) to clarify its intentions in order to comply with NPPF requirements of soundness, in terms of being justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In particular, we seek amendments to the policy to refer to an 'arena' rather than a stadium, and to clarify that its location within the Central Area is at the Recreation Ground.

2.6 For clarity, although we consider that matters have moved forwards, we still object to policy B1(8) as currently drafted (March 2013).

'Unique Legal Issues'

3.4 It is considered that legal matters that are outside of the remits of the planning system are not a material planning consideration, and should not be included within policy formulation as they are simply unnecessary and irrelevant to planning decisions. The current drafting could be construed as necessitating the finalisation of any and indeed all 'legal issues' before planning permission could be granted, and as such the wording would arguably mean an otherwise acceptable planning proposal may not be in accordance with the draft policy. Indeed, most development sites have some form of 'legal issues' to be dealt with but we do not note reference to them in other draft policies.

3.5 We have therefore suggested that there is no need for reference to the wording; "subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints" within the policy. It is unnecessary, imprecise and fails the tests of soundness set out in the NPPF.

3.6 Notwithstanding the above, for the Inspector's benefit we set out below an update as to current 'legal issues' and the activities that are being undertaken to resolve them.

5. SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO POLICY

5.1 As the Inspector will note from the above text, the multi-purpose arena will have numerous benefits to the people of Bath, in terms of providing enhanced sporting, cultural and leisure facility, as well as providing a facility befitting of Bath itself. The arena will also doubtless have a beneficial effect on tourism in Bath. It is notable that the existing built form at the Rec is not of the highest quality, and that there is an opportunity to significantly enhance the facility.

Submitted Core Strategy (December 2011)

5.2 The Inspector will be aware that Policy B1(8) of the Submitted Core Strategy (December 2011), as drafted stated:

"b. Enable the development of a new sports stadium and associated uses within the Central Area"

5.3 The Recreation Ground was included within the defined Central Area, and there were a number of related statements pertaining to it. Through the EiP process a number of amendments were agreed in principle with the Inspector. As detailed in Chapter 1, the Inspector has sought clarity on the Council's intentions as part of this next stage in the process.

Examination in Public (January/February 2012)

5.4 Discussions were held during the Examination and proposed changes to the policy were tabled informally between the Council and Third Parties, at the Inspectors request. It was agreed that further discussion would be undertaken and then consulted upon (which has happened in this current consultation).

BANES Full Council Report (March 2013)

5.5 On the 4th March 2013, Officers presented Members with a report to Full Council, in advance of this public consultation. The inspector should be aware that the policy drafting within the Officer's report was amended by Members. The Officer's proposed drafting contained in Annex 2 (see our Appendix 4) was as follows:

"RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO POLICY B1(8): RECREATION GROUND IN BATH

Adjoining the Central Area, at the Recreation Ground, and subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints, enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure arena. Associated uses may be acceptable but will be considered on their merits."

5.6 At the Council meeting, Members resolved to amend the Officer's proposed (as is now being consulted upon) as follows:

"At the Recreation Ground, and subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints, enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure stadium."

Response to Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy (March 2013)

5.7 We set out in our detailed comments to the various proposed policy changes in our Appendix 8. However, we would like to offer some specific comments on the currently proposed drafting of Policy B1(8). Although we are generally supportive of the draft text and amendments to the accompanying proposals maps for other parts of the Core Strategy, we do object to elements of the proposed text of Policy B1(8).

5.8 We are however grateful that the Council have now provided clarification that it is the Recreation Ground that is intended as the site of a new stadium/arena, and that it would be more than just a sporting venue.

5.9 In this context, we suggest alternative wording to policy B1(8) below:

"At the Recreation Ground, enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure arena. Associated uses may be acceptable but will be considered on their merits"

Reinstatement of the word 'arena'

5.10 As will be noted, there are three main changes that the respondents request are considered by the Inspector. Firstly, we request the reinstatement of the term 'arena' rather than stadium, as this is more befitting of our client's intentions.

5.11 We note that the submitted draft referred to a 'stadium' but it was agreed to change this to 'arena' through discussions with Officers.

5.12 In our view, a 'stadium' is commonly defined as a fixed structure with tiered seating predominately used for sporting events, whereas an 'arena' is defined as an enclosed area for the presentation of sports events and spectacles. The key difference is that the term 'stadium' does not imply flexibility which the new facility will retain.

5.13 The purpose of the east stand remaining removable is so that the Rec can still be managed as an open space. Therefore, we consider an 'arena' would be a more accurate description which accords with the founding principles of the Recreation Ground Trust and our client's objectives. There is a lack of clarity as to Members' rationale for the change to the consultation version of the policy

Reference to alternative uses reinstated

5.14 We also consider that it is helpful that there is an acknowledgement that alternative uses will be looked at on their own merits, particularly when there are likely to be clear urban realm and vitality reasons for doing so. This would be the normal course of action with any formal planning application submission, and therefore we see no justification for the removal of this particular phrase by Members. It should be reinstated.

'Legal and issues and constraints'

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

5.15 Finally, we continue to not see any merit in referring to the phrase “subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints”. These legal matters are not material planning considerations and would not be considered as such in any future planning application. Therefore similarly the need for them to be referred to within policy is equally unnecessary. Put succinctly, the council could not lawfully withhold granting planning permission for a scheme at the site due to these issues remaining outstanding, which as we noted previously, are being in the process of being resolved. As drafted, the policy would conflict with this well established legal principle.

5.16 The text should be deleted as these matters would be dealt with under other (non-planning) legislation. As drafted, the inclusion of this text results in an unsound, and un-implementable policy that could be regarded as ultra vires as a consequence.

Response to Inspector’s questions in ID/24

5.17 In summary, we consider that the March 2013 draft policy provides further clarity on our client’s and the Council’s intentions. Turning to the Inspector’s specific questions in ID/24, we comment as follows:

a) Whether the plan properly reflects the Council’s current intentions.

5.18 The identification of the Recreation Ground within the policy, and the statements at the March Council meeting firmly clarify the Council’s position.

b) Whether the inclusion of the whole of the Recreation Ground within the central area dotted boundary on diagram 7 is justified and intended, given that there is no suggestion that the whole of the Recreation Ground should be the subject of redevelopment or major change.

5.19 The Council’s amendments to the Central Area are acknowledged, and subject to the clear identification of the Recreation Ground elsewhere with policy B1(8), and the proposed changes we have suggested, are supported.

c) Whether the reference to a sports stadium and the additional wording introduced by PC28 (CD5/22) is the most appropriate description of what is now intended by the Council.

5.20 We have commented on this matter above. We believe that the term arena is appropriate, and that reference should be made to acknowledge that associated uses may be acceptable but should be consider on their own merit.

d) Whether the plan should acknowledge the unique legal issues concerning development at the Recreation Ground (in so far as they may remained unresolved at time of adoption of the plan).

5.21 Again, we have commented on this above, and do not consider that there is any need for the planning system to need to take into account non-planning matters. Reference should be removed to these in the policy.

E) Whether the reference to active riverside frontage in PC28 is too site specific for this proposal bearing in mind that a site specific allocation is not intended. (Could active riverside frontage be an intention for any redevelopment anywhere adjoining the river).

5.22 We consider that there is some merit in referring to an active frontage to the river, and believe that the Council would expect that in any planning application submission. We would be happy with the inclusion of such wording, but have not suggested it at this time as the development management system may be the best place to deal with such an issue.

Respondent Number: 4589 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** M H Farrell **Respondent Organisation:** Farrell & Company

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC55 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 (8)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I have attached my critique of the core strategy with specific reference to the Recreation Ground and the irreconcilable differences between conservation policies and the declared intent to build a new stadium. This to my mind is a major problem as any stadium will be in clear contradiction to all the declared policies concerning the World Heritage site and all conservation policies. No mention is made of the ground at Lambridge which is a far better option for a stadium in EVERY

respect.
I would be grateful if you would let me know the next stages so I can keep an eye on progress.
I delivered a hard copy to your offices today including some illustrations that are not attached.

The purpose of this document is to highlight anomalies and contradictions in proposed policies that affect the Recreation Ground.

The status of the recreation ground and its use has been a matter of scrutiny and debate over many years as it is clear that the current situation is in breach of both covenants and Charity Commission rules.

These breaches have come about due to the council assuming rights to build on the land and granting the rugby club a new 75 year lease in the knowledge that a professional organisation such as Bath Rugby club were not permitted to occupy the land. In addition the clear favouritism extended to the club by the council was also in breach of the covenants as there is a specific stipulation that no sports should be predominant on the recreation ground.

It is a fact that the council have expressed a desire to see a new stadium being built on the recreation ground whilst unaware of what impacts such a stadium would have on the World Heritage Site, the conservation area, and the open spaces and city views that are currently enjoyed.

It is also a fact that no firm proposals have been submitted for scrutiny either by the planning department, English Heritage, or the public at large.

It is also a fact that attempts are being made by both the Trustees and the Charity Commission to alter the legal status of the recreation ground so that the Rugby Club can remain there.

It is also a fact that the rugby club are intending to go the High Court to get a judgement saying that the covenants are un-enforceable, thus removing the obstacles that legally prevent the club from occupying the ground.

It is also a fact that there is a current application for Town Green Status pending.

In the light of the legal challenges pending it is inappropriate to include any policy that depends on an outcome that would allow a new stadium to be constructed on the ground. Such outcomes are far from certain as the legal challenges that will result will destine this affair to continue for years to come.

It is also entirely inappropriate to include such policies, as the construction of a stadium of the size being demanded by the rugby club would require all planning policies to be disregarded in their entirety, as the new west stand will need to be at least three times the size of the existing in both plan and height. Such a result will have a massive detrimental impact on the city, the river environment, the conservation area, and threaten the World Heritage Status the city currently enjoys. No matter how it might be designed, it will be a huge structure.

IN SUPPORT OF THE ABOVE

Relevant sections of the Core Strategy are referred to as follows;

SPC 12	Page 18	Para. 1.21	The district is renowned for it's historic Environment, and bath is the only city to be Designated a World Heritage Site
SPC 25	Page 20	Policy DW1	English Heritage's aim to protect, conserve, And enhance the district's nationally and Locally important cultrural and historic Assets.
SPC 37	Page 28	Para. 2.03	This paragraph refers to the World Heritage Site and how this status raised the city's Profile as an international tourist Destination, and how change and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Development should be managed

SPC 38	Page 29	Strategic issues	This statement reinforces the importance of A high standard of design in any new Proposals that contribute to the prosperity Of the city in the context of the WHS and And the importance of it in terms of Conservation and enhancement, and the Sensitivity of any proposals.
SPC 42	Page 30	Para. 2.05	This policy sets out to 'protect the Outstanding universal values' of the WHS.
SPC 44	Page 30	Para. 2.07	This policy highlights the importance of High quality developments that will endure, Providing proposals that are distinctive and Authentic, and not to satisfy short term Objectives
SPC 50	Page 33	Diagram 5	The proposals seek to alter the limits of the Central area by excluding the recreation Ground. This idea has no logic as the west Boundary comprises the only valuable Riverside asset the city enjoys. The Recreation ground is an intrinsic part of the City and cannot be differentiated from it.
SPC 51	Page 34	Policy B1(1)	This policy specifically states aims to Sustain and enhance the significance of the City's heritage assets, the outstanding Universal value of the world heritage site And it's setting, listed buildings and Bath Conservation area. This policy also states The importance of landscape and scenic Beauty, the network of open spaces Including the river Avon, formal and Informal parks and recreational areas, trees Woodlands.
SPC 54	Page 34	Policy B1 3 a-b	Paragraph 5a refers to the need to create New areas of attractive and productive Townscape and a much improved Relationship between the city and the river.
SPC 51	Page 37	Diagram 6	Refer to SPC 50 above
SPC 63	Page 38	Diagram 7	Refer to SPC 50 above
SPC 65	Page 39	Policy B2 (2)	Any changes should re-enforce and Contribute to the city's unique character and Identity
SPC 72	Page 42	Diagram 8 (1)	Refer to SPC 50 above
SPC 91	Page 52	Policy 2.31	This policy states that there is a strong Presumption in favour of the conservation Of the WHS in view of it's designation as a

Heritage asset of highest significance, as set Out in the statement of outstanding Universal value.

SPC 92 Page 52 Policy 2.32 This policy refers to the importance of the Setting of the world heritage site and the Impacts developments will have on it. It Refers to views, historical landscapes and Cultural relationships.

SPC 93 Page 53 Policy B4 This policy states that there is a strong Presumption against development that Would harm the outstanding universal Value of the WHS.

SPC 94 Page 53 Para. 2.34-.35 This policy refers to a building heights Strategy for new development in the city

The core strategy policies mentioned above are clear and definite in their intent to ensure that the city and it's world heritage status is not threatened by inappropriate developments.

The core strategy fails in this respect by the inclusion of the following;

SPC 55 Page 35 Policy B1 (8) Subject to the resolution of any legal issues Enable a stadium to be built on the Recreation Ground

This policy has to be removed from the Core Strategy as it is in clear conflict with all aforementioned policies designed to protect the city from such development as a stadium will entail.

This policy must read as follows

“The recreation ground will continue to be used as a sporting venue for all amature sports and that the professional rugby club that currently occupies part of the ground will move to alternative premises”.

In addition, a policy must be included that states;

“The current west stand and the club house buildings on the north side of the Recreation Ground will be demolished and a scheme to create a direct physical and visual connection between the river and the recreation ground will be implemented to improve the city views and access to the ground”.

THE IMPACT OF A NEW STADIUM

Annexed to this report are illustrations showing the intent by the Trustees and Bath Rugby to build a new stadium. Putting aside the whole question of the validity of any previous consultations, the indicative plans for the ground show one fundamental alteration to the current status quo.

Both consultations in 2011 and 2012, show the west stand to be at least three times the size of the existing stand. On the basis that the club will want the stand to have a roof, it is reasonable to expect that the new west stand will be much as it is shown on the enclosed superimposed illustration. Such a prospect is in clear contradiction to the policies articulated in the Core Strategy. For this reason alone, any policies included that supports this stadium proposal must be deleted to give authenticity the strategy.

The idea of a new stadium was promoted by the council in ignorance of the impact resulting from it, as no indicative proposals were presented to councillors at the time they decided. Councillors had no idea what a detrimental impact this stadium would have on the city, the river frontage, and the relationship with Pulteney Bridge, Parade gardens, Grand Parade, and the townscape views from both nearby and from the surrounding hills.

Change to the policy requested:

CONCLUSION

In relation to the Recreation Ground, the Core Strategy is inundated with policies that are designed to protect the City and it's World Heritage status. The foregoing identifies thirteen policies that are clearly designed to control new developments that pose threats such as with a new stadium.

The core strategy only has one policy that refers to the proposal for a new stadium. This proposed policy is included on a hypothetical thesis which is entirely based on a possibility, and not a probability. It is also in absolute contradiction to all conservation policies adequately articulated throughout the strategy. For these reasons alone, any reference to any new stadium on the Recreation Ground should be removed.

Change Ref. SPC56

Plan Ref.: Policy B1 10(d)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading **Respondent Organisation:** Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC56 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 10(d)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We note changes in wording in this section to take into account the different approach to flood mitigation in the Central Area and Enterprise Area, following the findings of the Bath Flood Risk Management Project (Black & Veatch, February 2013). In summary, rather than upstream storage this latest study puts forward as the preferred option the provision of compensatory flow conveyance at several locations along the river corridor, in combination with raising/protecting proposed development and existing defences. Through modelling Black & Veatch have demonstrated that implementation of these flood risk mitigation measures can satisfy NPPF requirements of ensuring new development is safe throughout its lifetime, without increase flood risk to third parties.

The Environment Agency is therefore supportive of the changes in wording to Policy B1. However, we feel the policy wording could be made more effective by inclusion of additional text and a cross-reference to an appropriate key diagram showing the flood risk management scheme proposals as detailed on the maps in Appendix D of the Black & Veatch Study. At present the wording under point 10D of Policy B1 is relatively generic and does not give much of an indication of the scale or location of the flood risk management works that are required to deliver new development along the river corridor. We also consider cross-reference to a diagram important to ensure the areas for the required flood risk management works are safeguarded in the Local Plan. This will ensure any proposals coming forward along the river corridor do not compromise the preferred approach put forward in the Black & Veatch report.

Change to the policy requested:

We would recommend the wording of Point 10D of policy B1 is changed to:

'Implementing flood mitigation measures, as detailed in the Bath Flood Risk Management Project Technical Note, to ensure development in vulnerable areas of the Central Area and Enterprise Area is safe whilst not increasing flood risk elsewhere. Measures include provision of flow conveyance improvements, raising/protecting proposed development sites and improvements to existing defences and buildings to ensure safe access and egress (see amended Diagram 5/6).'

See other representations on SPC49 for recommended changes to the diagrams.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** The Bath Society

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC56 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 10(d)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

B&NES previous Flood Risk Management Strategy was mooted by 'experts' and agreed by the Environment Agency. In less than a year B&NES now has new 'experts' (Black and Veatch) with a new FRM Strategy (not available to the public until April 2013 despite B&NES Full Council voting in favour on 17th February 2013 !) This latest FRM study is supported in principle by the EA – at least the underlying theory is.

We have reservations i) impact on WHS properties upstream of the City Centre. ii) impact on properties downstream of these works. A431 Kelston Road floods regularly at Swineford Furthermore the River Avon is sometimes tidal as close as Saltford and what about Keynsham ? iii) Have agreements re this B&V FRM strategy been received from neighbouring authorities about the possible impact of this change of strategy? eg in Wiltshire (Bradford on Avon floods) and Bristol (Swineford floods for example).

These concerns relate to the strategy of getting excess water through Bath more quickly – but doesn't raising the riverbanks cause impediment to flood volume with immediate effect on the adjacent 'weakest link' locations ? Did the modelling include the identification and assessment of these 'weakest links' ?

Our major concern is Deliverability – the cost of flood mitigation works in locations of i) multiple private ownership ii) infrastructure constraints (eg sewage) iii) Listed building/World Heritage Site constraints.

Who will pay ? and when ? Clearly these mitigation works (and if it is agreed they work) MUST be in place PRIOR to any development that requires flood compensation. Where are the B&NES policies and expert personnel to guide potential developers, with detailed advice re section 106 agreements and time constraints ? For example, what advice and flood compensatory requirements will be spelt out to potential developers on the Recreation Ground - Policy B1 (8) ? There should be a specific B&NES policy. In summary, we question the 'EFFECTIVENESS' as the strategy stands.

Change to the policy requested:

There must be a specific B&NES Policy drawn up detailing Flood Compensation requirements, relating to ANY proposed developments and stressing that these MUST BE IN PLACE AND EFFECTIVE PRIOR TO ANY DEVELOPMENT LIKELY TO INCREASE FLOOD RISK.

Respondent Number: 227 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** London Road Area Residents Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC56 **Plan Reference:** Policy B1 10(d)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

B&NES previous Flood Risk Management Strategy was mooted by 'experts' and agreed by the Environment Agency. In less than a year B&NES now has new 'experts' (Black and Veatch) with a new FRM Strategy (not available to the public until April 2013 despite B&NES Full Council voting in favour on 17th February 2013 !) This latest FRM study is supported in principle by the EA – at least the underlying theory is. We have reservations i) impact on WHS properties upstream of the City Centre. ii)

impact on properties downstream of these works. A431 Kelston Road floods regularly at Swineford Furthermore the River Avon is sometimes tidal as close as Saltford and what about Keynsham ? iii) Have agreements re this B&V FRM strategy been received from neighbouring authorities about the possible impact of this change of strategy? eg in Wiltshire (Bradford on Avon floods) and Bristol (Swineford floods for example).

These concerns relate to the strategy of getting excess water through Bath more quickly – but doesn't raising the riverbanks cause impediment to flood volume with immediate effect on the adjacent 'weakest link' locations ? Did the modelling include the identification and assessment of these 'weakest links' ?

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Our major concern is Deliverability – the cost of flood mitigation works in locations of i) multiple private ownership ii) infrastructure constraints (eg sewage) iii) Listed building/World Heritage Site constraints.

Who will pay ? and when ? Clearly these mitigation works (and if it is agreed they work) MUST be in place PRIOR to any development that requires flood compensation. Where are the B&NES policies and expert personnel to guide potential developers, with detailed advice re section 106 agreements and time constraints ? For example, what advice and flood compensatory requirements will be spelt out to potential developers on the Recreation Ground - Policy B1 (8) ? There should be a specific B&NES policy.

In summary, we question the 'EFFECTIVENESS' as the strategy stands.

Change to the policy requested:

There must be a specific B&NES Policy drawn up detailing Flood Compensation requirements, relating to ANY proposed developments and stressing that these MUST BE IN PLACE AND EFFECTIVE PRIOR TO ANY DEVELOPMENT LIKELY TO INCREASE FLOOD RISK.

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton

Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC56

Plan Reference: Policy B1 10(d)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Although the words “upstream flood storage” have been amended to “flood mitigation measures” it is clear from Diagram 5 that upstream storage is still the major plank in mitigation. This is fake science. The winter floods of the Somerset Levels demonstrated conclusively that no matter how much storage is available, it still fills in a trivial amount of time and then it is ineffective. The expert opinion when reviewing the Somerset Levels floods is that the only effective mitigation measure is to increase the capacity of the outflow.

When the Bath Flood Prevention Scheme was created in the 1970s, it included dredging the River Avon through Bath and down to the point where it became tidal. Since then there has been no further dredging, and the river through Keynsham is now reported by the council’s River Champion to have accumulated so much silt that it only has about 40% of the capacity created in the 1970s. Dredging is not now under council control, so it cannot be guaranteed as a mitigating solution. No amount of upstream storage is going to offset the currently reduced volume downstream, even assuming that upstream storage will be acceptable to the Wiltshire Local Authority that could veto any upstream aspirations. A modified wording is proposed, but there is little confidence that it is deliverable.

Change to the policy requested:

Implementing effective flood mitigation measures to ensure development in vulnerable areas of the Central Area and Enterprise Area is safe whilst not increasing risk elsewhere.

Respondent Number: 4660 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Norfolk Crescent Green Residents Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC56

Plan Reference: Policy B1 10(d)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC56 –
Black and Veatch prepared the Bath Flood Risk Management Project and Hydraulic Modelling Study which proposes to mitigate impact of flood risk to development proposed in the Central and Enterprise Areas by raising development sites, implementing conveyance mitigation measures and raising defence walls to protect access/egress routes, the latter specifically to the Lower Bristol Road (LBR). The Environment Agency confirmed Feb 2013 they were satisfied in principle with B&V’s document and the technical adequacy of the hydraulic modelling analysis and results underpinning the project.

According to it is accepted SPC56 "Implementing flood mitigation measures to ensure development in vulnerable areas of the Central Area and Enterprise Area is safe whilst not increasing flood risk elsewhere" is sound in principle.

However there are a number of major issues regarding deliverability of the proposals made in B&V's report, as described below. Prime issues concern delivery of conveyance mitigation measures between Churchill and Midland Road Bridges and raising defence walls to protect access/egress routes to and from LBR along the same stretch of river, which could ultimately mean that developments are significantly delayed or in worst case scenario may not be deliverable, as on site storage option has now been discounted.

B&V's study of this area records numerous constraints and uncertainties both regarding work to provide conveyance strips on the north bank and to protect access/egress to LBR on the south bank. Constraints to work on both banks include many services (sewers, gas, electric) ground conditions, contamination, environmental impact etc. On the north bank a number of mature trees would need to be removed which would have major environmental impact and on the LBR south bank there are several listed buildings in private ownership where there also structural issues ref withstanding hydrostatic loading during flood. It would be reasonable to expect private land ownership could be a major constraint to delivery, but in combination with buildings being listed and probably needing structural improvements this has potential to be a crucial constraint. These landowners clearly need to be approached at the earliest opportunity! It is noted that B&V mention that demountable defences/flood boards may have to be considered in these private buildings as part of the means of achieving protection to LBR route. In the event that individual owners had to be relied upon to put defences in place at times of risk to protect access/egress to LBR, we trust it would be agreed this part of the proposal would be considered unsound!

As yet costs have not been quantified for the whole flood management scheme or presumably for any phases. Both B&V study and CD4/FR39 refer to the scheme being delivered in phases as development sites come forward. CD4 also states the Council propose to submit a planning application for the first phase during 2013 with a view to completing the works 2014/15. CD4 states flood mitigation costs are generally part of individual development costs, but Council is proactively using RIF to remove major constraints to unlock key sites. B&NES Cabinet April 2013 agreed to draw down RIF funds for "the provision of FM works for the enterprise area comprising river and landscape works between Churchill and Midland Bridge" and considered "the project will release the key strategic sites of Bath Quays and Manvers St by improving flow characteristics between Churchill and Midland Bridge". Whilst it's pleasing to see that the Council is taking a proactive approach, already things seem to be proceeding in a piecemeal fashion which is very concerning as there seems no correlation between which FM phases are required to protect which development sites, either in B&V's report or in the actions taken so far. But B&V assume, and CD4/FR39 acknowledges, phasing needs to be discussed and agreed by EA and it is trusted this will now become a priority so that FM is provided for the correct site(s)! In addition timing of FM phases will need to be scheduled meticulously to avoid increase in flood risk to development and third parties whilst work is in progress. Whilst EA have indicated their technical support and assistance to aid progress, it is to be hoped that BANES will put in house the appropriate level of professional expertise to see this complex project through safely and to ensure development is delivered on target.

Two other issues ref delivery arise from the report ref 1) Bath Western Riverside and 2) B8 - BWR East.

Ref BWR, in B&V's main report 3.1.6 it is proposed to continue a conveyance strip through BWR site to Destructor Bridge, although there needs to be further assessment to determine the optimum level. But the Hydraulic Modelling of the Preferred Options considers the strip to Destructor Bridge in conjunction with Phase 1 development sites and further extends it to Windsor Bridge for all development sites and one continuous strip to WB is accordingly shown in Appendix D – Plan of Scheme Proposals. This makes it difficult to comprehend the exact focus of hydraulic modelling for BWR and ascertain the extent of proposals being considered! But assuming it is intended to pursue one or both strips, it is noted that OPA for BWR was granted for an 8m wide strip at 16mAOD, so any changes will need agreement. This may now need to be an urgent consideration as an application for replacement of the Destructor bridge has recently been validated, which may have implications for FM proposals so time may be of essence if a strip at the correct level is to be safeguarded at this location.

Ref BWR East (B8) - in Appendix C it is assumed an 8m strip will be left alongside the river and remainder of site raised, both presumably having been agreed at a meeting with BANES on 24.10.2012 when the extent of ground raising within each development site boundary was agreed for hydraulic modelling. But neither are detailed in the main report or shown in Appendix D. Again speed looks to be of essence to safeguard land to provide the strip and to obviate deliverability constraints.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC57

Plan Ref.: Para 2.12

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 228 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Websper

Respondent Organisation: Pulteney Estate Residents' Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC57

Plan Reference: Para 2.12

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

(b) SPC57, SPC220, and SPC221 – Flooding Sequential Test - The site of the Recreation Ground, the Leisure Centre, and Bath Rugby, is part of the River Valley Flood Plain and should be subject to the “sequential” test for development (Policy CP5). BANES has not submitted any adequate justification for development at this location.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES should provide evidence of the sequential test carried for the Recreation Ground. Unless a thorough sequential test has been carried out any proposal for development at the Recreation ground is considered UNSOUND.

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading

Respondent Organisation: Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC57

Plan Reference: Para 2.12

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support the wording on paragraph 2.12 which describes the NPPF requirement for a sequential risk based approach to be taken in relation to new development in Bath. We would however recommend clearer revised wording that refers to the Councils Sequential and Exception Tests Update paper (March 2013). We would also recommend that the paragraph states that a sequential risk based approach will need to be taken when determining the type and location of development on the forthcoming Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

For clarity we would recommend the wording of paragraph 2.12 be changed as follows:

‘Within this area flood risk is a key constraint which is likely to increase as a result of climate change. A sequential, risk based approach has been taken to the strategy for Bath, in accordance with the NPPF. As detailed in Council’s Sequential and Exception Tests Update (March 2013), there are not considered to be any reasonable alternatives to having a proportion of new development to the Central Area and Enterprise Area, given the need for regeneration in this area and other planning considerations. Through the Placemaking Plan a sequential approach will need to taken when determining the type, scale and location of development appropriate at specific sites. A site specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development within this area will be safe throughout its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere in accordance with the NPPF and Policy CP5.’

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC57

Plan Reference: Para 2.12

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Earlier representations by HFT to the PCdCS 2011 (HFT PC CP5) raised objections to the application of the Sequential Test at Bath and the subsequent technical solutions proposed by the Council through the Exceptions Test, which proposed upstream compensation. The Inspector in his note ID 28 raised substantial concerns at paras 3.10 – 3.24 regarding the soundness of a strategy for residential development in flood zone 2/3, as well as the lack of flexibility in the plan, should delivery prove difficult to achieve.

The Council have now presented a substantial change in technical supporting evidence to justify their continued reliance on residential development in FZ2/3 and undertaken a new Sequential Test (Update draft Feb 2013), which is published on their website.

The HFT maintain their continued objections to this strategy, the Sequential Test (former 2011 and Update 2013) and to the proposed solution, entitled “flood mitigation measures” (SPC 56) which for the reasons set out below, demonstrate that the Council have not addressed the fundamental questions raised from earlier reps (HFT PC CP5) or the Inspectors questions in ID 28. The fundamental consequence is that the Council should not rely upon a housing strategy which continues to require delivery of a minimum of 455 homes and possibly upto 1000 homes, in FZ 2/3 as part of the Bath Spatial Strategy.

This representation and objection is in respect of SPC 57 but also raises objections to SPC 54, (Policy B1) and SPC 56, that relate to the same issues.

The Council have undertaken an update of the Sequential and Exceptions Test for the proposed changes to the Core Strategy, including development sites in Central Area and Enterprise Area, Bath and at Somerdale, Keynsham. These representations are focused towards development within Bath however the same arguments can be directed towards development in flood plan FZ2/3 at Keynsham, where the Council have not undertaken an adequate Sequential Test.

Sequential Test Bath

The text at para 2.12 PC CS 2013 states that the Updated Sequential Test demonstrates that “the Central Area and Enterprise Area is regarded as the most suitable location within the District for the scope of activities envisaged.”

The test concludes that 455 homes cannot be accommodated in FZ1 in this area and therefore consideration of alternative, FZ1 greenfield sites should form part of the test.

HFT believe this figure of 455 homes could be a gross underestimate of the number of proposed homes in FZ2/3 in Bath.

This figure already makes an assumption that some housing on mixed FZ 1/2/3 sites can be directed to FZ1 through better design. There is no evidence of this and a precautionary approach should always be assumed. This amounts to an additional 442 homes. The plan shows no flexibility or contingency if the design of such sites cannot meet this objective, leading to a higher number of new homes being developed in FZ2/3 or being incapable of being delivered

at all. The Inspectors comment, at ID 28 para 3.23, that these sites may only need to come forward towards the end of the plan period is not correct. Such sites are already identified in the SHLAA 2013 within the 5 year Supply Period.

The Updated Sequential Test also identifies at Table 1, 752 new homes as windfall sites coming forward within the City. There is no assessment of the vulnerability of such windfall sites to flooding or to a sequential test (Table 2 omits windfall sites). Again the likelihood of some windfall sites being located in FZ2/3 cannot be ruled out. A precautionary risk based

assumption might suggest that between 10 % and 20 % of the windfall homes could be vulnerable to flooding in FZ2/3 and therefore the Updated Sequential Test should include an element of windfall housing that may need to be relocated to FZ1, (assumed 15% or 120 homes).

Considering the above assumptions, the Updated Sequential Test should consider a range of alternative greenfield locations around Bath , in FZ 1 , capable of delivering atleast 455 additional homes or possibly 455+ 120 homes or in the worst case scenario, 455+ 120 + 442 homes.

The conclusions of Sequential Test are set out in paras 4.7 --- 4.11, where sites in FZ2/3 are considered against reasonably available greenfield sites, in accordance with Sustainability Appraisal Annex L. The assessment of capacity at these sites on the edge of Bath is said to be a maximum of 720 homes (Odd Down, Weston and MOD Ensleigh), with this capacity already identified for delivery during the plan period. Any additional capacity at these sites is said to risk substantial environmental harm and would not have the same benefits of supporting regeneration in the Centre of Bath.

The fundamental aim of the Sequential Test, as set out in NPPF para 101, is to steer new development to areas with lowest probability of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. Para 14 of NPPF together with subnote 9 makes clear that sites at risk of flooding should be restricted.

The Council's most recent assessment of capacity at Odd Down (Development Concept Options Report, Arup April 2013) suggests a capacity in excess of 780 homes. This is reaffirmed in the Council's SHLAA Trajectory 2011---2029, under the heading additional "Green Belt Availability.... Land at Odd Down 750 homes."

In Sustainability Appraisal Annex L, land adjoining Odd Down has been subject to a Stage 3 Site Specific Assessment. Objective 18 entitled "Reduce vulnerability to, and manage flood risk (taking account of climate change)" concludes that as the land adjoining Odd Down is within flood zone 1, it passes the sequential test. "It also provides flexibility to respond to potential brownfield delivery issues. (about 600 homes in Bath and 650 homes at the Somerdale which are in or partly within FZ2/3)".

Therefore in the light of the evidence and the identification of land adjoining Odd Down in this latest core strategy, HFT find it difficult to reconcile the Council's conclusion at para 4.11 of the Updated Sequential Test that there is no reasonably available alternative site to accommodate the level and nature of development of 455 homes with economic and social benefits.

On the contrary, land adjoining Odd Down has the capacity to comfortably deliver both the 300 homes proposed in the plan, as well as the 455 homes identified within FZ2/3 of the Central and Enterprise Areas. This would be the correct application of the Sequential Test.

The application of other considerations such as regeneration opportunities in the Central Area and Enterprise Area are clear but these form part of the Exceptions Test (NPPF para 102) , not the Sequential Test. Where development can be located in areas of lower probability of flooding such as land adjoining Odd Down, the

Exceptions Test is not triggered.

Para 4.10 of the Updated Sequential Test states "The housing numbers in the key regeneration sites are still indicative but without the inclusion of housing provision could potentially undermine the achievement of better urban design, better social mix and economic viability, impacting on economic development".

Examination of the specific regeneration sites as set out on Table 3 of the Updated Sequential Test demonstrates that almost all of these sites will be capable of delivery of some level of housing as they are located partly in FZ 1/2/3. Table 3 suggests that upto 50% of the housing (442 homes) can continue to be delivered on these sites in FZ1. This clearly demonstrates that an argument about achievement of better urban design, or better social mix by placing 455 homes in FZ 2/3 is entirely misleading. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the proposed development in each flood zone and development density.

FZ 1 442 homes on 3.61 hectares giving a density of 122 dwellings per hectare FZ 2 63 homes on 0.65 hectares approx. 100 dwellings per hectare

FZ3 393 homes on 3.23 hectares approx 122 dwellings per hectare.

These are mixed use schemes which are intended to provide substantial new employment as well as dwellings. It seems hard to reconcile the overall objectives of trying to cram housing in ever increasing densities on mixed use sites in flood zone 2/3. The correct approach is to locate less vulnerable uses, such as offices and other commercial uses within those areas at higher risk of flooding and where possible locate residential in FZ1.

It should be recognized that the Council is going ahead with LEP funding (BNES 40) to secure on site defences as well as a conveyance mitigation scheme (Para 4.21 of the Updated Sequential Test) for the purposes of enabling key employment sites to come forward, including Bath Quays South, Bath Quays North (Avon St Car Park and Coach Park) Abb 1/2 and Manvers St---Royal Mail Abb3---5. These sites underpin key employment objectives in the Core Strategy and delivery of over 2000 jobs.

To conclude:

1. the Updated Sequential Test, if correctly applied, should re--allocate 455 new homes from FZ2/3 in the Bath Central Area and Enterprise Area to land adjoining Odd Down, resulting in no housing being located in FZ 2/3 in the City. The land adjoining Odd Down is in FZ1 and has capacity to receive this further housing as demonstrated by the evidence published by the Council. HFT will argue that the scale of the resulting development at Odd Down will provide a more sustainable mixed--use scheme, whilst minimizing harm on the edge of the City of Bath.
2. The current Bath Spatial Strategy B1 has no flexibility to address lack of delivery of housing due to over--reliance on development in FZ2/3, including windfalls. This uncertainty can make the plan unsound. The land adjoining Odd Down provides this added flexibility and ensures that with a capacity of 800-- 1000 dwellings (including a Care Village) the Bath Spatial Strategy is sound and meets the Sequential Test.
3. The Policy KE2 at Somerdale, Keynsham, for 260 dwellings to be located in FZ2/3 assumes in the Updated Sequential Test that there are no alternative locations in FZ1 in the district to accommodate these dwellings. The land adjoining Odd Down has capacity to accommodate these dwellings and provides a more sustainable location. This will ensure the Sequential Test is undertaken and the overall strategic policy is sound.

Exceptions Test Bath

The Exceptions Test for Bath as set out in the Updated Core Strategy, paras 4.13 ---4.23, is no longer necessary to provide for proposed new dwellings in FZ2/3 in the river corridor. The identification of land adjoining Odd Down demonstrates that through the Sequential Test, such housing can be accommodated on FZ1 and provide flexibility to the Bath Spatial Strategy. The Council argue that the SFRA level 1 and level 2 provides further justification for the Exception Test, however the proposed changes to the Core Strategy, including the introduction of greenfield sites on the edge of Bath, substantially change the opportunity to access FZ1 land for residential development. The SFRA may need to be refreshed to take account of these changes.

The Bath Spatial Strategy B1 is also reliant upon less vulnerable forms of development being accommodated in FZ2/3, for example office and commercial uses. As referred above, the strategy for flood mitigation and defences for the purposes of enabling key employment sites to come forward, including Bath Quays South, Bath Quays North (Avon St Car Park and Coach Park) Abb 1/2 and Manvers St---Royal Mail Abb3---5 will require the Exceptions Test to be applied both at the Core Strategy, the Placemaking Plan and the planning application stages. This will demonstrate the deliverability of such key sites and secure infrastructure funding through the LEP.

HFT note the proposed change in flood management strategy as proposed by their advisors Black and Veitch. The extent to which this strategy can rely on increased conveyance of the river flow, depends upon whether there is loss of true storage capacity or conveyance. The strategy still relies upon the provision of upstream flood storage which the Core Strategy will continue to identify on the Key Diagram. As such, HFT will continue to maintain their objection where there is reliance on upstream storage capacity. In addition, the Black and Veitch strategy relies upon the raising of ground levels across the all sites in the City in two phases. This includes industrial locations at Newbridge Riverside as well as Twerton Riverside. It remains to be seen whether such works are practical where these areas continue to function as key industrial zones.

To conclude:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The application of the Exception Test to locations in Bath remains vital in order to bring forward key employment sites that will be located in FZ2/3.

8. Please state the change to the policy or supporting text you are requesting. Please refer to the guidance note for more details.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 57

Para 2.12 : Amend the wording as follows :

Within this area flood risk is a key constraint which is likely to increase as a result of climate change. A sequential, risk--based approach is taken to the strategy for Bath is in accordance with the sequential/exceptions test requirements set out in PPS25 NPPF. Within The Central

Area/Western Corridor and Enterprise Area care will need to be taken to ensure that the most vulnerable development uses are directed to areas at least risk of flooding ie in areas of FZ1 in the City. Is regarded as the most suitable location within the District for the proposed scope of activities envisaged .

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC57

Plan Reference: Para 2.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We suggest that similar principles in the management of flood risk be applied to Radstock where current proposals to build on the town centre in an area in which the flood risk has been doubled by official survey and yet is being ignored.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 249 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Royal Mail Group Ltd

Agent ID: 31 **Agent Name:** BNP Paribas Real Estate UK

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC57

Plan Reference: Para 2.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This proposed change is supported by Royal Mail, but its soundness would be increased by adding clarification of who will be responsible for preparing the site specific flood risk assessment for the Central Area / Enterprise Area. It is understood that BANES has recently commissioned work on flood risk in the central area which forms part of the evidence base to the Core Strategy, but that developers of individual / combined sites will be required to augment this with site specific flood risk assessments.

Change to the policy requested:

Additional wording should be added to this paragraph to:

1. identify the evidence base information on flooding that BANES has / is commissioning,

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- clarify who will be responsible for preparing the site specific flood risk assessments for the Central Area / Enterprise Area, and
- clarify BANES's strategy for implementation of any identified flood mitigation works.

Respondent Number: 4660 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Norfolk Crescent Green Residents Association
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC57 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**
 SPC57 – sound, assuming this is merely intended to refer to NPPF policy requirements.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC61**Plan Ref.: Diagram 6**

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC61 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 6

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Diagrams 6 and 7 and para 2.16: the proposed alterations to the central area of Bath

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 228 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Websper **Respondent Organisation:** Pulteney Estate Residents' Association
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC61

Plan Reference: Diagram 6

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

(a) SPC72, SPC50, SPC61 - Central Area Boundary (was Ref 17 (pages 33,37,38,39) Diagrams 5,6,7 and 8 (i))

PERA supports the BANES amendment to the Central Area boundary such that it will not encompass the Recreation Ground/North Parade Road.

However, the Central Area boundary is still proposed as drawn along the river walkway between Pulteney Bridge and North Parade Bridge (on the EASTERN side of the river).

This boundary still leaves open the introduction of unspecified commercial 'mixed-uses', "associated uses", or 'active frontages' along the river as part of an extended Central Area. Again such a proposal is seen as UNSOUND, as commercial uses have not been justified in the Draft Core Strategy.

BANES has claimed in its notes to Ref 17 that concerns about "a wide range of commercial uses" is unfounded.

It has come to light since that BANES and Arena 1865 is proposing 1,858 sq m (20,000 sq ft) of city centre commercial activities, including bars, restaurants, retail units, and as previously noted "banqueting facilities", on the river frontage part of the Recreation ground site; and a hotel and conference centre development.

Such proposals have not been justified in the Core Strategy and is contrary to the evidence given previously to the Inspector by BANES.

PERA's view is that only a limited and appropriate level of ancillary uses is needed to protect local residents from the possibility of increased nuisance from intensification of use. The levels of commercial uses Arena 1865 and the Recreation Ground Trustees (BANES) are proposing will create unacceptable nuisance to local residents.

Change to the policy requested:

The amended Recreation Ground boundary is UNSOUND. To avoid any 'creep' of city centre uses on the Recreation Ground riverside, and to protect local residents amenity, that the boundary is amended to be on the west bank of the river.

Respondent Number: 228 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Websper**Respondent Organisation:** Pulteney Estate Residents' Association**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC61

Plan Reference: Diagram 6

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

BANES is endeavouring to find the Football Club an alternative location.

The possible alternative locations should be indicated as options in the Core Strategy before a Placemaking Plan for one particular site is progressed.

Alternative site for the Rugby Club should also be considered as part of the Core Strategy. AS this has not been done the site specific proposal for the Rugby Club location is UNSOUND. PERA is of the view that the level on intensification of use proposed for the redevelopment of the Rugby Club cannot be met at the Recreation Ground without compromising local residents amenity and harming the overall environment of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

That Policy SPC 61 include appropriates site for a joint Football Club and Rugby Club scheme.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Respondent Number:** 309 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Rachael Hushon**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC61

Plan Reference: Diagram 6

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I support the BANES amendment to the Central Area boundary such that it will not encompass the Recreation Ground/North Parade Road.

However, the Central Area boundary is still proposed as drawn along the river walkway between Pulteney Bridge and North Parade Bridge (on the EASTERN side of the river).

This boundary still leaves open the introduction of unspecified commercial 'mixed-uses' along the river as part of an extended Central Area encroaching into a residential neighbourhood.

This boundary creep could lead to the introduction of bars, clubs, hotels, and retail uses, along the 'active river frontage'. Again such a proposal is UNSOUND, as commercial uses have not been consulted upon or justified in the Draft Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

No reference to the "east" side of the river in this policy is now needed

Change Ref. SPC62**Plan Ref.:** Para 2.16**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 106**Comment Number:** 2**Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling**Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning**Agent ID:****Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC62

Plan Reference: Para 2.16

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Diagrams 6 and 7 and para 2.16: the proposed alterations to the central area of Bath

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 265**Comment Number:** 11**Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:****Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC62

Plan Reference: Para 2.16

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

This section claims to have been amended for accuracy, but it is nevertheless inaccurate. The Central Area as far as tourist information is concerned is the oldest part of Bath within the Roman city walls, though the Mayor's Guides treat the Royal Crescent and Circus as part of the Central area. The centre of the World Heritage Site geographically is in the Western Riverside. The city centre is defined by its roads and buildings and cannot physically expand anywhere. And none of these areas match the boundaries shown on the various diagrams, which are all different.

The definition of yet another Central Area as one where the boundaries are likely to change every five years can only add confusion to an already confused situation

Change to the policy requested:

The Central Area of Bath as referenced in the Core Strategy is approximately centred on the Roman Baths and much of it lies within the Bath Conservation Area. This Central Area comprises the city centre and neighbouring locations to the south and east. The precise extend of the Central Area boundary is identified on the Proposals Map. This boundary will be reviewed every 5 years based on observable change.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 820 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** St James's Investments and Tesco UK Stores**Agent ID:** 55 **Agent Name:** Terence O'Rourke Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC62

Plan Reference: Para 2.16

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy B2 identifies the Key Development Opportunities in the City Centre and Neighbouring the City Centre. Figure 7 indicatively identifies both these areas as comprising (the general extent of) the Central Area.

It is not the specific intention of Policy B2(3) that the City Centre is expanded to encompass the entire Central Area, but the Policy does identify and encourage "...neighbouring areas with the most capacity for significant change and key regeneration opportunities...." to come forward for mixed use redevelopment.

We therefore suggest that para 2.16 should be consistent with Policy B2, as suggested by the revised wording (below).

We are also concerned that paragraph 2.16 as redrafted, lacks clarity:

(i) The Central Area is not clearly defined on any of the Plans provided, (unlike the City Centre Boundary which is shown in Appendix 3); and

(ii) The text makes reference to '....neighbouring locations to the south and east', whereas Diagrams 6 and 7 and revised paragraph 2.17 indicate the neighbouring areas to be to the west.

Finally we would question whether the proposed review of the city centre boundary should occur every five years, or whether, to accord with the NPPF (para 153), the wording should reflect that reviews would be linked with changing circumstances.

Change to the policy requested:

We would suggest that paragraph 2.16 is reworded as follows:

The Central Area of Bath lies at the heart of the World Heritage site and much of it lies within the Bath Conservation Area. The Central Area comprises the city centre and neighbouring locations to the south and east west. A key objective of the plan is for the city centre to expand to encompass the entire Central Area, with tThe precise extendt of the current city centre boundary is identified on the Proposals Map. Whether the redevelopment of sites within the Central Area ought to lead to the expansion of the city centre This boundary will be reviewed every 5 years based on observable change as necessary to respond to changing circumstances, when reviewing this Local Plan.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4474 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Ediston Properties Ltd**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC62

Plan Reference: Para 2.16

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We write on behalf of our client, Ediston Properties Limited (Ediston), to make representations to the B&NES Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy (March 2013).

Ediston are the freehold owner of land at Pinesgate, Pines Way, Bath. Presently, the Pinesgate site comprise to two medium-sized office buildings, sandwiching an area of surface level car parking. The site is bound by the Pines Way gyratory system in its whole circumference.

We are currently developing proposals for the redevelopment of the Pinesgate site working with officers in the City Council, which will complement and are consistent with the redevelopment of neighbouring development opportunities at Bath Western Riverside East as set out in the Council's SPD Document and position the Pinesgate site in a use and form that is compatible and supportive of the long-term strategy for central Bath. The proposed redevelopment is not a standalone development opportunity; it is at the core of the Council's strategy for this part of the city to provide regeneration and knits together the neighbouring development and regeneration opportunities within the immediate context.

As a substantial site located within the central area of Bath, this site presents a considerable opportunity to deliver the spatial vision proposed for Bath city centre. Our client is therefore keen to ensure that the proposed changes to the Core Strategy place the site and its wider context in the best position to contribute to this strategy.

Whilst we are aware that the Council has invited consultation only upon the proposed or rejected changes to the Core Strategy, it is pertinent to outline our client's perspective of Planning Policy, Planning Services the overall development strategy. In considering the strategy in overview, our client expresses broad support for the document as proposed. In particular, the strategy proposed for Bath city-centre is supported as a rational and positive approach to ensure that the city is able to continue to grow and prosper. In conjunction, our client also supports the proposed strategy for transport and movement, particularly in Bath, where heavy traffic is currently having significant and adverse impacts upon the city centre. Measures to discourage traffic from the central area, and to provide and enhance pedestrian, cycling and public transport links to the central area are therefore welcomed strongly.

Commentary upon Proposed Changes

Since this current consultation seeks to elicit views upon the proposed and rejected changes to the Core Strategy (post-examination), we hereby set out our client's comments and suggestions in relation to the proposed changes. We again emphasise our client's overarching support for the Core Strategy, but confer no particular opinion outside of the comments provided below.

Paragraph 2.16 (page 33) – The Central Area:

We express some concern about the wording in relation to the spatial strategy for the Central Area. Specifically, it is expressed that the Central Area comprises 'the city centre and neighbouring locations to the south and east' (emphasis added). This is contrary to the remainder of the strategy, which emphasises the westward expansion of the city centre, rather than eastward.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Change Ref. SPC63**Plan Ref.:** Diagram 7**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC63 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 7

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Diagrams 6 and 7 and para 2.16: the proposed alterations to the central area of Bath

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref.** SPC64**Plan Ref.:** Diagram 7**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 820 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** St James’s Investments and Tesco UK Stores

Agent ID: 55 **Agent Name:** Terence O’Rourke Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC64 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 7

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We note the clarification that the ‘city centre’ boundary shown on Diagram 7 is indicative only. As all aspects of Diagram 7 are indicative, we suggest that any clarification made to this Diagram fully reflects the Council’s intentions.

Change to the policy requested:

We would suggest that the wording ‘indicative boundary only’ or equivalent is also added after the dotted line element of the key, ie

‘Central Area – Areas neighbouring the city centre (indicative boundary only)’

Change Ref. SPC66**Plan Ref.:** Policy B2 (2) (h), (n), (o) & (u)**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC66 **Plan Reference:** Policy B2 (2) (h), (n), (o) & (u)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The idea that there are unfulfilled pedestrian and cycling desire lines across the river is dogma not reality. Additional bridges have been included in various consultations in the past, have been opposed vociferously because of the unacceptable visual impact on heritage assets and/or important views, and have been deleted at the time, only to reappear in subsequent documents. The additional bridges now appearing in the Core Strategy have already been publicly rejected more than once, and it is only because the Core Strategy is not being specific about the locations that there hasn't been a similar outcry now. This apparent obsession with new and unnecessary bridges must cease. If there is money available to build them it would be far better spent on maintaining the ones that currently exist, rather than them being neglected to the point where they become unsafe as the Victoria Bridge was. One thing is certain: additional bridges will detract from, not be beneficial to, the enjoyment of the city. There should be no commitment to building them. The only unfulfilled desire for bridges is from motorists queueing to use one of the only three (of eight available bridges) for vehicular traffic. However, catering for motorists is not part of the Core Strategy, despite the demographic forecast of a higher proportion of elderly and (by implication) disabled motorists in future.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete:
o: There are areas where the river acts as a barrier to pedestrian and cycling desire lines and further crossings would be beneficial in respect of enable sustainable transport choices and for the enjoyment of the city.

Respondent Number: 4474 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Ediston Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC66 **Plan Reference:** Policy B2 (2) (h), (n), (o) & (u)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support: **Change to the policy requested:**

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: deletion of eastward and replacement with westward expansion of the city-centre

Change Ref. SPC67**Plan Ref.: Policy B2 (3)(f)**

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 249 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Royal Mail Group Ltd

Agent ID: 31 **Agent Name:** BNP Paribas Real Estate UK

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC67 **Plan Reference:** Policy B2 (3)(f)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We comment that this reference to the NPPF is unnecessary as a general reference because the NPPF is already cited in Table 3 - Policy Framework and mechanisms for delivering the strategic objectives, as well as being confirmed in Policy SD1 as being applicable in BANES's consideration of all development proposals.

If this reference to the NPPF is intended to refer to a specific section or paragraphs of the NPPF then it should do so, rather than remain as a 'blanket' reference. It is understood that the intention of BANES is to refer to paragraph 24 of the NPPF (requirement to apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses) .

Change to the policy requested:

The words "the NPPF" should be deleted along with the preceding words "Within the context of".

Failing this, reference should be added to the specific part of the NPPF that should be taken as context to Policy B2 part 3 Key Development Opportunities.

Change Ref. SPC68**Plan Ref.: Policy B2 (4)(b)****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 249**Comment Number:** 6**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Royal Mail Group Ltd**Agent ID:** 31 **Agent Name:** BNP Paribas Real Estate UK**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC68**Plan Reference:** Policy B2 (4)(b)**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Setting a policy expectation of a net increase of about 40,000 sq m of modern office floor space and creative workspace in the Central Area even over the revised plan period of 2011 - 2029 is unrealistic having regard to occupational demand and is unlikely to be deliverable.

It is unsound to set an undeliverable office development target because that may lead to unsustainable land use planning decisions being taken, possibly preventing land coming forward for beneficial redevelopment for non-office uses and constraining regeneration of the Central Area.

The office development floor space target should be reduced to reflect an achievable level.

Change to the policy requested:

The proposed change should be amended to read:

"a net increase of about 25,000 sq m...."

Change Ref. SPC69**Plan Ref.: Policy B2 (4)(h)****Development Location:** Comment on new development locations**Respondent Number:** 265**Comment Number:** 14**Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC69**Plan Reference:** Policy B2 (4)(h)**Development Location:** Comment on new development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Businesses succeed because of the goods or services they provide and the locations where they provide them. All the forced relocations in the past from the original Southgate, from the Newark Works and from the Podium have resulted in long established businesses folding soon after relocation. This casualty rate must not be ignored. The assumption in this policy statement that relocation is an acceptable course of action that can almost casually be decided upon must not remain. There is no point in destroying somebody's livelihood for a speculative development or arbitrary targets, when it is viable businesses which provide employment opportunities for the future.

Change to the policy requested:

Existing uses within the Central Area that remain viable, should, wherever possible be preserved as part of redevelopment proposals.

Change Ref. SPC70**Plan Ref.: Para 2.17****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 4474 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Ediston Properties Ltd**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC70

Plan Reference: Para 2.17

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Paragraph 2.17 (page 36) – The Centre Area in 2029

We welcome the additional wording expressed here, which provides greater clarity over the proposed strategy for the further development of the Central Area, as shown in diagram 8. Expansion westwards will ensure a coherent and integrated approach to development along the western river corridor. The specific intent to optimise these locations and generate more intense activity is also welcomed, though it could be clarified that pedestrian, cycling and public transport links with the existing city centre need to be improved and enhanced. The proposal also has the potential to facilitate the development of Bath Western Riverside East. It is the Council's intention to extend the City Centre boundary to include the Eastern section of Bath Western Riverside. The Pinesgate site holds the key to parking and the reconfiguration of the vehicular access to this area of the city. Ediston's proposals for Pinesgate will support this by responding to parking demands within the locality.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Change Ref. SPC72**Plan Ref.: Diagram 8(i)****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 228 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Websper**Respondent Organisation:** Pulteney Estate Residents' Association**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC72

Plan Reference: Diagram 8(i)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

(a) SPC72, SPC50, SPC61 - Central Area Boundary (was Ref 17 (pages 33,37,38,39) Diagrams 5,6,7 and 8 (i))

PERA supports the BANES amendment to the Central Area boundary such that it will not encompass the Recreation Ground/North Parade Road.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

However, the Central Area boundary is still proposed as drawn along the river walkway between Pulteney Bridge and North Parade Bridge (on the EASTERN side of the river).

This boundary still leaves open the introduction of unspecified commercial 'mixed-uses', "associated uses", or 'active frontages' along the river as part of an extended Central Area. Again such a proposal is seen as UNSOUND, as commercial uses have not been justified in the Draft Core Strategy.

BANES has claimed in its notes to Ref 17 that concerns about "a wide range of commercial uses" is unfounded.

It has come to light since that BANES and Arena 1865 is proposing 1,858 sq m (20,000 sq ft) of city centre commercial activities, including bars, restaurants, retail units, and as previously noted "banqueting facilities", on the river frontage part of the Recreation ground site; and a hotel and conference centre development.

Such proposals have not been justified in the Core Strategy and is contrary to the evidence given previously to the Inspector by BANES.

PERA's view is that only a limited and appropriate level of ancillary uses is needed to protect local residents from the possibility of increased nuisance from intensification of use. The levels of commercial uses Arena 1865 and the Recreation Ground Trustees (BANES) are proposing will create unacceptable nuisance to local residents.

Change to the policy requested:

The amended Recreation Ground boundary is UNSOUND. To avoid any 'creep' of city centre uses on the Recreation Ground riverside, and to protect local residents amenity, that the boundary is amended to be on the west bank of the river.

Change Ref. SPC74**Plan Ref.: Policy B3 (1) - (2)****Development Location: Comment on general development locations**

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC74

Plan Reference: Policy B3 (1) - (2)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Policy B3: delete section 2: Placemaking Principles

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 197 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Bray **Respondent Organisation:** Railfuture Severnside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC74

Plan Reference: Policy B3 (1) - (2)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We welcome the recognition of Oldfield Park station as a means of access to Twerton Riverside and support the amended clause.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on new development locations****Respondent Number:** 265 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC74

Plan Reference: Policy B3 (1) - (2)

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Use Classes quoted are too restrictive. It is stated that Newbridge already supports manufacturing, yet the retention of land is for purposes which do not include manufacturing. This is illogical. Similarly, Twerton is being reserved for an industrial process but not for product or process research, and this is unnecessarily restrictive. It is far better for the Core Strategy to recognise wider scope and then have this narrowed down, if necessary, by placemaking proposals.

Change to the policy requested:

- Newbridge Riverside will function as Bath's primary location for industrial enterprise, providing about 12 ha of land at Locksbrook Road, Brassmill Lane and the Maltings for a range of activities including advanced manufacturing. There is therefore a presumption in favour of retaining land and premises in the B1-B8 use classes where this remains a viable use of land and is supported by market signals that there is demand for continued occupation that cannot reasonably be accommodated elsewhere.
- Twerton Riverside has contracted as an industrial location in recent decades. This area is suitable for a broader range of uses and there is scope to redevelop the area to provide new business (B1a-c) premises and housing. The area presents an opportunity to host business that is displaced as a consequence of the residential led development of Western Riverside and the growth of the intensification of the Central Area into BWR East. Whilst Newbridge Riverside will remain the core industrial location, Twerton Riverside can provide additional flexibility. It will therefore be necessary to maintain an appropriate level of land in this area for B1 uses alongside office uses and housing.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 820 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** St James's Investments and Tesco UK Stores**Agent ID:** 55 **Agent Name:** Terence O'Rourke Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC74

Plan Reference: Policy B3 (1) - (2)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Our client supports the explicit recognition of their site (the former Bath Press) as a 'key development opportunity' within the Twerton and Newbridge Riverside area (Policy B3). Whilst our client also supports the emphasis towards employment-led, mixed-use proposals, we believe that the stated range of appropriate uses should be expanded to include retail, alongside light industry, offices and housing. This would provide the policy with greater flexibility to encourage

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

appropriate sustainable development that met its key objectives of providing regeneration and employment. Any proposal, which incorporated retail would still be subject to assessment against the other retail policy in the plan (CP12: Centre and retailing) and national guidance.

Change to the policy requested:

Add 'retail' to the last line of the second bullet. The final sentence would therefore read:

"It will therefore [be] necessary to maintain an appropriate level of land in this area for B1c uses alongside office uses, retail and housing."

Respondent Number: 828 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd

Agent ID: 149 **Agent Name:** Martin Bailey

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC74

Plan Reference: Policy B3 (1) - (2)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

In Policy B3 (1) :

- 1) It is essential introduce the Enterprise Area concept earlier in the document (please see Deeley Freed representation on SPC46);
- 2) Recognition of the contraction of Twerton as an industrial location is welcome, as is the recognition of Twerton as a suitable location for housing and new business premises.
- 3) In line 3 of the section on Twerton, the reference to Use Class B1(a), a main town centre use, is confusing, as is the reference to office uses in the final line. Reference to maintaining an "appropriate" level of land for Use Class B1© (light industry) does not provide the clarity necessary for investment decisions (Please see also Deeley Freed's representations on SPC53 on these points.)
- 4) Overall, with the replacement policy in the second bullet as now proposed, there is a danger that the development potential of much of Twerton will not be realised and that land will be sterilised, being kept for an "appropriate" level of "flexibility" in the period to 2029. The development potential is strong, particularly in the Roseberry Place location for the reasons set out in parts (2) and (3) of the policy and it would therefore be helpful to express the policy rather more clearly and more positively.

The amended Placemaking Principles in part 2 of the policy are broadly supported.

Recognition of Roseberry Place as a "key regeneration opportunity" in part 3 of the policy is welcomed and endorsed. However, of note, the proposed deletion of the guidance on scope and scale of change, previously part 4 of the policy, and now referred to in error, results in uncertainty. This is especially important as this key regeneration opportunity, Roseberry Place, can be delivered readily, early in the plan period, being already assembled with no infrastructure requirements. (Comments on the SHLAA, in which this appears not to have been fully appreciated, are being made separately to the Council.)

Change to the policy requested:

Rephrase Policy B3(1) positively to provide clear guidance for investment in development in a manner which recognises:

- (a) the potential of Twerton Riverside to accommodate now much-needed housing, employment and other forms of development in this sustainable location; and
- (b) the changes in character and land use already taking place in the context of the highly accessible location adjoining Western Riverside and within easy reach of the Central Area.

Change Ref. SPC78**Plan Ref.: Para 2.21****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 4508 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC78**Plan Reference:** Para 2.21**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;" The allocations at Odd Down and Weston will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4642 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC78**Plan Reference:** Para 2.21**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

SPC19 (Green Belt boundaries) Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;" The allocation at Odd Down will be fundamentally opposed to this principal. The land allocated will create urban sprawl, although the core strategy document talks about small scale local employment, there are limited examples within Bath of this occurring. In reality this will just provide housing, with employment being outside of Bath or as the council indicates with the river corridor. It would mean that the current urban areas will be expanded.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Respondent Number:** 4524 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Cardinal Close Residents**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC78**Plan Reference:** Para 2.21**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC78 objection

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Change Ref. SPC79**Plan Ref.: Para 2.22****Development Location:** Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Respondent Number:** 4560**Comment Number:** 2**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** IM Properties Ltd &

Linden Homes

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC79**Plan Reference:** Para 2.22**Development Location:** Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Paragraph 2.22 (Document reference SPC79)

This section of the document refers to the evidence base prepared for the Core Strategy including the SHLAA and Concept Statement, noting that the site specific details of the MoD allocations will be address in the Placemaking Plan and/or the Development Management Process – to be published and consulted upon in due course.

It is essential that the Council recognise the changes which have taken place since the drafting of the Concept Statement (dated April 2012 and approved by members in September 2012. In the interim period, the Council have increase the allocation incorporating the inclusion of the Extension land owned by the Royal High School (RHS) and the suggestion in the SHLAA of Kingswood School playing fields coming forward for development. The Bath and North East Somerset Council (B&NES) Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy (March 2013) is also accompanied by an ARUP Report entitled Ensleigh Development Concept Options Report dated April 2013 which extends the allocation at Ensleigh further to the Green Belt.

This document has not been formally consulted upon and states '[these] assessments are used to help the consideration of these locations for development . . . As such the reports have no planning status. The planning policy relating to any locations taken forward will need to be formulated in the first instance through the Core Strategy and sites will then be allocated with detailed site requirements in the Placemaking Plan . . . To be done in conjunction with local community involvement'.

On this basis, we challenge the weight that can now be attached to the Concept Statement and this clearly is superseded by the Changes to the Core Strategy and the Arup information used to inform the pending Placemaking Plan.

As noted above, the Council's aspirations for development at Ensleigh its current form is considered overdevelopment, based on the aspirations set out in the Concept Statement resulting in the housing numbers, open space and community infrastructure being unachievable when considering a development sensitive to the local environment. The Council's advisors (ARUP) in their supporting study recognise this position and seek to increase the land take accordingly. Therefore, the weight that can be place on the Concept Statement is challenged, leading to the revision of the Concept Statement (through the Placemaking Plan) and suggested housing numbers alongside the development partners for these sites.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: There should be a reduction in overall housing figures projected for MoD Ensleigh in recognition of the immediate context and environmental considerations. The Council must acknowledge that, in order to achieve housing figures, it is not possible to achieve all aspirations of the Concept Statement. The Council must recognise the Concept Statement has limited weight and needs to be revised, updated and consulted upon as part of the Placemaking Plan. IM Properties and Linden Homes reserved their position to make further representations at the Placemaking Stage of the Plan Process.

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4520	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name: Mr Alexander Neill	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC79 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.22

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

There are three large M.O.D. sites ripe for development in Bath, also Brownfield sites in Bath such as the abandoned Green Park House site. These should be fully utilised and the building concluded, and preferably occupied, before any development on Greenfield sites or the AONB is started. I consider the absence of any plans for this to occur renders the document unsound .

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4719	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Kingswood School
Agent ID: 39	Agent Name: GVA		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC79 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.22

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

Since this current consultation seeks to elicit views upon the proposed and rejected changes to the Core Strategy (post-examination), we hereby set out our client’s detailed comments and suggestions in relation to the proposed changes. We again emphasise our client’s overarching support for the Core Strategy, but confer no particular opinion outside of the comments provided below.

- Paragraph 2.22 (Document reference SPC79)

This section of the document refers to the evidence base prepared for the Core Strategy including the SHLAA and Concept Statement, noting that site specific details will be addressed in the Placemaking Plan and/or the Development Management Process – to be published and consulted upon in due course.

The Council has reviewed in the SHLAA, the potential of Kingswood School playing fields coming forward for housing development. The Proposed Changes is also accompanied by an ARUP Report entitled Ensleigh Development Concept Options Report dated April 2013 which extends the allocation at Ensleigh further into the Green Belt onto KS’s land interest.

This document has not been formally consulted upon and states ‘assessments are used to help the consideration of these locations for development ss such the reports do not have planning status. The planning policy relating to these sites will need to be formalised through the Core Strategy and then sites will be allocated with detailed site requirements in the Placemaking Plan (to be done in conjunction with the local community)’.

On this basis, we challenge the exclusion of the KS’s land from the Core Strategy Proposed Changes and weight that can now be attached to the adopted Concept Statement for MOD Ensleigh as this clearly is superseded by the Changes to the Core Strategy and the Arup information used to inform the pending Placemaking Plan.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Recommened Changes:

KS playing fields are included in the area allocated in the Core Strategy Proposed Changes. Furthermore, prior to discounting the KS playing fields for future development, the Council must recognise the significant opportunity this land could provide, in terms of education/sports provision or contribution to meeting the Council's five year housing land supply. Further environmental assessment should be undertaken in conjunction with the School to fully assess what the environmental impact of development in this location will be and how the land can actively contribute to the delivery of holistic regeneration of the MOD Ensleigh site and growth of the City in this location. In addition, the Concept Statement should be updated in parallel to KS's Estate Plan to reflect this opportunity and be consulted upon as part of the Placemaking Plan. KS reserve their position to make further representations at the Placemaking Stage of the Plan Process.

Change Ref. SPC82**Plan Ref.: Para 2.26A****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4607 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** JC & PA Elliot-Newman and

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC82

Plan Reference: Para 2.26A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

'The Council also observes that part of the (RUH) site may become surplus to the Trust's requirements and be available for alternative uses during the Core Strategy Period.'

The alternative uses should NOT be surplus to the Trust's requirements.

Change to the policy requested:

There is an overwhelming need for a considerable increase in onsite parking, both for hospital staff and for patients and patient's visitors.

The Hospital Trust is a major employer.

Much of the on street parking throughout the surrounding neighbourhood could be substantially reduced by such provision, easing the congestion in the residential areas of Penn Lea Road and on Weston Lane, Weston Road and Weston Park.

Respondent Number: 4612 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** The Elms Weston Bath Management Co

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC82

Plan Reference: Para 2.26A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

'The Council also observes that part of the (RUH) site may become surplus to the Trust's requirements and be available for alternative uses during the Core Strategy Period.'

The alternative uses should NOT be surplus to the Trust's requirements.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

There is an overwhelming need for a considerable increase in onsite parking, both for hospital staff and for patients and patient's visitors.

The Hospital Trust is a major employer.

Much of the on street parking throughout the surrounding neighbourhood could be substantially reduced by such provision, easing the congestion in the residential areas of Penn Lea Road and on Weston Lane, Weston Road and Weston Park.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 16 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton

Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC82

Plan Reference: Para 2.26A

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The hospital site has insufficient parking space for its staff, many of which work unsocial hours and cannot therefore use public transport. Currently some of these staff are forced to park in residential areas outside the hospital site. The Trust should not be allowed to declare surplus land until that can demonstrate that this latent demand has been satisfied.

Change to the policy requested:

The Council will support investment in the development of the hospital to meet the needs of health care infrastructure and its staff. The Council notes that if part of the site becomes surplus to the Trust's requirements and the needs of its staff it would be available for alternative uses during the Core Strategy period.

Change Ref. SPC83**Plan Ref.: New Para 2.26B****Development Location: Comment on new development locations**

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 17 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton

Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC83

Plan Reference: New Para 2.26B

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The assumption has been made that the Football Club's land swap would be for land that the council has no development plans for. This is not guaranteed, and the possibility should be recognised in the text..

Change to the policy requested:

Bath City Football Club, who own Twerton Park football stadium has stated that site will be available for redevelopment during the Plan period. It intends to leave Twerton Park and sell it or facilitate a land swap elsewhere in B&NES on which it can build a new facility. The site will therefore be available for redevelopment as part of a residential/mixed-use scheme during the Plan period, and provided the new location for the Football Club does not conflict with development plans elsewhere in the Core Strategy this will be a net gain.

Change Ref. SPC85**Plan Ref.: Para 2.27**

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC85 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

SPC 46
 SPC 85
 SPC 150
 SPC 171
 SPC 183
 SPC 184
 and to the omission of Planning Policies NE.1 and NE.2 from the list of "Saved Policies" from the 2007 Local Plan

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC85 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Objection

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC85 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.27

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Objections

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 246 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE **Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC85 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.27

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Please see Combe Hay Parish Council's detailed comments relating to SPC 88.

Change to the policy requested:

For "three", read "two". Delete – "on land adjoining Odd Down" For "two", read "one" Delete – "Odd Down" For "both Weston and Odd Down", read "Weston"
Delete – "B3A"

Change Ref. SPC86

Plan Ref.: Para 2.30

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 197 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Bray **Respondent Organisation:** Railfuture Severnside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC86 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.30

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support in principle improvements to enhance links between Bath, Oldfield Park station, the city centre and the Enterprise Area.

Change to the policy requested:

The definition of "public transport links" needs to include rail services from beyond the boundaries of Bath & North East Somerset, including enhancements proposed by the Greater Bristol Metro scheme.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Respondent Number: 4607 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** JC & PA Elliot-Newman and

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC86 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.30

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The improvements of sustainable transport choices, pedestrian, cycling and public transport routes do not include those from the Weston area, very necessary before any further housing development in that area.

We cannot see how or where the existing routes could be changed / improved

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent** 4612 **Comment** 5 **Respondent**
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent** The Elms Weston Bath
Organisation: Management Co**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC86

Plan Reference: Para 2.30

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The improvements of sustainable transport choices, pedestrian, cycling and public transport routes do not include those from the Weston area, very necessary before any further housing development in that area.

We cannot see how or where the existing routes could be changed / improved

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent** 4474 **Comment** 6 **Respondent**
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent** Ediston Properties Ltd
Organisation:**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC86

Plan Reference: Para 2.30

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Paragraph 2.30 (page 43) – Sustainable Transport Choices

Though the amendment proposed here rephrases rather than outlines new proposals, we welcome the retention of wording to underscore the need to provide and enhance pedestrian, cycling and public transport links between the existing city-centre and the western river corridor. It could also be expressed that this would need to provide enhanced links across the river Avon in particular to attain the level of connectivity required for a healthy and integrated central area.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Change Ref. SPC87**Plan Ref.: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B****Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh****Respondent** 4560 **Comment** 3 **Respondent**
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent** IM Properties Ltd &
Organisation: Linden Homes**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

•Paragraph 2.30A & 2.30B (Document reference SPC8 – Development on the edge of Bath)

In line with the comments made above, any changes to the green belt near to MoD Ensleigh should be consulted upon as

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

part of an updated Concept Statement, in partnership with the landowners in this location including IM Properties, Kingswood School and the RHS. The focus of all new development should be prioritised on the 'previously developed land' consistent with the Core Strategy approach and advice set out in the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: The Council must acknowledge that priority for development must focus on previously development land and this should be directly referred to in the supporting text in order to minimise the need to release Greenfield sites. Any changes to the Green Belt should be drafted in conjunction with neighbouring landowners and consulted upon directly with the wider community. IM Properties and Linden Homes reserve their position at this stage to make further submissions in relation to any future revisions to the Green Belt in this location. The Core Strategy, Placemaking Plan and Concept Statement must all be consistent and commercially deliverable in order to ensure the delivery of a robust and realistic five year housing land supply. Based on the reasons set out above, this is not considered to be the case at present as the allocation cannot meet all the Council's objectives set out in the Concept Statement.

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change to the policy requested:

In addition, SPC87 says there is no scope to identify safeguarded land in the longer term. We consider it is inappropriate for the Core Strategy to make this pre-judgement. SPC88 and Proposed Policy B3A requires detailed work which will inform the process for identifying whether or not safeguarded land is appropriate. Either a proper comprehensive Green Belt Review should have been carried out to enable this judgement to have been made now, or if the 2 stage Local Plan process continues, the pre-judgement regarding scope for our safeguarded land at Odd Down should be deleted.

Respondent Number: 278 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cotswolds Conservation Board

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. The Cotswolds Conservation Board ('the Board') was established by Parliament in 2004.

The Board has two statutory purposes :

- a) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and
- b) To increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.

In fulfilling these roles, the Board has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of people living in the AONB.

2. The Board considers the proposed addition to Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

"Development on the edge of Bath

In order to meet the need for additional housing within the District during the Plan period development needs to be provided for in three locations on the edge of Bath on land adjoining Odd Down; Weston; and MoD Ensleigh, Lansdown. In two of these locations (at Odd Down and Weston) land needs to be removed from the Green Belt.

The Placemaking Plan will identify and allocate the sites for development and, where relevant, will define the revised detailed Green Belt boundary.

National planning policy makes it clear that when altering Green Belt boundaries a long term view needs to be taken to ensure that boundaries endure beyond the plan period.

Where necessary this can include plans identifying areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs. At both Weston and Odd Down environmental sensitivity and the need to minimise harm means that there is no scope to identify safeguarded land for the longer term. Policies B3A, B3B and B3C outline the planning requirements for each of the three locations which need to inform identification and allocation of the sites in the Placemaking Plan and delivery of the sites through a planning application.”

to be unsound.

3. The sites identified as Weston and Odd Down are within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. AONBs are statutorily designated under Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) in order to conserve and enhance their natural beauty.

4. Section 85 (1) of the CROW Act states:

“In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.”

5. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”

6. Footnote 9 states:

“9 For example, those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.”

7. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states:

“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

8. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states:

“116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

9. The Board is of the view that in proposing the use of Green Belt land at Weston and Odd Down for residential development the Council has given insufficient weight to

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- a) The location of these sites within the Cotswolds AONB
- b) The statutory purpose of the designation of the AONB
- c) Consideration of the restriction of development highlighted by footnote 9 of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.
- d) The “highest status of protection” given to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB compared to sites outside the AONB rejected by the Council; and
- e) The lack of any clear indication as to how the detrimental effect on the environment of the proposed release could be moderated.

10. With respect to point (e) it noted that the Council proposes under paragraph 2.15 of the plan to prepare a “Placemaking Plan” to indicate how development of these sites could occur. The Board submits that in the absence of such a Plan it cannot be demonstrated that the detrimental effect on the environment can be moderated.

11. With respect to paragraph 10, the Board would wish to draw the Inspector’s attention to paragraph 21 of the Secretary of States letter dated 13th February 2013 with respect to Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 78) Appeal by Fay & Son Ltd Highfield Farm, Tetbury, Gloucestershire GL8 8SD (Appeal Reference APP/F1610/A/11/2165778) which states:

“The Secretary of State agrees that the primary concern about the impact on the AONB is the loss of fields to housing development (IR14.53). Despite the visual improvements that would result from the landscaping proposals, and to some extent moderate the impact of the new buildings, he agrees that the loss of open fields must inevitably have a detrimental effect on the landscape and environment.”

12. The Board is therefore of the view that the proposed use of AONB sites does not “minimise harm” as suggested by the proposed addition to Paras 2.30A & 2.30B. In any case this is not the correct test as required by the CROW Act and the NPPF, which are

- a) does the change conserve and enhance the AONB? And
- b) does the change give the highest status of protection to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB?.

13. The Board therefore suggests that the proposed addition to Paragraphs 2.30A & 2.30B is amended to remove reference to land at Weston and Odd Down to make the plan sound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Board therefore suggests that the proposed addition to Paragraphs 2.30A & 2.30B is amended to remove reference to land at Weston and Odd Down to make the plan sound.

Respondent Number: 4547	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name: Mr Martin Davis	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC87	Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B		
Development Location: Comment on general development locations			

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

THE ADDITIONAL HOUSING NEEDS IDENTIFIED ARE QUESTIONABLE AND HAVE BEEN USED AS AN EXCUSE FOR DEVELOPING AONB/ GREEN FIELD SITES AT ODD DOWN AND WESTON WHICH ARE OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE TO THE SETTING OF BATH AS A WORLD HERITAGE SITE THESE HOUSING NUMBERS NEED TO BE REVIEWED ONCE AGAIN AND IF VALID NEED TO APPLIED TO BROWN FIELD SITES

THE CURRENT PROPOSED CHANGE AND PLAN IS THEREFORE UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4607 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Respondent **Respondent Organisation:** JC & PA Elliot-Newman and

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

No reference made to any consideration of meeting the need for additional housing in any areas other than the three named locations.

Change to the policy requested:

Other areas of Bath should be included, which are less environmentally sensitive to the need to protect Green Belt Boundaries and the World Heritage Site.

Respondent Number: 4612 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Respondent **Respondent Organisation:** The Elms Weston Bath Management Co

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

No reference made to any consideration of meeting the need for additional housing in any areas other than the three named locations.

Change to the policy requested:

Other areas of Bath should be included, which are less environmentally sensitive to the need to protect Green Belt Boundaries and the World Heritage Site.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Respondent Number: 67 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Trevor John **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Submitted Core Strategy is not legally compliant/sound. The NPPF says that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt land at Odd Down is not needed, as sufficient homes could be built elsewhere by increasing the density on brown field sites and by utilising under occupied properties in central Bath e.g. flats above retail shops. Also, this land is AONB land and exceptional circumstances have not been put forward for its development.

If 300 homes really are necessary, a report prepared by Arups for the Council (dated April 2013) shows that 235 homes could be built on the most westerly part of the Odd Down land, adjoining Combe Hay Lane. This would include a football pitch, which could easily relocate to unusable land adjoining the Park & Ride. These 235 homes would be very close to the Park & Ride and so ideally sited for transport links into Bath. To destroy AONB/Green Belt land for an additional 65 homes is ludicrous

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Delete the reference to land at Odd Down

Respondent Number: 4524 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cardinal Close Residents**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC87 objection

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Respondent Number:** 4721 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak **Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

Delete reference to the need to release land at Weston from the green belt. The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

Delete reference to the need to release land at Weston from the green belt. The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4763 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Terrence Hiskens**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC 87 (Green Belt) Object

The five fundamental aims of the Green Belt should be preserved. The NPPF keeps the requirement to retain the fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The allocation of land at Weston is fundamentally opposed to this with development proposed in the open countryside.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete reference to Weston.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Respondent Number:** 265 **Comment Number:** 18 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Green Belt land is supposed to have statutory protection and although Local Authorities have the ability under the legislation to remove land from Green Belt, it should only be done under exceptional circumstances. This section of the Core Strategy does not identify exceptional circumstances, it merely claims that they are sustainable locations without clarifying exactly what makes them sustainable, or what deficiencies in other land locations outside the Green Belt rule them out. The impression given is that removal of land from Green Belt protection is proposed as a convenience rather than a necessity, and that cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be classed as exceptional circumstances. Whilst the Government may have "wish list" housing targets, the legislation has not been amended and therefore the legislation is more binding on a Local Authority than numerical targets.

It may be that in Bath in order to meet the housing needs (as opposed to arbitrary targets) it is eventually concluded that there is insufficient available land apart from some Green Belt incursions, but these should always be a last resort, not a planned easy option.

The Core Strategy must emphasise that the use of Green Belt land is a last resort.

Change to the policy requested:

In order to meet the need for additional housing within the District during the Plan period development needs to be provided for on the edge of Bath on land adjoining MoD, Ensleigh, Lansdown. Only where it proves essential and unavoidable in order to meet unmet need (rather than arbitrary targets) will land in the Green Belt be considered. Two potential locations (at Odd Down and Weston) have been suggested where land needs to be removed from the Green Belt. The Placemaking Plan will identify and allocate the sites for development and, where it proves unavoidable, will define the revised detailed Green Belt boundary.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 3152 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.

The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Reserve the change.

Respondent Number: 4426 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** John Brookes**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We object to the above on the following grounds:-

- 1 While infill would be acceptable, expanding Bath in annular rings into the green belt would be detrimental to the setting of the World Heritage Site.
- 2 While ribbon development along the route to Bristol would be unacceptable, it would be better to further expand Keynsham or Saltford or start a new town remote from existing towns.
- 3 The proposal, even if provided with good access in three directions and one school would further overload the roads into and within Bath and other infrastructure..

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4541 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Stephen and Pam Chamberlain**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I consider this change to be unsound, as no justification has been provided for the choice of land adjoining Weston as a suitable development site. Rather, documents such as the Arup Report (on which the amended Core Strategy is largely based) dismiss most other sites around Bath as being 'not available'. This indicates that 'availability' – in the form of Council ownership – was the key factor in making the decision. I do not believe that is in line with any planning guidelines.

(Specific objections are submitted under SPC89.)

Change to the policy requested:

This change should be removed.

Respondent Number: 4707**Comment Number:** 1**Respondent Name:** Ms R Harvey**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not agree that the Proposed Change to number of Housing required in Bath is justifiable or positive.

Bath has a unique position as World Heritage City which brings a number of economical advantages to the city through tourism. The proposed developments on Green Belt/AONB sites may address a nationally established housing number but appear to take no account of such unique and positive City features and long term may be detrimental, indeed not sustainable.

This also relates to use of Green Belt/AONB.

Should any development of Green Belt/AONB be pushed through, it should be fully incorporated in the Strategy that any future development in Bath should ensure Brownfield Sites are prioritised and NO development of Green Belt permitted prior to FULL TAKE UP of ALL current AND FORTHCOMING Brownfield Sites.

I believe there should also be a break clause whereby if future review indicates initial estimates are indeed unduly positive, then further development can be ceased without hitting the original numbers.

Although Banes have taken the opportunity to communicate proposals via usual documentation and recent Public consultations, I am aware of a number of residents adjacent to the proposed land at Odd Down, who are not aware of the plans and have had no opportunity to review the proposals and respond to today's deadline. A doorstep delivery may not have been considered to be cost effective, but would have been a much more proactive positive approach to engage the directly impacted local Community so impacted by any development, as per any other Planning proposal. Knowledge is power, but no knowledge can also put power in the hands of decision makers !

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4719**Comment Number:** 3**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Kingswood School**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC87

Plan Reference: Paras 2.30A & 2.30B

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Paragraph 2.30A & 2.30B (Document reference SPC8 – Development on the edge of Bath)

Whilst KS acknowledges the role and purpose of the Green Belt, there is a clear disconnect between B&NES recognition of the School as an important major employer and education provider in the City, and the proposed Planning Policy Framework.

The School sites do not benefit collectively from a major developed site status in the Green Belt and its current designation solely as Green Belt land significantly restricts the ability of the school to invest in the delivery of new and improved facilities or alternative land uses (on surplus sites) as part of the emerging Estate Strategy. As consistently stated, the School requires as part of its Estate Strategy to undertake improvements to the education offer on site and alternative land uses on land no longer required for core educational purposes. Consistent with the changes to the Core Strategy, this submission requests the Council amends the Green Belt Boundary to remove the school estate from the designation in totality or if the Council is unable to support such a release, designate the KS sites as 'major development site in the Green Belt' consistent with other schools in Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: The KS sites should be removed from the Green Belt designation or alternatively as a minimum, KS should be designated as a 'major development site in the Green Belt'. KS reserves their position at this stage to make further submissions in relation to any future revisions to the Green Belt in this location.

Change Ref. SPC88**Plan Ref.: Policy B3A****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 93**Comment Number:** 3**Respondent Name:** Mrs Jacqui Ashman**Respondent Organisation:** Highways Agency**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions. These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements.

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Land adjoining Odd Down Bath

The Agency in principle has no objection to the residential led mixed use development of this site to the south west of Bath. We welcome the planning requirements listed including the provision of cycle and pedestrian links to Bath City centre and Odd Down and Combe Down local centres as well as localised junction improvements. The development of the site has the potential to impact on the SRN at the A36 so any detailed proposals for the site will need to be drawn up and a robust transport assessment undertaken to assess capacity and include any necessary mitigation measures before we can comment specifically .

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Policy B3A: delete or edit criteria under “Planning Requirements”

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

HFT welcome the proposed changes incorporating development on the edge of Bath and at Odd Down. Since 2005, HFT have made substantial representations to the Regional Strategy and then Core Strategy. Since these representations have been at Strategic Level, they have not sought to define or to allocate a specific site but to demonstrate the capacity of the location to accommodate a significant scale of development and to demonstrate deliverability of that development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The text of 2.30 A says “In two of these locations (at Odd Down and Weston) land needs to be removed from the Green Belt.

The Placemaking Plan will identify and allocate the sites for development and, where relevant, will define the revised detailed Green Belt boundary.”

Clearly the land in question is entirely located in Green Belt and earlier representations to the dCS HFTPC GB, proposed the new boundaries of the Green Belt. The Council has proposed this is a matter for the Placemaking Plan and while HFT would agree with the broad principle of this, it nevertheless believes that in determining the overall strategic capacity of the site, now and in the future, it is important to have an idea where the broad extent of the Green Belt has been so altered and where such permanent and defensible boundaries might be located.

The current position is that the strategic policy B1 and B3A amends the general extent of the Green Belt in this location sufficient to accommodate the proposed scale of development. The text in 2.30 A says “ land needs to be removed from the Green Belt “ whereas HFT would prefer the clarity of “ land is removed from the Green Belt “. This amended wording is proposed. At present the Council have determined a scale of development that falls well short of the overall capacity of the site ie only 300 dwellings, capable of occupying approximately a third of the plateau site area. The evidence brought forward by the Council gives no clear reasons why 300 units are the maximum scale of development on this site or, broadly speaking, where such scale of development should be located on the plateau.

It is this exercise that HFT and its advisors will address themselves over the next six months, in order to determine the most appropriate location, with minimum harm, to accommodate around 300 dwellings and local employment.

It is self evident that HFT believe the location at Odd Down can accommodate a greater scale of development and that in many respects, such a larger scale development is their preferred way forward, however HFT accept that a smaller scale development can be brought forward with high quality design and which can meet the development requirements set out in Policy B3A. The Council have indicated that they intend to bring forward their Placemaking Plan this summer and so HFT will work with the Council to develop more detailed proposals to form part of that evidence and if appropriate share these with the Inspector.

The HFT own or control almost all the undeveloped land on the plateau and so are well placed to bring forward plans efficiently. The SHLAA Trajectory 2013 identifies this location making a significant contribution to the Five Year Supply. HFT have examined the constraints affecting the land, considered the necessary provision of survey evidence and assessed the deliverability of utilities to the site, given the timetable set out in the SHLAA 2013.

Recent correspondence with Wessex Water has confirmed that necessary online improvements to sewer infrastructure in the vicinity of Odd Down and the Wellsway will result in sufficient capacity being available to meet the entire development needs of either the 300 new dwellings , upto 1000 dwellings, during the plan period . The initial modelling suggests there is some capacity within the existing sewer system sufficient to allow the development to proceed in 2015/16 before works are necessary to improve capacity. Wessex recommend undertaking modelling work as part of a planning condition attached to any development and an undertaking to make financial contributions alongside Wessex Water to allow improvements in sewer capacity in due course. The likely capital costs per home of such a contribution is well within the viability envelope for this type of scheme where the scale of development is larger.

Para 2.30B

The Council at new paragraph 2.30B reject the suggestion that land could be safeguarded at Odd Down and in contrast propose that locations at Whitchurch and SW of Keynsham should be identified for safeguarded land to be identified in the Placemaking Plan.

Inso far as the Inspector fails to accept the case by HFT that there is sufficient need and justification to develop the whole of the plateau and thereby roll back the Green Belt to the natural edge of the escarpment at Odd Down, it is argued that the balance of any suitable land beyond that taken for 300 dwellings (or more) should be identified as safeguarded land capable of providing for development beyond the plan period but leading to establishing a long term permanent Green Belt boundary.

The evidence from the Council’s own work demonstrates the suitability of the site and it is available and deliverable. HFT will not set out at this point the arguments why this approach by the Council is illogical and unsound as we fail to understand how the Council reached a conclusion on limiting the development to 300 units in the first place.

Therefore we reserve our position to respond once the Council have provided such evidence.

Change to the policy requested:

The key Diagram 4 should be modified as follows:

The number of homes at Bath should be increased by up to 700 dwellings to 7700 new dwellings.

The key should identify the land adjoining Odd Down (and others) with the same yellow strategic location designation as Somerdale and Bath Riverside. The key should identify the scale of development at odd down as 1000 homes.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 278 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cotswolds Conservation Board

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. The Cotswolds Conservation Board ('the Board') was established by Parliament in 2004.

The Board has two statutory purposes :

- a) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and
- b) To increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.

In fulfilling these roles, the Board has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of people living in the AONB.

2. The Board considers the proposed addition to Policy B3A

“Land adjoining Odd Down

Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 300 dwellings, small scale local employment opportunities and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary.

Planning requirements...:”

to be unsound.

3. The site at Odd Down is within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. AONBs are statutorily designated under Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) in order to conserve and enhance their natural beauty.

4. Section 85 (1) of the CROW Act states:

“In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.”

5. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.9”

6. Footnote 9 states:

“9 For example, those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.”

7. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states:

“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great

weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

8. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states:

“116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

9. The Board is of the view that in proposing the use of Green Belt land at Odd Down for residential development the Council has given insufficient weight to

- a) The location of the site within the Cotswolds AONB
- b) The statutory purpose of the designation of the AONB
- c) Consideration of the restriction of development highlighted by footnote 9 of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.
- d) The “highest status of protection” given to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB compared to sites outside the AONB rejected by the Council; and
- e) The lack of any clear indication as to how the detrimental effect on the environment of the proposed release could be moderated.

10. With respect to point (e) it noted that the Council proposes under paragraph 2.15 of the plan to prepare a “Placemaking Plan” to indicate how development of this site could occur. The Board submits that in the absence of such a Plan it cannot be demonstrated that the detrimental effect on the environment can be moderated.

Subparagraph (e) of the proposed addition is

“e. Identify and assess the landscape character, landscape features and significant view points and the likely effects of development on them. Protect and enhance these aspects and mitigate to avoid or minimise the effects. Significant aspects of landscape include the Cotswold AONB...”

11. With respect to paragraph 10, the Board would wish to draw the Inspector’s attention to paragraph 21 of the Secretary of States letter dated 13th February 2013 with respect to Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 78) Appeal by Fay & Son Ltd Highfield Farm, Tetbury, Gloucestershire GL8 8SD (Appeal Reference APP/F1610/A/11/2165778) which states:

“The Secretary of State agrees that the primary concern about the impact on the AONB is the loss of fields to housing development (IR14.53). Despite the visual improvements that would result from the landscaping proposals, and to some extent moderate the impact of the new buildings, he agrees that the loss of open fields must inevitably have a detrimental effect on the landscape and environment.”

12. The Board is therefore of the view that sub paragraph (e) clearly shows that that the means of moderating any detrimental effects on the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB have not been demonstrated.

13. The Board therefore suggests that Policy B3A is amended to remove reference to land at Odd Down to make the plan sound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Board therefore suggests that Policy B3A is amended to remove reference to land at Odd Down to make the plan sound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4481 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Jean Cowley**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I have the following objections to the Draft Core Strategy.

1. Housing Density.

The additional houses required could easily be accommodated in the areas defined in the previous Draft Core Strategy if built to a slightly higher density. I understand that there is a particular need for affordable housing in the Bath area and a higher density in these locations would be consistent with this objective while also providing housing to a good standard. There is therefore no need to build on Greenfield sites within the Green Belt and particularly within the AONB.

2. World Heritage Status

Bath's setting in a green environment with vistas of the city is important to its continuing designation as a World Heritage City. I understand this point has already been accepted as a reason for not building houses on the approach to Bath from the Newton St Loe.

3. AONB and the Wansdyke

Within the zone designated in the Southstoke/Odd down area, the area adjacent to the Midford road is particularly sensitive. It has special protection against development through its AONB status and it contains one of the few remaining open sections of the Western Wansdyke. Development in this area would, as the BNES amendments point out, require a major road near the Cross Keys pub, leading to further major degradation.

I believe further housing development in the area to be wholly unnecessary and inconsistent with BNES' objectives.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4642 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC88 (Odd Down) NPPF states "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest." The council is proposing that 12700 houses should be built in the plan period, for Odd Down this represents 2% of the housing proposed, combined with Weston this totals 4%. Overall the level of error of a plan that is 15 years long could not justify the allocation of this site being in the public interest.

The paragraph goes on to say the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; Evidence from the Council shows that there is only a need for 10,000 houses if only the need for jobs is considered in looking at housing number requirement.

Further paragraphs say "the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and" This could be met by increasing the housing density within other brownfield sites, and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

therefore the allocation should not go ahead.

The proposals don't fit within the final sentence in this paragraph any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

Bat foraging area. A large part of this Odd Down/ South Stoke Plateau area has been recognised by European Experts in Wildlife Conservation as an extremely important foraging area for the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat. The disturbance through noise and light pollution created by the proposed development will cause very real harm to this threatened species and it's habitat. Bat's can be seen flying around the Sulis Meadows estate at night.

The Wansdyke is a very ancient important Archaeological feature, so much so that it is registered as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument'. By definition it must be protected against inappropriate development on, or near it, that might cause actual or visual harm. This proposal would simply ruin one of the few remaining sections of the Western Wansdyke,that are accessible to the public. Protection of the Wansdyke should be an important consideration, even though a large stretch is within the council's ownership, a management plan has not been developed, destruction has taken place when the council built Threeways School. These proposals will not enhance the setting of the Wansdyke, with the potential for creating urban development both sides of the Wansdyke.

The entire site from Combe Hay Lane to South Stoke lane is in the Cotswold AONB. This has, by statute, the highest level of protection against unauthorized development. The site viewable for many miles, light pollution will fundamentally alter the character of the AONB in this area.

Major development in an AONB is only allowed if it is in the "Local and National interest".

No proof of this has been provided in this proposal. Indeed elsewhere in the Draft Core Strategy there is specific mention of the great importance of the GB and AONB to the Setting of the World Heritage City of Bath.

The proposed amendments conflict with BANES own policy and so are "unsound"

Traffic/Access.

Limited access - Road connections into site would be possible from only two narrow outlets in South Stoke Lane to the east and Combe Hay Lane to the west. Both would add enormous traffic problems to already badly congested surrounding areas.

Any connecting roads would create a rat run and cause major problems to residents and safety would be impacted.

Children are able to play relatively safely currently due to the roads on Sulis Meadows being quiet, this would not be the case if the estate was then joined via road to new housing.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Respondent Number: 67 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Trevor John

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Submitted Core Strategy is not legally compliant/sound. The NPPF says that Green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The report prepared by Arups for the Council (dated April 2013) shows that 235 homes could be built on the most westerly part of the Odd Down land, adjoining Combe Hay Lane. These 235 homes would be very close to the Park & Ride and so ideally sited for transport links into Bath. This would mean that there was no need for a road link from the B3110/Midford Road/Southstoke Road/Cross Keys junction. To destroy AONB/Green Belt land for this road and an additional 65 homes is ludicrous.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete the reference to land at Odd Down

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 67	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name: Trevor John	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC88		Plan Reference: Policy B3A	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**
 The Submitted Core Strategy is not legally compliant/sound. To destroy AONB/Green Belt land for a school is quite unreasonable, when other local schools can easily be expanded .

Change to the policy requested:
 Delete the reference to land at Odd Down

Respondent Number: 68	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mrs Jennifer John	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC88		Plan Reference: Policy B3A	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**
 These comments refer to what is called 'Land at Odd Down' in the amended Core Strategy. This is a misnomer. The majority of the land lies within the rural parish of South Stoke, with a small proportion in Combe Hay. Not one iota of it lies within the Ward of Odd Down. In giving it this title, BANES is ascribing the farmland with an unjustified urban identity. It should rightly be called 'Land within South Stoke and Combe Hay'.

SPC15 'The Council...has identified locations which cause the least harm to the City's highly sensitive environment and has sought to minimise the scale of the impact'. The Council has failed in its duty to protect its sensitive environment by including what it refers to as 'Land at Odd Down' and so the Amended Core Strategy is not sound. This land should be removed from the Core Strategy. The reasons are indicated below.

SPC12 Inclusion of Land at Odd Down – NOT JUSTIFIED. It is a sustenance zone for rare Horsehoe Bats for the Bath & Bradford on Avon Bats SAC and within/adjacent to the Fuller's Earth Works SNC1. The Interim Habitat Regulations Assessment identifies that there is potential for significant impact on the SAC to which 'Land at Odd Down' is very close. It should not be considered for development, as it is an offence under European law to interfere with their habitat. Skylarks, another rare species, have recently returned to nest on this plateau land having been driven away by the Sulis Manor Estate development in the 1990s. Pearl bordered fritillary butterflies have recently been seen there. The rare Bath Asparagus plant, as featured on all local Manor Farm/Hignett family trust notices, is native to this area. It is unrealistic to consider that 'mitigation' could be effective when a large scale development plus additional infrastructure requirements (e.g. primary school, work places) is proposed. This land may not superficially appear important to protect: further careful consideration reveals that it IS.

SPC14 The identification of land for development has sought to minimise the impact on the environment and the Green Belt and take account of infrastructure requirements This is untrue. BANES would not be considering this land were it not that an avaricious landowner wishes to exploit this 'asset' of pristine farmland – 'a national non-renewable resource'. There are other less highly protected areas within BANES. The proposed 300 houses for 'Land at Odd Down' would require community buildings, and other infrastructure which is not fully addressed in this document. If jobs are to be created on site, this will take up even more space. Adjacent Sulis Manor Estate (c.350 homes) lacks a pub or community hall. 650 adjacent dwellings would surely need substantial infrastructure to create pleasant communities.

SPC24 The Green Belt should be respected. With a minor increase in density of the homes in the 3 ex-MOD sites, a further 300 homes could be created, obviating the need for despoiling highly protected farmland. Furthermore, there are many empty top floor flats within Bath which the Council should bring into use – the most sustainable place to create homes for Bath workers. Not only is the ‘Land at Odd Down’ in the Green Belt, it is within the Cotswolds AONB, and no case has been made by BANES for exceptional circumstances of local and national importance to justify a major development within the AONB. The Schedule of amendments to the Core Strategy is therefore unsound.

SPCs 30 and 31 Refer to removing land from the Green Belt to provide for urban extensions to Bath. This should not be necessary in the case of ‘Land at Odd Down’, as it is strongly protected farmland for which no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated, and alternative solutions have been suggested. A recent freedom of information reply to the question of how many homes had been granted planning permission, but were unbuilt, yielded the total of 4,000 four thousand within BANES. Amended core Strategy is not sound.

SPC 38 ‘The conservation and enhancement of the WHS, its setting and the conservation area’ The ‘Land at Odd Down’ lies within the setting of the WHS. It will not be conserved or enhanced by 300 houses, a road and other necessary infrastructure being built on it. It will in fact be destroyed. Amended core strategy is unsound.

SPC42 ‘seek to protect the outstanding universal value (OUV) of the site and its setting....the green setting of the city’ Taking the ‘Land at Odd Down’ for development is NOT protecting the OUV. BANES should recognise the importance of this tract of farmland, and preserve it as just that – a vital part of the WHS setting. Policy at variance with proposals. Amended core strategy unsound.

SPC46 ‘Where development is needed on the edge of Bath, it will be positioned....to sustain the ‘significance’ of Bath’s heritage assets and the integrity of its landscape setting. Covering an area of land with the status of AONB, Green Belt and WHS setting protection is NOT sustaining its ‘significance’, but destroying it. To retain the integrity of the landscape setting of the WHS, this land should remain as it is – undeveloped. It is not necessary to build here. Alternatives: a minor increase in the density of ex-MOD sites would take up the 300 extra homes required; in February 2013, there were 456 unoccupied homes within BANES; this does not include the above shop flats which ought to be the most sustainable place to create homes. A recent case where the setting proved crucial to a decision was made by Mrs Justice Lang (Lyveden New Bield). Amended Core strategy is unsound.

SPC 51 ‘Give great weight to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty’ There is a contradiction in terms here – hard landscape, roads, 300 homes, street lighting and other street furniture, a primary school etc. however well built, can NEVER be seen as conserving landscape and scenic beauty which is of a NATURAL variety. No attempt has been made to demonstrate the essential case for the desecration of the AONB here: in every respect, development would bring harm and damage. The ‘Land at Odd Down’ should be excluded from development. Amended Core Strategy is unsound.

SPC54 Again, ‘Land at Odd Down’ should not be included for development. To summarise the reasons:

1. It is within the AONB and no exceptional circumstances have been cited for it to be sacrificed.
2. It is within the Green Belt.
3. It forms part of the Setting of the World Heritage Site. The setting comprises countryside with beautiful Cotswold stone villages scattered around the southern environs of Bath. (Page 49 of BANES’ SHLAA 2013 records ‘Development in the southwest corner of this area would have a high impact on the rural setting of the World Heritage Site, newly revealing the urban form to the surrounding rural landscape.’)
4. The conservation village of Southstoke is one of these rural villages. 300 homes plus the associated infrastructure would inevitably mean the two would become joined, destroying the character and integrity of Southstoke. (Page 48 of BANES’ SHLAA E14 2013 records: ‘There are serious concerns about the overall development coverage and the impact on the rural setting of Southstoke Conservation Area to the south.’) There is a thin dividing line at present: if reduced, it would be meaningless.
5. The Wansdyke, a Scheduled Ancient Monument, runs along part of the northern boundary of Southstoke parish. BANES’s archaeologist, Richard Sermon, has publicly stated that “the Wansdyke is of equal archaeological importance to the Roman Baths”. It has been seriously damaged by recent unofficial ‘crossings’ made by the public, which erode the monument. This has increased greatly since Sainsbury’s supermarket arrived. An impact assessment (page 48 BANES SHLAA E14 2013 records ‘Previous residential development to the west of the area has placed considerable pressure on the Wansdyke, and lead to serious erosion of the monument.’) How can building a road across the Wansdyke be seen as ‘sustaining and enhancing the significance’ of the City’s heritage assets? SPC54.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

6. Southstoke, a parish with a Conservation Area, which has defended its very special identity over the years, comprises at present some 183 homes. The proposed 300 homes (plus primary school and other infrastructure) on 'Land at Odd Down' would be almost totally within the parish of Southstoke. To swamp a rural parish with such disproportionate (well over 100% increase) development would destroy its identity, and inevitably lead to its coalescence with Bath. This is not what the NPPF intends (not more than 10% in RA1). Not justifiable, and so unacceptable.

7. Bats and other wildlife. See notes on SPC 12. Fragile habitats need to be protected.

8. Light Pollution and Visibility The very nature of the 'Land at Odd Down' which is on a high plateau – the Cotswold escarpment – means that when street lights are in place it will be highly visible from up to 15 miles or more to the south. To see the detrimental effects of lighting on the night sky, one only has to come to Southstoke and look to the south at night. The sodium lights of Peasdown St John are highly visible. Conversely, looking north towards Bath from the south, the Park & Ride lights are highly visible. Trees only have leaves for part of the year, and would have a very minor mitigating effect.

9. Traffic. The streets of Bath are clogged up with traffic at present, which is bad for the buildings, bad for our health, and leads to residents and visitors forming a poor opinion of the city and experiencing frustrations over parking. With another 7,000 new homes, it is likely to come to a standstill!

10. Amenity value. There are public footpaths which skirt the 'Land at Odd Down', which are very well used – providing quiet walks, extensive 180 degree views to the south, and opportunities for city folk to refresh their spirits in tranquil surroundings. If development were to go ahead, these valuable benefits would be lost for ever.

BANES' stated policies are at odds with its own proposals as in SPC25 'Protecting, conserving and enhancing the district's locally and nationally important cultural and historic assets' The Amended Core Strategy is therefore unsound.

Bath is indeed a very special case. It is unique in that the whole city is a World Heritage Site. Can not the Inspector, NPPF and protective legislation be used to defend it from this massively overwhelming increase? Could not some degree of proportionality be brought to bear? BANES should be the defender of the World Heritage City, not promoting the despoiling of it. Additional background on The Wansdyke, and its significance.

The Wansdyke from St Gregory's School to the Cross Keys Inn forms what has been the boundary between Bath and the parish of Southstoke since at least 961AD when King Edgar re-granted 5 hides of land at Tottanstoc (Southstoke) to St Peter's Monastery in Bath. King Edgar's Charter includes this dire warning (See Page 17 of 'The Book of South Stoke with Midford')

'..none of our successors shall dare, so long as Christendom endures, to tamper with it in the smallest detail, but if anyone so dare, may he endure the bitter anguish of eternal hell.'

Post war development on the north side of the Wansdyke (Woden's Dyke), and Sulis Manor Estate to the south (1990s) have had a seriously detrimental effect on the Monument – people have unofficially incorporated it into their gardens, it has been used as a dumping ground and unofficial crossings have been made by the public which have eroded the Monument. Photos Wansdyke 1 and Wansdyke 2 show an unofficial breach at OS155 742618, which is used by pedestrians, cyclists and horses. Erosion has increased seriously since Sainsbury's supermarket arrived. BANES and English Heritage have not actively defended and protected the Monument as its status deserves. Whilst the section which runs beneath the road at the Cross Keys Inn is not formally scheduled, it nevertheless exists, and should not be damaged by 'upgrading' the junction in the form of a roundabout or traffic lights and the construction of a road across it. Its setting is as important as its existence, and as the SHLAA report of 2013 concludes – 'It is highly unlikely that effective mitigation would be achievable against the impact of increased human pressure on the SAM, as well as the further loss of its current rural setting. In addition, crossing the Wansdyke again with development further weakens its historic role as a barrier to urbanisation in this area.'

Further development south of the Wansdyke would inevitably lead to pressure for more north/south crossings, which in turn would inevitably and irretrievably damage its integrity. Land at Odd Down should be removed from the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 130 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Michael Devenish

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The proposal to develop on land adjoining Odd Down, which is actually known as the South Stoke Plateau, is unsound because :

1. This land is wholly within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural beauty and any development within the AONB has to be of national and local importance. BaNES may argue local importance, I disagree, but how do they justify it to be of National importance ?
2. This land is within the Green Belt and any development within the Green Belt must be justified by the demonstration of "Special circumstances" . No such "Special Circumstances" have been demonstrated by the applicant.
3. Bath is a World Heritage City and the proposal to develop on the Green Buffer Zone around the City threatens the very existence of that World Heritage Status.

Bath should be viewed as a special case because of its World Heritage Status.

4. A large part of the proposed site is bordered by The Wansdyke which is a scheduled ancient monument The Wansdyke is already suffering from previous development.

5. The proposed site is a foraging area for the very rare Greater Horseshoe Bat and is also a regular nesting area for Skylarks.

This proposed change to the Core Strategy is unsound for all the reasons stated above.

The only degree of protection greater than that currently in place for this land is that of National Park.

If the current level of protection for land adjoining Odd Down is insufficient to prevent development then the whole Core Strategy is unsound for proposing to ignore legislation.

Change to the policy requested:

The proposal to develop Land adjoining Odd Down should be removed entirely from the Core Strategy

Respondent Number: 199 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Beatrice Godwin**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

May I remind you that Tom King, Assistant Director for Planning and Housing Delivery at the Government Office for the South West (2 Rivergate, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6EH) rejected recommendations to extend the area of search for the Bath urban extension in 2009. He agreed that the area of search for the Bath urban extension should not be widened into the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The notion set out by the Panel Inspectors that "a Panel Tour visit found that the location concerned (the South Stoke plateau land – erroneously referred to as Odd Down land) did not give the impression of being part of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and was distinctly separate both physically and visually from the adjoining parts of the AONB" is incorrect because wildlife knows no boundaries and the entire area is a haven for skylarks, greater spotted woodpeckers, bullfinches and greenfinches, brimstone, orange tip and peacock butterflies, deer and many other threatened species. The whole area is of high landscape quality and is an intrinsic part of the Cotswold area both topographically and geologically.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 224 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ms Caroline Kay**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Preservation Trust**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Council has been wrestling with the considerable dilemma placed upon them by the economic drivers in the NPPF and the Inspector's preliminary findings of creating a clearer methodology for determining a compliant housing need, and then attempting to meet that need. At the same time, the NPPF recognises that constraints may limit the capacity to fulfil the housing need (NPPF 14) and the Council also needs to be sensitive to the requirements of the NPPF to protect Green Belt (NPPF section 9), AONBs (NPPF (115) and World Heritage Sites (NPPF Section 12).

The Trust recognises that there is a need the need for AFFORDABLE housing in Bath and that allocation of land to achieve the public benefit of affordable housing is imperative. However the allocations indicated in the Core Strategy will be nearly 60% market housing and we do not see sufficient indication that the open housing market in Bath is capable of delivering the housing benefit assumed.

In turn we therefore question whether the housing development proposed provides sufficient public benefit (as distinct from economic benefit to development companies only) to outweigh the potential harm to Bath's green belt (as required in NPPF 88) AONB (as required in NPPF 116) and WHS setting (as required in NPPF 132). In addition by conceding some areas of green belt and AONB as potentially appropriate for development the Council has undermined the clarity of Bath World Heritage Site's protections of its setting and risks opening the City up to inappropriate and speculative developments, possibly even in advance of the brownfield sites of the City being developed, in contravention to NPPF (a). By the nature of its history, designation and topography Bath has an absolute environmental capacity and this is borne out rather than countermanded by B&NES' own evidence base.

Evidence Base for Constraints

The NPPF required that the local plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence (NPPF 158). There is a substantial evidence base for this Core Strategy, though some has been produced so recently that it cannot inform the plan (EG Arup reports on Development Concept options in the Green Belt sites of Bath, dated April 2013 and only functionally available on the website on 2 May 2013). Some elements which should have formed an evidence base (eg an up to date character appraisal for the Bath Conservation Area) does not currently exist and this does not meet the consideration in NPPF 170 to having an up to date historical evidence base.

Notwithstanding these gaps, much of the provided evidence base support the idea of Bath having a limit to its environmental capacity eg:

- Arup Stage 1 Green Belt review (which clearly states that the Green belt areas considered for development fulfil all the purposes for which the Green belt exists)
- World Heritage Site Setting Study (now adopted as SPD, which emphasises the rural setting of Bath being a key value as part of its inscription)
- Building Heights Strategy, which implicitly limits the economic capacity of individual sites;
- World Heritage Site Management Plan, which refers to planning policy, in particular green belt, AONB, and Article 1(5) of the GPDO as providing specific protection and removal of PD rights to the WHS and its setting;
- UNESCO mission report
- AONB boundary
- SSSIs, Birds and habitats directive.

These tie in closely to the list of reasons why development might need to be restricted (NPPF para 14, footnote 9) in a locality.

It is difficult to see from this evidence base how the Council draws the conclusion that it is appropriate to override these constraints in order to deliver developments consisting of 60% or more market housing in the Green belt and AONB, let alone have a SHLAA trajectory which assumes that that the site at Odd Down starts being built out in 2015, which is in advance of several of the brownfield sites and seems to contradict therefore the encouragement of effective use of previously developed land (NPPF 17 bullet 8)

Harm caused by core strategy not accepting these constraints

The evidence base points to various harms or potential harms which would be caused to the various designated sites if developed. The Council appears to be saying that the placemaking plans will determine new boundaries for green belt and how any harm can be mitigated; however the placemaking plan does not have the authority to redraw the boundary of the AONB.

The recently produced Arup reports undertake detailed visual and landscape studies of these sites. These too highlight the constraints, and acknowledge significant adverse effects from development in these locations.

Our concern is that by leaving a robust determination of Bath's environmental capacity and urban boundary to the Placemaking Plan, the principle of working within a recognised constraint on Bath's development had been sacrificed.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Further, the local plan is incomplete without this element and given this we are concerned that there would be a presumption to permit development in these highly sensitive and protected areas. Without third party appeal of planning applications, we believe it is for the LPA to demonstrate the need to protect the national designations in their Local plan and the Strategy as presented fails to do this. This is of great risk to Bath.

Compliance of Core Strategy with planning guidance

Despite the direct quotation of NPPF paragraph 14 (SPC 150) in the Core Strategy, (see our separate submission on this) it appears the LPA has neither read the footnote to that paragraph spelling out the importance of green belt and AONB designations, nor clearly articulated how their evidence base leads to a conclusion that the public benefit is best served by over-riding tem. By failing to take properly into account the other sections of the NPPF eg NPPF section 9, NPPF 115 and NPPF Section 12 the Strategy fails to be compliant with local policy.

By assuming that Green belt /AONB development is possible in these sites, in advance of the placemaking plan, it appears that the LPA has surrendered its capacity to influence key development control criteria on these sites in advance of the placemaking plan being complete.

Minutes from the UNESCO monitoring mission agreed that the State Party (ie the UK Government) should 'act on the reinforced protection of the landscape surrounding the property (City of Bath) to prevent any further development which could have an adverse and cumulative impact on the OUV of the property and its integrity'.

It is our view that the measures in place under the jurisdiction of the State Party, that is Green Belt and AONB legislation and the NPPF provisions regarding the protection of heritage assets, provide appropriate protection and that the Council is not free to over-ride these protections.

Change to the policy requested:

In order to make the text compliant we believe that land at Odd Down and Weston should be removed from the SHLAA trajectory unless the following conditions have been met: At the very least, in order to be made compliant the Core Strategy needs to incorporate a mechanism to prevent inappropriate development on the Green Belt/AONB sites until

- A specific study to determine the limits of Bath's environmental capacity has been carried out;
- A clear policy statement has been drawn up and agreed with DCMS and UNESCO explaining how the setting of the Bath World Heritage Site is to be protected in future before any amendments are made to the Green Belt boundaries around Bath;
- all brown field sites within Bath have specific consents which will allow them to be built out;
- a detailed review of Green Belt boundaries has taken place in the context of preparing the placemaking plans;
- detailed mitigation measures have been established and agreed with statutory consultees including the Cotswold AONB Board for any development sites proposed within the AONB.

Respondent Number: 246	Comment Number: 11	Respondent Name: Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE	Respondent Organisation: Combe Hay Parish Council
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

For the reasons in Combe Hay Parish Council's letter reference G3346 dated 8 May 2013

Change to the policy requested:

Either delete Policy B3A in its entirety – for the reasons in Combe Hay Parish Council's letter reference G3346 dated 8 May 2013. Or Modify Policy B3A – as indicated in Combe Hay Parish Council's letter reference G3346 dated 8 May 2013.

Respondent Number: 246	Comment Number: 12	Respondent Name: Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE	Respondent Organisation: Combe Hay Parish Council
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

CORE STRATEGY – SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED CHANGES – SPC 88 – COMMENT BY COMBE HAY PARISH COUNCIL.

Combe Hay Parish Council is most grateful for the opportunity to respond to this final consultation concerning the Core Strategy for Bath and North East Somerset.

Combe Hay Parish Council very much appreciates the extensive engagement with this and other Town and Parish Councils throughout the lengthy process, which has culminated in the Submitted Core Strategy and the latest Schedule of Proposed Changes.

Consequent to that engagement, it is inevitable that Combe Hay Parish Council fully supports the vast majority of the paragraphs and Policies in the documents.

However, Combe Hay Parish Council wishes to challenge the current Proposed Changes which seek to provide housing and other infrastructure on Land Adjoining Odd Down.

This letter, which:

A. Outlines the reasons why proposed Policy B3A (SPC 88) should be deleted.

B. Indicates the modifications which should be made to Policy B3A, if it is decided to continue with that Policy. is submitted as an attachment to the relevant Comment Form Part 2. Reasons for deleting Policy B3A.

Notes:

a. These reasons are not in any order of significance.

b. These reasons will be expanded upon at the Examination in Public.

1. The land is entirely within the Bristol and Bath Green Belt – its designation is intended to prevent the sprawl of the City of Bath out into the open countryside.

2. The land is entirely within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

3. The land is currently committed to the production of food.

4. The land is entirely a “green field” site.

5. The land forms a most valuable part of the Setting of the City of Bath World Heritage Site.

6. There are identified archaeological remains under the land.

7. Building on the land would greatly harm its biodiversity, in particular the bat population, especially the protected Greater Horseshoe Bats.

8. Building on the land (and the lighting of buildings and streets) would have a very harmful visual impact on the surrounding countryside.

9. Building on the land would have a very harmful impact on the landscape.

10. The land is understood to be under-tunnelled – and thus unstable.

11. The significant difficulty in providing access to the land.

12. The difficulty in providing public transport to and from the land.

13. The already almost unacceptable traffic congestion in the vicinity (the A367, the Park and Round roundabout, St Gregory’s College (currently being expanded to incorporate a Sixth Form), Combe Hay Lane and Sulis Manor Road).

14. The potential for the loss of the identity and the setting of Combe Hay, its Conservation Area and its many Listed Buildings.

Change to the policy requested:

Modifications to be made to Policy B3A. These modifications assume that all other measures have been explored in order to remove (or most significantly reduce) the number of new homes required on the Land Adjoining Odd Down. Such other measures should include:

a. Increasing the density of new housing on brownfield sites in the District, especially in Bath.

b. Striving harder to bring back into use the c. 500 empty properties in the District, especially those in Bath.

c. Looking to identify offices in Bath, which might, with advantage, be converted into homes.

d. Considering seriously the development (for housing) of Sulis Manor and its 3-plus hectares.

e. Considering seriously the development (for housing) of the Odd Down Football Club’s large parcel of land.

f. Ensuring that brownfield sites in Bath are fully built-out first. SPC 88 paragraph

e. Add “Combe Hay Conservation Area and its setting” to the significant aspects of landscape. SPC 88 paragraph e. Add “Combe Hay Lane and its open rural character” to the significant aspects of landscape.SPC 88 paragraph

f.Add “Combe Hay Conservation Area, including its many Listed Buildings” to the designated heritage assets.SPC 88 paragraph f. Add “the A367 Turnpike Parish Boundary Markers” to the designated heritage assets.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 264 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Brian Huggett**Respondent Organisation:** Englishcombe Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Englishcombe Parish council objects on the grounds of justification.

We strongly oppose the development of housing on an area covered by an AONB, and are very concerned at the proposed revision of the Green Belt boundary.

We are concerned that this could create a dangerous precedent.

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a detailed examination of densities of dwellings on proposed brownfield and other sites to see if this number of dwellings could be accommodated within these sites. Thus avoiding the use of AONB/Green Belt land close to an important Conservation Area.

We strongly support the principle of brownfield first, with AONB and/or Green Belt development a last resort.

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 19 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Green Belt land is supposed to have statutory protection and although Local Authorities have the ability under the legislation to remove land from Green Belt, it should only be done under exceptional circumstances. This section of the Core Strategy does not identify exceptional circumstances, it merely claims that they are sustainable locations without clarifying exactly what makes them sustainable, or what deficiencies in other land locations outside the Green Belt rule them out. The impression given is that removal of land from Green Belt protection is proposed as a convenience rather than a necessity, and that cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be classed as exceptional circumstances. Whilst the Government may have "wish list" housing targets, the legislation has not been amended and therefore the legislation is more binding on a Local Authority than numerical targets.

It may be that in Bath in order to meet the housing needs (as opposed to arbitrary targets) it is eventually concluded that there is insufficient available land apart from some Green Belt incursions, but these should always be a last resort, not a planned easy option.

The Core Strategy must emphasise that the use of Green Belt land is a last resort.

Change to the policy requested:

Land adjoining Odd Down

The potential for land to be removed from the Green Belt has been recognized but will only be implemented if it eventually proved to be unavoidable when monitoring the Placemaking Plan. The land identified is in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 300 dwellings, small scale local employment opportunities and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary.

Planning assumptions for this location:

a. Residential led mixed use development of around 300 dwellings in the plan period, including 40% affordable housing

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

...

Add:

o. Assess and protect against the additional risk of downhill flooding due to increased water run-off from developed land compared to the current open land.

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. This representation does amount to an objection to significant elements of the new policy B3A, however subject to resolving the appropriate scale of development at Odd Down the Hignett Family Trust support a new policy B3A to be included within the Core Strategy, to provide for a New Neighbourhood at Odd Down, Bath. In contrast to the Council's significant but modest proposals for "around 300 dwellings and small scale local employment opportunities and associated infrastructure" HFT propose that this development will provide a mixed- use scheme capable of accommodating up to 1000 new homes including up to 300 new affordable homes, a Care Village and stimulate up to 800 new jobs on the edge of Bath. The Council have considered the need for and impact of a larger new neighbourhood at Odd Down and have rejected this option in favour of distributing the new housing elsewhere in the district. HFT will demonstrate that this decision is not sound and that a New Neighbourhood at Odd down of the scale it proposes represents a more sustainable approach, in order to deliver the Councils Vision and strategic objectives. HFT have prepared an Illustrative Masterplan for the larger scheme, which was submitted as part of earlier representations.

HFT is not at this time tabling an Illustrative Masterplan for 300 dwellings, Policy B3A, as studies are underway to consider the most appropriate location on the plateau for such a scale of development. These studies include ecological surveys, landscape, transport and heritage appraisals as well as infrastructure and services. Elements of those studies are emerging and they will be reported on as part of this submission and in subsequent stages of this Core Strategy process and in the Placemaking Plan consultation. These studies also build on the most recent Arup Concept Options Report April 2013, commissioned by the Council.

The remainder of the comments on SPC 88 will be found on the amended representation to the earlier consultation Proposed Changes in 2011 ref HFT B6 SPC2013 PCdCS. This is to show the consistency of the comments and the evidence base provided by HFT that remains relevant to this submission, together with any changes or withdrawals by HFT in the light of the new changes to the Core Strategy Part 1 Local Plan (PC CS) and should therefore be taken into account. This is a large document and will therefore not be attached to this rep. but will be forwarded separately, together with other supporting evidence, previously submitted and new. This bundle of evidence entitled Banes Core Strategy, Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy 2013 (PC CS 2013): Statement by Hignett Family Trust will include HFT B6 SPC2013 PCdCS.

2.Spatial Objectives

A number of spatial objectives have also been developed and these may form the basis of future development principles, which will help shape the look and feel of the area. The following objectives are recommended for inclusion alongside and in support of the new policy B3A (SPC 88) Land adjoining Odd Down. HFT recommend that the Council incorporate these spatial objectives in Part 1 of Local Plan, whatever the final scale of development, as they will assist in the development of Placemaking Plan Part 2 of the Local Plan and justification for new policy B3A.

The objectives should be inserted after para 2.30 b.

Change to the policy requested:

The proposed changes to B3A are set out in detail on HFT B6 SPC2013 PCdCS together with reasoned justification for the changes. A summary of those changes is set out below with recommended changes in black.

POLICY B3A Land adjoining Odd Down

Land is will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location

shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 1000 300 dwellings. small scale local employment opportunities and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary.

Planning requirements:

a) Residential led mixed use development of around 1000 new 300 dwellings including 40% affordable housing, a Care Village and on-site employment for up to 500 jobs in the plan period.

b) Be developed to a comprehensive Masterplan, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with neighbouring areas, including the sensitive incorporation of Sulis Manor.

c) Ensure that the principles and benefits of Green Infrastructure contained in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and other guidance and best practice are embedded in the design and development process from an early stage. Key requirements include provision of habitat connectivity through the retention and enhancement of the existing high valued habitat; provision of well integrated green space (formal, natural and allotments); provision of well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems; and provision of cycle and pedestrian links through the site connecting to the existing network particularly towards Bath city centre and Odd Down and Combe Down local centres.

d) Appropriate site assessment and ecological surveys to be undertaken to inform site master planning with particular attention to potential impacts to Bradfordupon-Avon bats and Mells SACs. An Ecological Mitigation Strategy and Management scheme is required to ensure satisfactory compensation, mitigation and protection of European protected bat species and their habitats (to include protection of dark skies to the south of the location, retention and cultivation of linear planting features and off-site habitat protection and mitigation compensation on land south of this location), and protection of Priority Species.

e) Identify and assess the landscape character, landscape features and significant view points and the likely effects of development on them. Protect and enhance these aspects and mitigate to avoid or minimise the effects. Significant aspects of landscape include the Cotswold AONB; the World Heritage Site and its setting; South Stoke Conservation Area and its setting; the character of the Cam Brook valley and Sulis Manor plateau; trees including ancient woodland, tree belts, hedges and field patterns; Midford Road and South Stoke Lane and their open rural character; and tranquillity. Significant viewpoints include local properties; medium and long distance views such as Upper Twinhoe and Baggridge Hill; Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument; Midford Road and Cross Keys junction; South Stoke Lane; Combe Hay Lane; and local Public Rights of Way.

f) Assess and evaluate any direct or indirect impacts on designated heritage assets and their visual/landscape settings. Prepare and implement management schemes (including avoidance or physical separation) in order to mitigate the impacts of development and ensure the long-term protection and enhancement of the designated heritage assets and their settings. Designated heritage assets potentially affected by development at this location include the Cross Keys Inn (Grade II), South Stoke Conservation Area including its Listed Buildings, Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument and Bath World Heritage Site.

g) Assess and evaluate any impacts on non-designated heritage assets. The degree of harm to or loss of non-designated heritage assets will be balanced against the positive contribution made by the development and the extent to which harm/loss can be mitigated. Non-designated heritage assets of equal significance to designated heritage assets will be subject to the same considerations as designated historic assets. Non-designated heritage assets potentially affected by development at this location include Prehistoric activity and flint scatters, Bronze Age and Roman occupation, and Midford Road

turnpike and markers.

h) The assessment and evaluation of the above designated and non-designated heritage assets should also consider their cumulative or collective “group value” and also understand the heritage assets’ relationship to other environmental considerations such as landscape, historic hedgerows, ancient woodland and ecology.

i) Ensure good public transport provision.

j) Junction improvements at the B3110 Midford Rd/Southstoke Rd (Cross Keys) and A367 junctions to provide the principle vehicular accesses to the location including access to existing on-site employment

k) Development should scope potential for and incorporate renewable energy, including investigation of District Heating opportunities (linking to the Odd Down District Heating Opportunity Area).

l) Educational needs generated by the development must be met; a primary school is to be provided on site, unless an alternative solution can be found and agreed with the Education Authority.

m) Provide integrated waste management infrastructure.

n) Ensure any areas of land instability are either avoided or addressed.

o) The level of affordable housing to be provided at the site will be determined by the new affordable housing policy CP9

p) Make provision for the care for the elderly including people with disabilities through the provision of a Care Village

2)

HFT recommend that the Council incorporate these spatial objectives in Part 1 of Local Plan, whatever the final scale of development, as they will assist in the development of Placemaking Plan Part 2 of the Local Plan and justification for new policy B3A.

The objectives should be inserted after para 2.30 b

Spatial Objectives of the New Neighbourhood

The New Neighbourhood at Odd Down will:

1. Be an exemplar of low carbon development, exceeding government targets
2. Have a mix of uses which will make sure that there is vibrancy and activity, while also offering easy, safe and affordable access to local employment, community, health and educational opportunities.
3. Offer access to a wide range of services and facilities be well linked to the new Care Village and will support the needs of the new and existing communities
4. Provide a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes, including affordable housing, family housing and housing for the elderly, disabled and special needs, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community
5. Contribute to the sustainable economic vitality of the area and the city as a whole by the provision of a variety of employment types
6. Be well linked into Bath and work as a new neighbourhood in the city
7. Minimise the impact on the integrity of the villages close to the city including maintaining the general extent of the Bristol-Bath Green Belt subject to boundary changes to accommodate the New Neighbourhood
8. Be located and designed in a way that minimises any negative impact on environmental assets and the views of, and from, them including the World Heritage Site and its setting and the Wansdyke
9. Be designed and developed in a way that makes sure that measures are taken to enhance and otherwise mitigate and compensate for harm to the landscape of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty including improving recreational opportunities and to protect and enhance nature conservation interests and their habitats
10. Include a network of connected high quality accessible green infrastructure providing local recreation and biodiversity

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

opportunities and visual benefits. This will include a comprehensive mitigation strategy to be agreed with Natural England comprising an ecological corridor on the plateau edge and on land to the south of the plateau, which together will ensure no adverse impacts upon the integrity of the SAC.

11. Be a high quality place with its form and appearance responding to the character and context provided of the site and the wider area, but at the same time encouraging the efficient use of land

12. Be a place that is easy access and move around with excellent walking, cycling and public transport links both within the community and with the surrounding urban area and surrounding countryside

13. Have good access, via a range of transport modes including walking, cycling, public transport and car to Bath and the wider area

14. Be designed and developed in a way that results in a more sustainable use of resources maximising energy efficiency and integrating the use of renewable and low carbon energy and minimising impact on flooding, heat gain, water resources and water quality and maximizing the use local building materials.

15. Be designed to meet the needs of a varied community and provide a safe, playful and healthy environment

16. Provide an integrated waste management infrastructure. Any scope for integrating waste management and heat generation should be exploited where practicable.

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Whilst it is right that development should take place at Odd Down as proposed, where there is no obstacle to development that cannot be overcome and where development would be deliverable in the early part of the plan period, there is no reason either for development to be capped as the Council proposes, and there is good reason why this location should be identified for more development.

Change to the policy requested:

- For a greater level of development to be provided for at Bath by planning for a larger development to be planned at Odd Down
- For the plan to make changes to the Green Belt at Odd Down such that the boundary follows the edge of the plateau, and hence uses a recognisable line, reflects development that should be provided for in the plan, and hence is defensible.

3.3 The proposal for development at Odd Down

3.3.1 HFT support the Council’s proposal for a development at Odd Down as part of the strategy within a revised Core Strategy, presented as Proposed Change SPC88 dealing Additional Policy B3A.

3.3.2 These representations have already considered the evidence demonstrating the need for more development land to be identified and included in the plan and for an element of this – what is proposed and more – to be at Bath through development at Odd Down. This section of the representations sets out HFT’s views on how the tests that need to be met in proposing this development are met, and how by the same assessment, more development can be satisfactorily accommodated and delivered at Odd Down.

3.3.3 The land at Odd Down is:

- Within the Bristol Bath Green Belt

- Within the Cotswolds AONB, in part
- On the edge of Bath and the built up area of Bath is a World Heritage Site
- Close to the South Stoke Conservation Area
- Adjacent to the Wansdyke Ancient Monument.

3.3.4 The Council has concluded that none of these policy designations or environmental and heritage assets represents an insurmountable obstacle to some well designed development at Odd Down. The Council has drawn on a number of recently commissioned reports to reach this conclusion, with the most important being:

- Bath and North East Somerset Green Belt Review Final Draft Arup February 2013
- Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Findings Report March 2013, together with its appendices
- Land Adjoining Odd Down – Development Concept Options Report Arup April 2013
- Land Adjoining Odd Down – Landscape and Visual Study Arup April 2013.

3.3.5 In addition the Council has published the Sustainability Appraisal of the proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy, prepared by Environ and dated March 2013.

3.3.6 HFT's representations support the identification of land at Odd Down for development, and note the basis for the Council's proposal as presented by the evidence reports. However HFT note that the evidence the Council draws upon does not provide any basis for limiting the extent of the development as the Council proposes. The conclusions reached by the reports the Council identifies as the evidence base in support of its Proposed Changes actually provide support for a greater quantum of development at Odd Down than currently proposed.

3.3.7 The issues that have to be considered in proposing development at Odd Down are dealt with in turn below.

Green Belt

3.3.8 All of the periphery of Bath as well as much of BANES is designated Green Belt as part of the Bristol Bath Green Belt. Providing for development on the edge of Bath through the Local Plan

Core Strategy therefore will require the Green Belt boundary to be changed, with in this case the general extent of the Green Belt to be changed through the Core Strategy and the changed Green Belt boundary to be defined through the Placemaking DPD. Making changes to the Green Belt when necessary and through the development plan has always been provided for in national planning policy and this is currently the case with the Framework.

3.3.9 Any review of Green Belt must be done according to the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt. These purposes as set out at para. 80 of the Framework are the purposes for which Green Belt policy can be used and hence provide the only criteria by which the persistence of the use of a Green Belt designation can be tested. Other policies may be used to achieve other objectives, but not Green Belt.

3.3.10 In applying the purposes to assess the contribution the inclusion of a particular piece of land makes to an existing Green Belt, the purposes are generally poor at distinguishing one parcel of land from another. If the argument in relation to assisting regeneration is that preventing development in one place promotes development in another – a fairly thin argument at the best of times – then any part of the land in the Green Belt around Bath contributes to the same extent.

3.3.11 The Council has commissioned a review of the Green Belt from consultants. The conclusions of this work support the identification of land at Odd Down as part of the means of providing for the development required in BANES. This land is referred to only briefly in the report's Summary and Conclusions, in the section on 'Around the remainder of Bath' and the role this part of the Green Belt is described here as playing is 'preventing the potential for ribbon development along

the A367 and eventual potential merger with Radstock (and Peasedown St John)'. The development at odd Down proposed by the Council and by HFT is very obviously not 'ribbon development along the A367' and it is equally clear that the development could not be conceived as leading to the merging of Bath and Radstock. The development of the plateau as considered in the Development Concept Options Report by Arup is not the start of some greater development, and clearly maintains the separate identities of Bath and Radstock. The intervening topography will ensure that this is the case, regardless of the delineation of the change now proposed to the Green Belt.

3.3.12 In the body of the report the 'Assessment of the South of Bath land parcel' refers to various 'purposes' which the Green Belt in this location serves, though some of these are not the purposes set out in the Framework as the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Land cannot be designated as Green Belt to achieve these purposes and hence they cannot be used to assess the merit of retaining land in the Green belt. By reference to one of the five purposes from the Framework, that purpose concerned with preventing the encroachment into open countryside, the report rather unhelpfully but perhaps unavoidably identifies all of the land on the periphery of Bristol and Bath as contributing to this purpose. It is clear however from simple observation that on the south side of Bath, there is a distinction between land which is under the influence of the urban area and land which is open countryside open countryside. This distinction falls along the readily identifiable 'edge' where the plateau gives way to the steep scarp.

3.3.13 The real test for whether land should remain in the Green Belt when there is a strategic requirement for development providing the exceptional circumstances to justify a change in the Green Belt, is whether development of the land would significantly detract from the overall integrity of the Green Belt. This would clearly not be the case for land at Odd Down whereas land at Keynsham lies between Bristol and Bath, and retaining separation between Bristol and Bath by keeping land open was the fundamental reason why the Bristol-Bath Green Belt was established in the first place.

AONB

3.3.14 The land at Odd Down is in the AONB. The Council has already satisfied itself that this should not be reason to prevent identifying parts of the area at least for development. There are two issues here. First, the area is acknowledged not to be of the landscape quality that would normally justify the land being designated as AONB. The landscape and visual impact studies that have been carried out by the Council and by HFT demonstrate that the development of the land would not harm the landscape in such a way that AONB designation generally is designed to prevent.

3.3.15 It is documented that historically the delineation of the designation of the AONB was drawn to coincide with that of the already established Green Belt for administrative purposes and management convenience (notwithstanding the completely different and unrelated roles of AONB and Green Belt). Current evidence-based development plans made in the context of modern planning policy and an overarching statutory duty to seek more sustainable development should certainly not carry forward past bad planning for no other reason than an aversion to change. It is to the Council's credit that in respect of the AONB it is not proposing to do so.

3.3.16 The second point is that since for all its lack of merit, and whilst the proper approach might be that that designation should be changed to retain the credibility of this policy tool, the formal starting point is that the land at Odd Down is within the AONB, the use of this land for development should meet the test set out for development. This, according to the Framework, para. 116, is a test of 'exceptional circumstances'. There is also a test of demonstrating that the development is in the public interest, which housing clearly is, and in BANES there is a need otherwise going unmet. The main issue therefore becomes one of the development proposed within the AONB could take place outside the AONB, and if so whether those alternatives have been assessed and rejected for good reasons. The Council has done this exercise and the consideration of the alternatives is presented in various of its evidence reports. The nature of the landscape and the impact of its development, including the visual impact, has been an important consideration. The various reports presented to the Council by its consultants have led the Council to conclude – rightly by our own assessments – that the development of the flat plateau at Odd Down would have less impact than the development of land with significant changes in levels, such as much of the other land which could be put forward around the edge of Bath.

World Heritage Site

3.3.17 The urban area of Bath is a designated World Heritage Site, in due recognition of the significance of the architectural quality and historic significance of Bath and the important assets that are part of the City. Rather like the designation of the AONB however, the designation of the WHS was of the whole built area rather than according to the inclusion of those parts worthy of WHS status. With a significant area between the land at Odd Down and those parts of the city which are

worthy of WHS status, the development of the land in an appropriately designed way would not harm the WHS through a change to its setting. This is the conclusion of the evidence commissioned by the Council.

Other environmental assets

3.3.18 There are valuable environmental assets in the form of the Wansdyke Ancient Monument the South Stoke Conservation Area. These are acknowledged and their setting readily protected by limiting the extent of development and with suitable boundary treatment. This is fully recognized in the Arup work on development concepts and would be the intention of HFT in any case.

3.4 The form and scale of development at Odd Down

3.4.1 The Council does not indicate the specific location for the 300 dwellings to be provided at Odd Down or what form this development should take. This may be appropriate given the role of the Core Strategy and the relationship that the Council still intends there to be between this part of the Local Plan and the Placemaking DPD.

3.4.2 The Council has to be satisfied that this level of development could be accommodated and delivered in the broad location however. HFT can confirm that this is the case.

3.4.3 The 300 dwellings referred to in the new Policy B3A can be delivered. All of the land is in one ownership, there are no significant infrastructure requirements to be addressed and no matters on which development depends which are out of the landowner's control.

3.4.4 There are a number of ways that this scale of development could be delivered, though the Arup Development Concept Options Report does not consider this question because it only addresses the development of the whole of the land which is identified as suitable and available in the SHLAA. It is evident however that the options that present themselves for the order or phasing of development include starting the development at the western side – with proximity to the existing residential development, the primary school, and the Park and Ride site – or to the north east of the available land with proximity to the secondary school, retail facilities and other residential development. That these choices are available demonstrates again how readily development of this land can be seen to conform to current expectations of sustainable development in terms of the accessibility of facilities and services, including public transport and employment opportunities.

3.4.5 With no obstacles to overcome or significant infrastructure to provide, the lead time for the development would therefore be determined by the planning process. With a favourable planning context and process, it would be reasonable to expect a start on site in two years. With two outlets initially, in a rising residential market and in a very strong location with a historic scarcity of good new provision, the disposal of at around 40 units per year per outlet could be expected. Hence 80% of the allocation of 300 would be delivered in the next five years and all of the allocation within six years. With a greater allocation more outlets would be possible and more contribution could be made towards the five year supply and the overall requirement.

3.4.6 To satisfy itself on the appropriateness of development on land adjoining Odd Down the Council commissioned work from Arup on the acceptability of development and the form development could and should take at Odd Down. This work examined the possible development areas south of the Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument and east of Combe Hay Lane. Two options are explored and whilst the conclusions of the report seem rather mixed up the findings are that development of the land would be acceptable and the development could provide 768 dwellings together with the other uses appropriate for a mixed use development and the supporting local infrastructure. Nowhere in this report is there any reference to 300 dwellings. No such option is tested and critically there is no indication that any part of the land should not be developed leading to a reduction in the suggested capacity to the figure the Council has adopted.

3.4.7 The land adjoining Odd Down is only one of two locations at Bath but outside the existing urban area and hence in the Green Belt that are identified in the SHLAA as meeting the Council's criteria for development (by reference to the requirements of suitability and availability identified in the Framework) as having 'suitability credentials' and having the 'availability confirmed'. The area is listed in this report as Sulis Manor / Southstoke. Whilst the 'Summary Schedule' from Appendix 1b: Bath Green Belt lists the housing potential as 300, the assessment of the land parcel (E14) in the body of the report provides no basis for this limit. The report says that 'all of this area (comprising some 43ha) is available for development' and cites the Odd Down Plateau Development Concept Report by Arup March 2013 as the source of

information on the 'housing potential'. The SHLAA Findings Report refers to the Arup report too, and says that this identifies the capacity of Odd Down / Sulis Manor as 750.

3.4.8 The Council considered a report on the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy at its meeting of 4 March 2013. Annex 1 of this report provides (at Table 6) a 'Summary of Locational Assessments', where the options for increasing the housing land supply in BANES are all considered according to a number of criteria. A note to the table invites the reader to 'see the evidence base including SA/SLAA for more detailed assessments'. In relation to the land adjoining Odd Down the assessment in relation to 'Social/Economic' issues is correct and fine. In relation to 'Environmental' issues however there is a string of references to the 'reduced capacity option', to 'smaller scale of development', and to 'reducing the scale of development'.

3.4.9 Annex 1 is presumably the origin of the decision by the Council to identify the land adjoining Odd Down as the location for 300 dwellings rather than 750, though there is no 'audit trail' for this. Presenting the report in this way and as the supporting evidence for the decision to be taken by the Council on the Proposed Changes is highly misleading and quite disingenuous. The 'evidence base' referred to does not have lower capacity options set out and does not provide any basis or justification for the route the Council has apparently taken. Quite the contrary, the reports – which all interrelate of course - provide the evidence for a higher amount of development being acceptable. The Conceptual Options Report by Arup in particular specifically identifies the various environmental issues – such as Southstoke Conservation Area and the Wansdyke - notes how possible impacts on these can be mitigated and concludes that the development of the land with about 750 dwellings and according to certain specification would achieve this mitigation.

3.4.10 The way the assessment and this part of the evidence base is reported and used by the Council in relation to the decision on the Proposed Change to introduce Policy 3A is therefore simply wrong.

3.5 Further development at Odd Down

3.5.1 These representations have demonstrated that more development should be directed to Bath in the form of additional development through changes to the Green Belt than is currently proposed, that this could be satisfactorily accommodated at Sulis Down, the land adjoining Odd Down, and that the result if this option were followed would be a more appropriate and more sustainable spatial strategy.

3.5.2 HFT therefore object to the provision at Odd Down in the Proposed Changes being constrained to 300 dwellings and to the Council's attempt to prevent any development beyond that scale, as set out in the new Policy B3A Land Adjoining Odd Down (in the composite Core Strategy). The text introducing the proposed wording for the Policy says that, 'National planning policy makes it clear that when altering Green Belt boundaries a long term view needs to be taken to ensure that boundaries endure beyond the plan period. Where necessary this can include plans identifying areas of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs'. This much is true – it is set out at para. 83 of the Framework. What the Government clearly has in mind in writing this policy is to make the changes that might be required in the future now, so that the resulting Green Belt is one that can endure. The text for Policy B3A however goes on to say that. 'At ...Odd Down environmental sensitivity and the need to minimize harm means that there is no scope to identify safeguarded land for the longer term'. This statement is wrong in every way.

3.5.3 Not only is Green Belt not a policy for dealing with 'environmental sensitivity' and 'minimizing harm', but there is no evidence to support the Council's position on the capping of the capacity of the development to 300, or that there would be harm if the development were larger that is of a fundamentally different form or significance from anything arising from a development of 300 dwellings. This is clear from the evidence that the Council has commissioned and otherwise relies upon, including the Conceptual Report and Green Belt reports by Arup, and the SA. The findings from these reports on the assessment of the land adjoining Odd Down proposal for demonstrate that the acceptability of the development is not conditional on the development stopping at a level of 300 dwellings. The assessments and conclusions in all of the evidence reports relate to all of the available land.

3.5.4 The Arup work does not suggest any reason to distinguish between the partial and complete development of the area at Odd Down that it assesses, and provides no evidence or conclusions from which the Council could arrive at or justify its proposal to propose that the development at Odd Down should not exceed 300 dwellings. On the contrary it is clear from the evidence commissioned and relied upon by the Council that Odd Down is an appropriate location for more development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

3.6 Dealing with Green Belt boundary in the plan

3.6.1 The further related issue is that a Green belt boundary will have to be determined.

3.6.2 The Green Belt boundary should reflect the situation which is demonstrated by the evidence.

It should be drawn to provide for the whole of the available area to be developed in the plan period, or at very least and as a poor alternative, the part of the land adjoining Odd Down that is not required immediately should become safeguarded land on the basis that the development needs of Bath will continue to be unmet and this area has emerged from all of the objective assessments as being a suitable location for development and one in which sustainable development can be achieved.

3.6.3 The Council may be thinking that the boundary will simply be drawn to be co-terminus with extent of the development, wherever this comes to be. This would be the poorest of practice. The Green Belt boundary should be drawn according to which land needs to be kept open and which doesn't, and development locations should take account of well chosen Green Belt boundaries which follow identifiable features. To the south of Bath a clear and obvious location for the Green Belt boundary is the top of the scarp to the south of the plateau. Drawing a Green Belt boundary at some arbitrary point on the plateau determined solely by the extent of a development which was the product on arbitrarily defined number would be meaningless and simply discredit planning in this area.

Respondent Number: 279 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Rohan Torkildsen

Respondent Organisation: English Heritage

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Odd Down

Can the local authority demonstrate that there has been a proper assessment of the significance of heritage assets in this area, including their settings, and of the potential for finding new sites of archaeological or historic interest³, and that a proper assessment is available to demonstrate where development would be inappropriate because of its historic significance?

For example, what is it about the Wansdyke here that is important and how does the land proposed for development contribute to its significance, and what in turn does this mean for the principle of development, and any future design response? The local authority is advised to note an application of The Setting of Heritage Assets (English Heritage Guidance, October 2011) may help to inform this matter.

Also, what does the World Heritage Site Setting SPD indicate about the importance of the site?

Without such an assessment the local authority cannot properly assert that the objectives for sustainable development have been understood and therefore cannot say whether the objectively assessed development needs of the area will be met or not in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development⁵.

Without prejudice to the above, and should the principle be accepted, I would expect that to help conserve the Wansdyke any prospective developer should also provide for a focussed management plan and works to repair, enhance and interpret the monument for the long term future.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 281 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy**Respondent Organisation:** Natural England**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Odd Down

The proposed development land at Odd Down is on a plateau and visible from few and distant view points. However it falls away sharply to wooded hillside to the south and west and development would quickly encroach both visually and physically if not carefully contained. Although the proposed land is within the AONB, it is managed as arable/crop farmland and does not share the characteristics of the surrounding AONB landscape. Nonetheless there remain a range of important landscape features that will need to be protected.

This site is also close to components of Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat SAC; however a substantial amount of survey evidence has been provided about the use of the site and its environs by bats and we are satisfied that the broad measures needed to ensure the favourable conservation of the designated site and its qualifying features are clearly conveyed in the Plan and that further more detailed consideration will be given to these and other issues in the forthcoming Placemaking Plan.

With the above in mind we consider that some parts of the proposed development site could accommodate sympathetically designed development without undermining the purposes of the AONB or significantly affecting the Bat SAC.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 397 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Stokefield Trust**Agent ID:** 51 **Agent Name:** Hoddell Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

THE COUNCIL HAS FAILED TO CONSIDER ALL REASONABLY AVAILABLE DEVELOPMENT LOCATIONS ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF BATH AND, AS A CONSEQUENCE, ITS CORE STRATEGY REMAINS UNSOUND ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT IS NEITHER JUSTIFIED OR EFFECTIVE. IN PARTICULAR LAND TO THE NORTH OF PACK HORSE LANE, SOUTH STOKE SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSED STRATEGIC ALLOCATION AT ODD DOWN ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT REPRESENTS A LOGICAL EXTENSION TO THAT SITE, AND MEETS MANY OF THE CRITERIA AGAINST WHICH THE PROPOSALS FOR ODD DOWN HAVE BEEN ASSESSED. THE REMOVAL OF LAND TO THE NORTH OF PACK HORSE LANE FROM THE GREEN BELT WOULD ENABLE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LAND AS PART OF A LATER PHASE OF THE DEVELOPMENT AT ODD DOWN, WITH PACK HORSE LANE ITSELF PROVIDING A ROBUST AND DEFENSIBLE GREEN BELT BOUNDARY.

Change to the policy requested:

EXTEND PROPOSED ALLOCATION OF LAND AT ODD DOWN TO INCLUDE LAND TO THE NORTH OF PACK HORSE LANE. THIS WOULD INCLUDE LAND WHICH IS GENUINELY AVAILABE FOR DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES IN THE PLAN PERIOD AND WOULD PROVIDE FLEXIBILW SHOULD SITES IDENTIFIED ELSEWHERE IN THE CORE STRATEGY NOT COME FORWARD, OR A NEED FOR

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT BE IDENTIFIED.

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Whilst we support this policy of extra housing in Bath at Odd Down Weston and MOD, Endsleigh Lansdown and two sites at Odd Down, extra housing allocation is required in the Bath Twerton area to the West of Bath towards Bristol .

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a further allocation of housing on the two Odd Down sites and extra housing allocation to the West of Twerton towards Saltford. Bath needs to provide more housing to meet its waiting lists for social housing. Odd Down and East of Twerton are on a good public transport bus corridors to Saltford, Keynsham and Bristol A4 A367 to Radstock Midsomer Norton and Wells .

Respondent Number: 939 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Trevor Osborne **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

My observations are particularly relevant to the proposal to release land at Odd Down. In essence, my evidence will relate to the issues set out below.

- 1.The undemocratic process by which the Council reached a decision in relation to the proposed amendments to the Core Strategy and, in particular, the release of land for housing without proper consultation, allowing public comment only to follow the making of that decision rather than arranging for it to proceed before a decision was taken.
- 2.The target number of homes required does not take into account the recent change in permitted development which allows office buildings to become homes without the need for planning permission. Nor does it take into account the decision to permit extensions of residential properties without the necessity for planning permission to be obtained. Both of these changes will make a significant contribution to the number of homes to be created within the period of the cost plan possibly by as many as 300. The Council has failed to research this issue and to take it into account.
- 3.By virtue of the Council’s decision without the benefit of public consultation, it has, in effect, given planning permission for housing within the Green Belt and in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty without justification of the very special circumstances which would permit such an implied consent to be given.
- 4.The Council’s strategy does not take into account the substantial number of dwellings which could be provided within existing villages by virtue of Neighbourhood Planning and Place-making. In particular, Policy SPC143 and 173 unnecessarily restricts the opportunity for infill development or edge of settlement opportunities in villages unless three of the stated criteria are met. This is an unnecessary restriction which, if removed, could contribute to the achievement of the housing target.
- 5.The Council have previously acknowledged the necessity to release sites in urban areas (brown field land) and many such sites are controlled by the Council. It is therefore inexcusable that land at Odd Down should be scheduled for release as from 2015. This is far too early in the period of the plan because it does not take account of the premise that the Green

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Belt should be sacrificed only if absolutely necessary. Such a very special circumstance may exist in the future but only if the brown field sites have failed to satisfy housing need. This will not be known for some considerable time.

6. If any land is to be released at Odd Down, then it should significantly include land which is not used for agriculture including the Football Club, the unused land owned by St Gregory’s School and the land occupied by Sulis Meadow and used as a language school.

7. The Core Strategy does not sufficiently recognise the sensitivity of the Odd Down site as Green Belt land and in the Wansdyke Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is not sufficient for the place-making plan to deal with the physical extent of the land to be released nor indeed its screening and the future use of adjoining land in common ownership.

8. The plan fails to recognise the serious impact that a substantial housing estate would have on the small communities which it would immediately adjoin and be part of.

9. The Council has given insufficient consideration to the implications of land at Odd Down and has not shown the very special circumstances which would justify its release from the Green Belt.

10. The site at Odd Down is important in terms of the environment of the World Heritage Site. The geographical and topographical limitations of the World Heritage Site are such that the importance of its Green Belt status is made even greater than would otherwise be the case. The Core Strategy insufficiently recognises NPPF 14.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 1525 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South Stoke Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposed changes to the Draft Core Strategy, listed in section 5a above, constitute a major threat to the very existence of the ancient settlement of South Stoke.

The very general area, called the ‘Odd Down Plateau’, identified in the ‘Proposed Changes’ document as the location for 300 houses is entirely within the Green Belt, the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Setting of the World Heritage City of Bath.

It should be noted that almost all of the land on this plateau area lies within the entirely Rural Parish of South Stoke, with a small element in the equally Rural Parish of Combe Hay. A very small part of it lies within the Odd Down Ward of the City of Bath. Its title is therefore misleading.

Whilst South Stoke Parish Council understands the need for an adequate supply of comparatively low cost housing to support Bath’s largely tourist economy, it is important to consider the effects of these proposed changes against each of these headings and against B&NES own policies elsewhere in the Draft Core Strategy.

Because the proposed “changes” are so interlinked we have prepared our comments under the specific National Policy Headings listed below to avoid endless repetition. All are based on the “Changes” listed in 5a above and the supporting documentation provided by B&NES Council.

Green Belt.

Section 9 of the NPPF reiterates Government Policy on Green Belt land [“the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”]. Also restated are their five purposes.

B&NES Draft Core Strategy very clearly sets out a strong intention to follow this Government Policy and enshrines this in Policy CP8.

These changes to the Draft Core Strategy are clearly in direct conflict with all five of the purposes of the Green Belt at

South Stoke.

B&NES own Green Belt Review, dated February 2013, sets out very clearly exactly how strongly the Green Belt serves its purposes on this parcel of land. It is particularly clear in paras 6.4.1 & 6.4.6 that “the gap between Bath and South Stoke is particularly narrow”. As a result their own study concludes that development here would threaten the “individual character, identity and setting of South Stoke...” and that “even relatively limited developments could threaten coalescence with the large built up area”.

Para 5 on page 62 of the same document confirms that in its current form the ‘Southern Green Belt’ assists in urban regeneration. To remove this section from it is clearly in conflict with the fifth purpose in NPPF 9.80.

No evidence has been provided which might demonstrate that “very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm” caused by the development proposed by these changes.

Cotswold AONB.

The Planning Status of an AONB is beyond doubt. The NPPF reaffirms that an AONB has the “highest status of landscape protection”, equal to that of a National Park. Development in an AONB can only be allowed if it is of such Local and National importance that the benefit of it would outweigh the inevitable harm caused.

This Plateau Land displays all the visual amenity attributes of a Cotswold Landscape, large open fields bounded by dry stone walls and expansive views.

B&NES Landscape and Visual Study report issued on April 4th 2013 says of the “Sulis Manor Plateau” (page 27) that “the sensitivity of the landscape character area is considered to be high” and that the “overall effect of development within the study area is considered to be adverse”.

Arup’s Development Concept Options Report dated April 2013, notes on page 14 that:

- “Development would need to be kept away from the more exposed parts and edges of the Plateau to prevent the appearance of the City spilling beyond the contained hollow of Bath into rural views and the open setting of Bath.”
- “New tree planting would have limited benefit in screening development at the edges of the plateau because of the visually exposed nature of the site...”

The importance of the status of the Cotswold AONB has not been properly addressed. Furthermore no evidence has been submitted that could demonstrate “Issues of National Importance” that might allow the development proposed in these changes.

World Heritage Site.

The Setting of the Bath World Heritage site was a crucial part of its inscription in 1987. Views into and out of the World Heritage site are important and should be given great weight when considering the impact of these changes on its setting.

B&NES’ Landscape and Visual Study report prepared by Arup shows quite clearly that distant views of the Plateau site will be almost impossible to screen. (see photos from Baggeridge and Twinhoe) Indeed this report recommends that any development should be kept well back from the Southern edge of the plateau.

Nowhere has the effect of domestic and street lighting been considered properly in any of these reports. Even if the plateau land’s Cotswold character is changed further by increased tree planting along its Southern edge, in an attempt to mitigate the damage to these views, there will be significant damage caused by the inevitable ‘Light Loom’.

Summary.

South Stoke Parish Council’s view of the changes listed above is that they make the Draft Core Strategy “Unsound”. They are in direct contravention of many National policies and contradict B&NES own policies in other parts of the Draft Core Strategy document.

Whilst the NPPF now includes “A presumption in favour of sustainable development” it makes it absolutely clear, in para 14 footnote 9, that development should be “restricted” on land designated as Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

In our view there is scope to absorb the housing proposed for the Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau within the City by minor adjustments to housing densities on identified brownfield sites and by more imaginative policies that would encourage use of empty space above retail premises in many parts of the City.

To allow development on this open land will effectively be to promote a “Greenfield First” policy which directly conflicts with B&NES and National policies to regenerate City centres by adopting a “Brownfield First” policy.

Change to the policy requested:

Given the weight of evidence against the proposed changes listed above, South Stoke Parish Council asks that they be deleted from the ultimate Core Strategy.

If compelling evidence is eventually produced that provides a convincing argument for any form of development on this

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

plateau land it remains essential to avoid coalescence of South Stoke Village with the City of Bath. This would mean that no development would be possible East of Sulis Manor and that development to the West would have to be restricted to allow adequate measures to mitigate the inevitable harm. Definition of such boundaries should be defined in the core strategy and not passed over to the, seemingly less democratic, 'Place Making Plan'.

Respondent Number: 1525 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South Stoke Parish Council
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Heritage Assets and Historic Environment.

South Stoke Parish Council notes that the proposed changes to the Draft Core Strategy listed in section 5a above have a direct bearing on the 'Heritage Assets' associated with the land area described as the Odd Down Plateau.

Several of these changes conflict with the detailed background evidence provided by B&NES and as such they render the Core Strategy proposals "unsound".

To avoid endless repetition we have commented on each acknowledged "Asset" individually below:

The Wansdyke.

This is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. A rare and extremely important Archaeological Asset relating to the post Roman "Dark Ages". Its importance is recognised by Archaeologists of National and International Status. It has been recorded as being of "equal importance to the Roman Baths".

As such it should be afforded the highest level of protection from the effects of inappropriate development.

B&NES SHLAA published in April 2013 makes specific reference to the serious erosion of the monument caused by the previous development of Sulis Meadows and the totally inadequate provision of a suitable buffer zone there.

The same document raises serious concerns as to whether adequate protection could be provided for the Monument against the harmful effects of further development to the East of the Plateau land. Both the SHLAA and the B&NES Landscape and Visual Study call, at the very least, for a substantial 'setback' for any development from the Monument. The Parish Council believes that any development to the South of this ancient monument would be seriously detrimental to its setting.

Under 'Mitigation' on Page 49 of the SHLAA is the following definitive statement: "It is highly unlikely that effective mitigation would be achievable against the impact of increased human pressure on the Scheduled Ancient Monument, as well as the further loss of its current rural setting."

The Wansdyke has provided a clear Southern boundary to the City for many years until it was breached by the Sulis Meadows development. It is clear that development on the Eastern end of the site would be entirely contrary to National Policy and would lead to its ultimate loss as a Heritage Asset.

This role for the Wansdyke as creating a viable Southern Boundary to the City was reinforced by the then Secretary of State's acceptance of the Government Inspector's conclusion, when rejecting an Appeal by Crest Homes in 1988/89 against refusal to build 350 houses on this plateau land, that "The Wansdyke

provides a strong boundary to the built edge of Bath in this area....it restricts quite firmly the sprawl of the City".

It should also be noted that in a recent High Court Judgement, Mrs Justice Lang found that a Planning Inspector had failed "properly to interpret and apply" the effect of relevant policies on the setting of an important heritage site. It may be that this Judgement would have a clear effect on the situation with respect to the Wansdyke and its relationship to the proposed development on this Plateau Land.

If that is the case, there would be a strong possibility of legal action against the Council if this matter were to be dealt with without due care.

South Stoke Conservation Area.

There is a current Conservation Area Appraisal for the Village of South Stoke, which has been ready for formal adoption by the Council for over three years. This has been delayed by the Planning Department without any satisfactory explanation but since it has passed all levels of scrutiny and is ready for adoption it should be regarded as having considerable weight in

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Planning matters.

The SHLAA, B&NES' Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt review all raise concerns about the effect that development would have on the Conservation Area of South Stoke. Under 'mitigation' in the SHLAA, page 49, is the statement "Furthermore, it may prove equally difficult to protect the setting and the rural character of South Stoke Conservation Area".

Archaeological Remains.

There is clear evidence of Prehistoric, Bronze Age and Roman activity on or near this Plateau Land.

The Sustainability Appraisal Report notes that "Development of the area could potentially have a very damaging effect on any buried archaeological remains.....in the area."

The SHLAA, under 'Mitigation' on page 48 states that " Whilst there is potential to preserve some archaeological sites.....this requires detailed knowledge of their location.

Summary.

South Stoke Parish Council considers that because these carefully prepared reports and the evidence above demonstrate that the proposed 'Changes' listed in section 5a above are in direct conflict with Local and National Policy, their inclusion would make the Draft Core Strategy "Unsound".

Change to the policy requested:

Because there is substantial evidence that building on the Plateau Land, particularly on the Eastern side of Sulis Manor, would create serious and harmful impacts on the principle Heritage Assets associated with this site, South Stoke Parish Council asks that all reference to development on the Odd Down/ South Stoke Plateau be deleted from the proposed changes to the Core Strategy and that the clauses listed in section 5a above be amended accordingly.

Respondent Number: 1525 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South Stoke Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Nature Conservation.

Bath and Bradford-on-Avon SAC.

South Stoke Parish Council are concerned that a large part of the proposed site, listed in Changes SPC87 & 88, is a Designated SAC of European importance. It is defined as a foraging area for a rare and protected species of Horseshoe Bat. B&NES SHLAA notes that mitigation against the effects of development on the Plateau would be difficult, particularly because "legal mechanisms are difficult and untested locally". Of particular concern are the effects of noise and light pollution, as well as habitat disturbance.

It is noted that subject to the outcome of current European Legal Proceedings it may be that Natura 2000 regulations, which cover this designation, may trump UK law.

Other Rare Wildlife.

The plateau land has long been a natural breeding habitat for the now rare Skylark and a variety of other downland birds. Development on this land would inevitably lead to their decline and a loss of biodiversity.

Summary.

Development on this Plateau Land would threaten endangered species and may become the subject of European legal challenge.

Change to the policy requested:

Having considered the evidence provided by B&NES supporting documents, South Stoke Parish Council asks that the proposals in SPC87 & 88 to develop the Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau Land be deleted from the proposed changes and SPC12 & SPC 41 be modified accordingly.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 1525 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South Stoke Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Highway Issues.

The change ref: SPC88j includes the provision of an access onto the proposed Plateau Site from the Southstoke Lane/B3110 junction.

The B&NES Transport Evaluation published in February 2013 discusses at some length the effects of increased traffic on the Wellsway, the Bradford Road, Pennyquick etc but completely fails to address the major problems that would be created on the B3110 and in the Village of South Stoke.

The B3110 is already being used as an unofficial Southern Bypass to Bath with damaging consequences for the Residents of Midford. At peak hours the junction of the B3110 Midford Road and A3062 Bradford Road is dramatically over capacity.

The planned development at Foxhill will increase this problem.

To introduce further traffic from the Plateau Land into this part of the already stretched highway network would be extremely unwise. To ignore it altogether is irresponsible.

A considerable amount of traffic already uses Combe Hay and South Stoke as a "Rat Run" to avoid queues on the A367. To introduce further traffic onto these tiny, single track lanes would be seriously damaging to South Stoke Conservation Area.

In addition, whilst access to the Odd Down Plateau Land is possible and sustainable from the West, where it is close to the 'Park & Ride' facility and the major road network, the introduction of any form of access to the site from the Cross Keys junction will guarantee that the whole Plateau area is 'Suburbanised' and the inevitable site for wholesale development in time.

Clearly this would eliminate, at a stroke, any attempt to mitigate the harmful effects of development on South Stoke Village, The Green Belt, AONB, Wansdyke and the Setting of the World Heritage City of Bath.

Summary.

South Stoke Parish Council feel very strongly that to include an access to the site from the Cross Keys junction or from Southstoke Lane would make the Core Strategy "Unsound".

Change to the policy requested:

Having considered the effects of the proposed change SPC88j on the Highway network and on the South Stoke Village Conservation Area, South Stoke Parish Council asks that this change be deleted from the Draft Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 1525 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** South Stoke Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Regarding proposals for the Odd Down Plateau, I would comment as follows:

I do not support the proposals for development in this area which I believe to be unsound for the following reasons:

1. The entire area is within the Green Belt and, as such, provides a very narrow strip between South Stoke and Bath. Any

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

development of this area will cause coalescence between Bath and the South Stoke Conservation Area which will be contrary to one of the principle purposes of the Green Belt. The Council commissioned report by Arup makes this point and also voices concerns about the impact on archaeological remains and the Wansdyke Ancient Monument.

2. The site is within the Cotswold AONB. Bath's setting in this environment would be damaged by development in an AONB and could not be considered to be in 'Local and National Interest', the only criteria under which development could be permitted.

3. Access to the site from the B3110 at The Cross Keys will have have significant impact on the village of South Stoke, greatly reducing the effectiveness of any buffer between the village and development. In addition, the B3110 is already heavily used and the extra load will cause considerable disruption.

4. The area is important to wild life. Recognised by European experts in wildlife conservation as an important foraging area for the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat, it is also home to Skylarks which are becoming increasingly rare.

Change to the policy requested:

None

Respondent Number: 2012 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Steven Gourley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The plan proposes to build 50 houses per year – to a total of 300 – on this site from around 2015. This is unsound because:

- It is unlikely to be delivered on time due to the vigorous opposition such building will face
- It cannot be completed without contradicting other planning policy objectives included in the plan.

The whole site is in both Green Belt and AONB. The planners will need to demonstrate a clear case for building here – they have not attempted to do so in either the plan or supporting documents. Making this case will be very difficult.

The Arup report describes this as one of the narrowest sections of Green Belt around Bath – there is very little room for development. Indeed, the B&NES SHLAA document recognises the impact of building 300 houses on any part of this site:

- Building West of Sulis Manor will have a high impact on landscape character that will be hard to mitigate. My conclusion is that this damage to the setting of the World Heritage Site will prove unacceptable to Bath.
- Building East of Sulis Manor will lead either to further damage to the Wansdyke (Scheduled Ancient Monument) or the coalescence of the village of South Stoke with Bath. Councillors, through motions passed in March, have reaffirmed their wish to maintain a buffer zone between Bath and South Stoke.
- Mitigation of the “significant Bat issue” mentioned in the report is not considered in this plan but will be a very significant factor (see the wording on “environmental capacity” at SPC12).

There is a long record of local opposition to building on this land spanning several decades. There is also evidence from B&NES Council minutes that this proposal is not welcome to them either. Because this consultation is addressed to the Inspector and not B&NES, the Council will not have the opportunity to influence the plan based on this consultation. This flaw in the democratic process seems to go against the principle of the NPPF if not the letter. Does this not leave this aspect of the plan open to challenge in future?

This proposal appears incomplete, ill-considered and unwelcome. It is most certainly unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The entire change denoted by reference SPC88 is unsound and should be removed. This will require adjustments elsewhere in the plan. I make appropriate SPC suggestions in my comments on other changes.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 2450 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Susan M Tewson**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Green Belt and AONB

The entire area is within the Green Belt and AONB, the latter being the highest level of protection. There is no point in having these categories if they can be disregarded at will. The open area between the City boundary and the village of Southstoke is already very narrow, and should be protected at all costs.

The Wansdyke

The Wansdyke is registered as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and therefore should be protected from development very close to it, to prevent it from damage. As this is one of the few remaining sections of the Wansdyke accessible to the public, it should not be surrounded by development.

Traffic/Access

A roundabout at the Midford Road/Southstoke Lane junction would be an excellent way of slowing the traffic down along Midford Road, and making the junction safer, but to put an access road across the fields would wreck the open area bordering the Wansdyke, and diminish the buffer between Midford Road and Southstoke village. It would become a rat-run during busy times for traffic trying to avoid the hold-ups on the A367 Wellsway. Surely this makes the plan unsound.

Protection of bats

A large part of the area has been recognised as an important area for very rare Greater Horseshoe Bats,; development in the area will seriously threaten this species.

I hope you will consider these points as I believe they each contribute to making the plan unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

None

Respondent Number: 2563 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Guinness Trust**Agent ID:** 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC24, 54 and 88: Proposed Urban Extension at Odd Down

We previously advocated an urban extension at Odd Down as a means of relieving some of the aforementioned affordable housing needs, as well as providing an ideal opportunity to cater for the particular needs of older people. We therefore welcome the Proposed Change for inclusion of new Policy B3A subject to the following caveats.

Our client's first and foremost concern is to ensure affordable housing delivery as part of a mixed and balanced community, in accordance with the NPPF's paragraph 50. For this reason we seek to ensure that the emergent policies in the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan afford sufficient regard to economic viability.

The development will need to be sensitive to the landscape setting, ecological designations and adjacent (and potentially

on-site) heritage assets, most notably Bath World Heritage Site, Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Wansdyke Scheduled Monument, thereby demanding the highest quality of design. The need for physical, social and green infrastructure is not disputed as this will contribute to the creation of a sustainable community, however this will demand upfront finance which will have a substantial bearing on the development costs, especially the new primary school. Build costs will also be at the higher end of the scale on account of the acknowledged need in Arup's Development Concept Options Report (April 2013) for: "A simple palette of high quality building materials ... in keeping with the surrounding Bath townscape" (page 43) and a bias towards larger sized or 'family' housing.

It will be necessary to generate economies of scale in build and infrastructure costs. There is the opportunity to increase the allocation from "around 300 dwellings" as currently proposed, to up to 1000 dwellings. This is consistent with the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Findings Report of March 2013 and Arup's independent report., which show a capacity of at least 750 dwellings Such an uplift will also assist the Council in overcoming some of the deficiencies with the Proposed Changes to the housing requirement under SPC14.

In any case this will be subject to further viability testing at the masterplan stage, as recognised in the Council's Viability Study Update:

"The approach to viability assessment that is based on postcode sectors is generally robust. However, there will be instances where the approach is not 'fine grained' enough to deal with specific circumstances. It is recommended that where a postcode may include a potentially large greenfield housing development, the Council reserves itself in policy terms, the right to set a target for affordable housing as ambitiously as viability constraints will allow. The precise target will be based on further detailed testing relating to a masterplan or similar" (paragraph 6.7).

Whilst supportive generally of the 40% affordable housing target pertaining to this part of B&NES, we believe 30% is more appropriate at Odd Down, taking account of the provision of the Care Village and other infrastructure and development requirements.

Two further considerations relative to the affordable housing target are firstly that the precise mix of tenures and housing types and tenures will be fundamental to achieving a socially sustainable community and secondly that the opportunity to meet identified priority accommodation and care needs for the elderly may also enter into the equation.

Therefore, subject to resolving the appropriate scale of development:

1. We support a new Policy B3A to be included within the Core Strategy, to provide for a New Neighbourhood at Odd Down, Bath.
2. The Council's significant but modest proposals for "around 300 dwellings and small scale local employment opportunities and associated infrastructure" are not sound.
3. The proposed development should provide a mixed-use scheme capable of accommodating up to 1000 new homes including up to 300 new affordable homes, a Care Village and stimulate up to 800 new jobs on the edge of Bath.
4. The Council have considered the need for and impact of a larger New Neighbourhood at Odd Down and have rejected this option in favour of distributing new housing elsewhere in the District. This decision is not sound.
5. A New Neighbourhood at Odd Down at the scale and with the ingredients proposed above represents a more sustainable approach in order to deliver the Council's overall Vision and strategic objectives.

Summary

On balance, we prefer the Council to proceed to adopt the Core Strategy expeditiously. However if the Plan is to be declared sound it must incorporate a higher level of housing growth than set out in the Proposed Changes; consistent with all of the evidence.

The proposed urban extension at Odd Down can and should accommodate a mixed use scheme of up to 1000 dwellings, a Care Village and 800 new jobs. It can both assist much needed affordable housing delivery at Bath and increase choices for older people in B&NES; pending an early review of the Core Strategy.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

If the Inspector agrees that this is a more sensible approach than declaring the Core Strategy unsound (and seeking the Council to start again with production of a new Local Plan) then we would hope to see the Council commence the review as soon as practicable, and certainly within the next five years.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 2565 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Bolden

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This 'Land adjoining Odd Down' is protected by three designations, 1) Green Belt, 2) AONB, 3) part of the setting of Bath World Heritage Site. In addition there is the Wansdyke SAM immediately adjacent to the eastern part of this land. An additional factor is the proximity of the South Stoke Conservation Area.

In relation to Green Belt I consider that SPC88 is unsound in relation to NPPF (Clause 83 in particular) in that "Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances". In my opinion "exceptional circumstances" have not been demonstrated in the Core Strategy so SPC88 is not consistent with national policy. The only driver seems to be the calculation (estimate) of dwellings considered to be needed for the plan period. Clause 83 refers to Green belt boundaries as "capable of enduring beyond the plan period". Surely that was the principle behind Green belts being set up in the first place.

In relation to development within the AONB I consider that SPC88 is unsound in relation to NPPF (Clause 115 in particular), "Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty". Clause 116 states "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest." As with the Green Belt no "exceptional circumstances" have been demonstrated in the Core Strategy so SPC88 is not consistent with national policy in relation to the AONB. The 'highest status of protection' should mean exactly what it says – development will not be permitted.

The setting of Bath as a World Heritage Site is defined by the green space around it so it follows that loss of a portion of green space around Bath must interfere with the World Heritage status in some way. But I would look to the protection of the setting to come from the existing Green Belt and AONB designations. How much stronger is it possible to state the importance of the AONB than 'Great Weight', and 'highest status of protection'?. Clause 137 states that, "Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance." This does not appear to give licence to moving the setting, i.e. encroaching outside the setting defined by the Green Belt and AONB. So again I consider that SPC88 is unsound in relation to NPPF.

The Council's own reports draw attention to the area being a foraging area for European protected species (bats) and the importance of retaining habitat (including protection of dark skies). The Council's "HRA Review of All Proposed Policy Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy March 2013 Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010" classifies 'Scope for effects to Occur' as 'Likely' for the Land adjoining Odd Down. No other areas of proposed development contained in the Core Strategy attract this level of risk – others are 'possible' or 'unlikely'. So these ecological drivers could, on further investigation, require planning permission to be refused by virtue of NPPF Clause 118, bullet points 1 and 5. This could therefore prevent development proceeding and would render this area undeliverable in terms of NPPF Clause 47 and therefore unsound. Regrettably the Council has in the last few months shown little regard for any consideration of dark skies by the introduction of street lighting which is noticeably brighter than the predecessor lighting.

I will discuss the Wansdyke SAM under a heading of Placemaking considerations

Placemaking considerations

The number of properties proposed for “Land adjoining Odd Down” is proposed as 300. The consultation ‘newspaper’ prepared by the Council also notes that a primary school is to be provided on the site (unless an alternative location can be found and agreed). If we take the housing density of the existing 1980’s Sulis Meadow as a guide, which I have carefully calculated as 35.5/Ha then the land to the west of Sulis Manor could accommodate between 321 and 359 properties, depending on the effective boundary of the site. The actual density of Sulis Meadow is in fact slightly higher because 35.5 includes the area occupied by a radio mast in its midst. Present day housing densities might be expected to be a little higher than 35.5 so, on these numbers, accommodating the school west of Sulis Manor appears to be viable. There would appear to be sufficient highway infrastructure (notably the roundabout on A367 at the entrance to the Park and Ride) for a development in this area to be serviced by a main link road to Sulis Manor Road with perhaps some improvement to Combe Hay Lane. This would leave the land east of Sulis Manor / Sulis Meadow entirely untouched by development, and the Wansdyke SAM entirely unaffected.

The consultation ‘newspaper’ shows development potentially split either of Sulis Manor. This is illustrated to need a significant new entrance to the area from the junction of Midford Road at the ‘Cross Keys’ and in point 10 it is stated to provide the principle vehicular access to the site. Development of the eastern end of the land should not be a foregone conclusion in the way the Council has implied. It would unavoidably render the Wansdyke SAM to be just a linear feature through a developed area and would detract from its role as a defensive boundary between one place and another, in the present case between town and country. Indications are that it was built as a northern defence line so it would be fitting that it should be allowed to continue defending the countryside from the encroachment of town.

The creation of a five way junction at the Cross Keys would be likely to require either a roundabout or traffic lights (the worse of two evils) either of which would bring unsightly urban features to the very edge of the countryside. This need can be avoided by simply not developing land east of Sulis Manor. As I have shown there is no need for this eastern land to be included in the proposals. The need to create a new traffic junction is by definition less sustainable when the western alternative requires no such extra provision. Attempting to reduce the junction to a 4 way junction might be attempted by linking first to Southstoke Lane but this would reduce the separation of South Stoke from Bath and would likely involve a greater land take. I consider that Southstoke Lane contributes to the separateness of South Stoke (i.e. a Green belt consideration) from the conurbation of Bath so it should be retained throughout its length.

In considering the merits of land east or west of Sulis Manor it is once again necessary to consider the purpose of Green Belt. NPPF Clauses 79 and 80 are relevant;
79 – “The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”.
80 – “Green Belt serves five purposes: 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; 4) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and 5) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”

In my opinion seeking to permit development in the land east of Sulis Manor would be contrary to both these NPPF clauses due to the proximity of South Stoke. Maintaining the openness is central to retaining the separate identity of South Stoke from Bath – i.e. village from town. To the west of Sulis Manor the openness of the existing fields is equally important but development in this area does not have the risk of coalescence between two communities as the presently ‘separate’ area is the car park of the Park and Ride.

However in terms of landscape any development of the land west of Sulis Manor would involve, due to the southward facing slope of this land, the urban area of Bath spilling over the brow of the hill and thus detracting from views of this skyline from the AONB to the south.

Any development on land either side of Sulis Manor would bring the light of the town into the countryside. The town should stay within its existing boundaries.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

I believe that SPC88 is unsound due to its lack of compliance with legitimate constraints identified in the NPPF and so should therefore be withdrawn in its entirety.

Respondent Number: 2775 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sara Beaugeard

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The area opposite The Cross Keys pub is of major historical value and provides vital access to off road walks into the Southstoke valley. Another road leading into the Midford road will cause major impact and Southstoke Road will suffer a heavy increase of 'rat run' traffic.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment.

Respondent Number: 2935 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: St Martin's Garden Primary School

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Governors of St Martin's Garden Primary School are responding to the proposed development on the land adjoining Odd Down, Bath which states that "Educational needs generated by the development must be met: a primary school is to be provided on site, unless an alternative solution can be found and agreed by the Education Authority". Your document states an initial 300 homes with an assumption that there will be a need for 31 primary school places per 100 dwellings. (99 extra places) St Martin's Garden Primary School, Odd Down currently has 185 pupils with the capacity for another 210. St Martin's Garden benefits from a large site with plenty of space inside and out, which could be developed. Therefore The Governors at St Martin's Garden Primary School feel we are the alternative solution and are happy to work with the Education Authority on this option.

Change to the policy requested:

St Martin's Garden Primary school provides a good education to it's current pupils and is at the heart of the Odd Down Community, this development will be within walking distance of our school gates so as the Governors of St Martin's Garden Primary School we feel we would be an excellent provision and we would like to work with the Education Authority to be the alternative solution to building another Primary School.

We feel, strongly, that a new Primary School is not needed and with investment St Martin's Garden Primary School has the capacity to take the initial assumed 99 places and could also accommodate extra pupils if further housing development was carried out in a further planning period.

Respondent Number: 3095 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans

Respondent Organisation: CPRE Avonside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We object to the intention to remove land adjoining Odd Down from the Green Belt and to allocate sites for 300 houses on that land.

This land should not be released from Green Belt to allow housing development as it is not necessary; a higher density of development within Bath should be specified to remove the need for an urban extension. The policy is therefore unjustified.

This land is within Green Belt; it is part of the Cotswolds AONB; it is within the Setting of the World Heritage Site as identified within the 2012 Draft City of Bath World Heritage Site Setting SPD; it is closely adjacent to the South Stoke Conservation Area; it is adjacent to the Wansdyke Scheduled National Monument. In addition, there are local reports of a number of protected species including orchids and bats, as well as sensitive species including skylarks and several species of owl.

This is therefore a highly unsuitable site for new development. The only justification for development on a site with as many different types of protection would be if there was an overwhelming need for the development that could not possibly be met in any other way. We believe that on the contrary, it would be possible to meet the need for new homes within Bath without resorting to immensely damaging green field development on this site.

The Core Strategy includes the retention of policies from the 2007 Local Plan, including Policy HG7 which relates to minimum density of housing developments; this will therefore guide the Placemaking Plan in detailed planning of new housing developments and has presumably been used in calculating the number of houses that have been given for each site.

HG7 states that new housing developments are expected to be designed with a minimum density of 30 houses/ha and that in some circumstances, developers will be 'encouraged' to work to a density of 30-50/ha. We feel that this is inadequate in the current circumstances. As a comparison, between 1996 and 2006, completed developments within Bristol had an average density of 58.8 homes/ha (source – West of England Partnership Board Report 6/2 Housing Density). Within Bath, the Georgian architecture typical of the central area is built at a very high density; in two recent new developments that were designed to match surrounding Georgian architecture, densities of over 140/hectare were achieved (Bathwick St, 05/01011/FUL and 07/03670/FUL). These developments were flats and that density would not be achievable for other types of housing, but it demonstrates the inherent density of the local building style.

Within Bath, the Core Strategy plans for 5000 new homes in the central area and outer neighbourhoods combined, with another 1000 homes planned for 'intensification'. We request that a minimum density for the 5000 new homes be set at a higher level than that given in HG7. We accept that it is probably unrealistic to attempt a higher density of development for 'intensification' which is likely to consist of infill on constricted sites. However, if the density of housing on the sites allocated for 5000 homes were increased by 10%, this would provide sufficient additional housing to render it unnecessary to build on the Odd Down site. We would suggest a minimum density of 45/ha which is still within the band set by HG7 of 30-50.

We feel strongly that the character of Bath is closely related to the tall, narrow, elegant Georgian architecture of the city and that this model should be closely followed in new developments. Bath is a naturally high-density, pedestrian-focussed city and this is a model which is inherently sustainable and which gives rise to a good quality of life. We should take the opportunity of the Core Strategy to require new developments to follow the architectural pattern of the Georgian city.

Change to the policy requested:

We request that Policy B3A should be removed from the Core Strategy, with Odd Down being treated as other rural villages, and the land adjoining Odd Down being treated as other Green Belt land around Bath.

Respondent Number: 4447 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** David Payne

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The revised Core Strategy is unsound in relation to Change SPC 87 because:

1. it envisages development in a Green Belt area and will bring about coalescence of South Stoke with Bath. There are no "very special circumstances" to warrant this.
2. this land is part of the Cotwolds ANOB and such is even more to be protected. No-one has demonstrated that there is any "exceptional local or national interest" in over-riding this protection. The envisaged changes seem to treat "Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty" as mere words, with no real meaning.
3. Bath's World Heritage status is extremely important to the city and its economy. To endanger that by developing Green Belt is highly counter-productive and could have very serious economic consequences.
4. access to proposed development appears to be via a "gateway" opposite the Cross Keys pub and a new road across this protected land. The new road would probably generate serious traffic problems around the pub. But more importantly, once a new road is built, the whole of the Green Belt/ANOB land near Odd Down would effectively be available for development: regardless of what the current Core Strategy says, it would only be a matter of time before far more than 300 houses were built.

Change to the policy requested:

I feel very strongly that the current policy does not give proper weight to need to prevent irreversible destruction of both Green Belt and part of an ANOB. Therefore the policy priorities should be changed to require building first on brown field sites. When all brown field sites have been completely exhausted, and only then, should green field sites be considered but excluding Green belt and any ANOB. If this does not yield enough land to meet perceived demand then the demand forecasts need stringent reassessment: forecasting is notoriously fallible, particularly in relation to the assumptions used. So the assumptions used to calculate the requirement for new homes needs to be appraised very critically, as does the minimum density of new builds. Where land is so scarce, as it is in Bath, it will not be possible to be generous for each new home. Finally in no case should land that is both Green Belt and in an ANOB be developed.

The council must make the case forcefully to central government (whose priorities are very different from those of Bath) that current policy will impose serious damage in our area – damage that cannot be undone.

Respondent Number: 4454 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Colin Britt

Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Paragraph (e) claims to "protect and enhance" the open rural character and tranquillity of the area opposite the Cross Keys. Yet paragraph (j) allows for "junction improvements" at the Midford Road (B3110) junction with Southstoke Road (Cross Keys) in order to provide the principle vehicular access to the location of multiple new housing. These statements are obviously conflicting.

The provision of the main access to the proposed site from the above junction is far from ideal. The B3110 is already a very busy road, with standing queues at peak times often extending from its junction with Bradford/Frome Roads (Glasshouse) well beyond the Cross Keys junction. The addition of access to a new housing estate from this junction can hardly be consistent with the requirement for sustainability.

It is, in my opinion, very undesirable that the green belt between Odd Down and Southstoke should be reduced further, especially around the site of the Fosse Way. However, if there are to be any developments, surely it would be more sound to give access from the opposite end (ie the relatively new Sulis Meadows area), rather than jeopardising the open and rural character of the area opposite the Cross Keys.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove paragraph (j) of SPC88.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4457 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** John Scriven **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1. General - the development of an AONB requires exceptional (i) local and (ii) national reasons. These have not been substantiated. Judicial review could result. In particular the following have not been properly taken into account.

2. Employment – there is no evidence for increased employment opportunities specifically in Bath (as opposed to a wider area). Currently job opportunities are scarce. If new residents can't find work in Bath, the development will be dormitory. Accommodation for commuters with the attendant traffic congestion

3. Traffic – there is traffic congestion in Bath and limiter, if no opportunity for easing, due to its Wall Heritage status. There is currently congestion at commuter times along the Midford Road, the Bradford road and Frome road. Additional housing could result in gridlocks.

Change to the policy requested:

1. For the reasons stated in paragraph 7 above, there should be no development on the AONB.

2. If the density of housing in other areas, particularly the 'Brownfield' sites, were increased, there would be no requirement for the destruction of the AONB.

3. If there is to be building on the AONB (which is strongly contested) then:

- The core strategy should prioritise Brownfield sites so that no development takes place on the AONB until the later of (i) the completion of the place setting and (ii) June 2020 and
- The building on the AONB should be at the western edge so as to maintain the ruralbetween the new housing on South Stoke village, as required by a council resolution and
- There should be no access to the development from the Cross Keys intersection, since this would result in unnecessary destruction of the AONB and usual pollution.

Respondent Number: 4458 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Caroline Scriven **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1. The Midford Road and Bradford Road are already key access roads to and from Bath, with heavy traffic in rush hour in particular. Were they to constitute the "principle vehicular accesses" to a new development of 300 homes via a junction enhancement at the 33110 Midford rd/Southstoke rd, traffic blocks would be inheritable and cause both frustration and disruption also putting unsustainable pressure on the junction at Bradford rd/Southstoke rd. The result that it would impact on the area would render this draft core strategy "unsound"

2. The whole of the proposed development is on land designated on AONB, on the outskirts of a world Heritage city, the proposed changes would threaten these significantly. The land between Bath and Southstoke is already squeezed, and any further development here will merge the two which would seem to conflict with BANES policy.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

1. That there should be no development on the land adjoining Odd Down, Bath.

2. That if some development is considered at all, that it be in the SW corner of the proposed site which will impinge less on Southstoke and on the roads already carrying heavy traffic.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4460 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Elizabeth Lewis**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Preservation of Wansdyke Ancient Monument.

The area is full of ancient sites and this adds to the interest and culture of the Bath area. Loss or disappointment of this monument would be a tragedy!

- Transport – A367 is busy at all times. Adding as it is heavily used by emergency vehicles. New homes require new roads!
- Loss of green fields.

We all need fresh air to breathe and to be able to enjoy and be restored by the natural world.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

- Build less houses here than planned. Density is already very high.
- Consider access roads to be properly incorporated in the plan.
- Don't let Southstoke become part of greater Bath, the residents are entitled to live in a village

Respondent Number: 4464 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mary Duncan**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The proposed development is wholly within the Green Belt and the land satisfies all five purposes of the Green belt as set out in the NPPF. Most importantly to prevent coalescence - in this case with Southstoke. (The Arup report notes that the Green Belt between Bath and Southstoke is very narrow.) The proposed development would not be compliant with these principals and no 'very special circumstances' have been defined in this case - the Core Strategy amendments are therefore unsound.

The development is within an AONB. No proof has been advanced that this development is in the 'Local and National interest' as is required for major developments in AONB. The proposed development conflicts with the Draft Core Strategy's specific mention of the importance of GB and AONB in relation to Bath as a World Heritage City. For these reasons it is also unsound.

The Wansdyke is a Scheduled Ancient Monument and as such must be protected. The Arup report states that the western section of the Wansdyke has already suffered from inappropriate development. Therefore it should be considered unsound for any further development to take place that would cause harm to the eastern section.

European Experts in Wildlife Conservation have identified this area as a foraging ground for the Greater Horseshoe Bat. This species is under threat and the destruction of vital habitat, combined with the noise and light pollution that will result from this development, will cause it real harm.

Baths status as a World Heritage City must be protected. An important aspect of this is its setting in a green environment. This development, as well as others that have been proposed, conflict with the councils support of this status by putting it at risk, and with it Bath's tourist based economy. This is unsound and not 'sustainable development'.

The proposed site access from the B3110/Southstoke Lane junction will create a rat run across the site and add to already
Bath North East Somerset Council

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

difficult traffic problems at the B3110/Wellsway junction. Whilst BANES has acknowledged the need for a buffer to be maintained between Bath and Southstoke the construction of this road will cause significant harm to the bat foraging area and damage to the Wansdyke . It will also open up the whole plateau to future development. This must be considered as unsound and not 'sustainable development'.

Change to the policy requested:

That any development on the site be limited to the land to the west of Sulis Manor with access also on the western side of the development

That that the proposed access from the B3110/Southstoke Lane junction be rejected as unsound and not compatible with 'sustainable development'

Respondent Number: 4465 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Nicola Fickling and Andrew Berry **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We do not believe that the proposal for building on the Odd Down site is either justified or consistent with national policy.

The proposed plans to build are in direct opposition to the National Planning Policy Framework. In particular:

- It does not meet the need for planning to be environmentally sustainable (P2 of the National Planning Policy Framework). The plan to build on green belt land and in close proximity to a conservation area will lead to a destruction of natural environment, biodiversity and will have an effect on wildlife within the area including the protected species of bats. It does not “promote biodiversity” which is a key point of the National Planning Policy Framework
- It is building on protected green belt land. This goes against P5 of the National Planning Policy Framework where it states “protecting the green belts around them (cities/towns)”
- The proposed plans do not “recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside” (P5) with the proposed building work being located within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- It does not “support thriving rural communities” (P5) with the proposed building site being located in close proximity to South Stoke – in itself a conservation area that will be swallowed up by Bath.
- It is not “land of lesser environmental value” (P6). The land that is proposed being built on is extremely environmentally sensitive, including ancient woodland and tree belts.
- It specifically states in the National Planning Policy Framework that “the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence”. Releasing green belt land for building on does not support green belts as “permanent”. It specifically states in the national planning document that “a local planning authority should regard construction of new buildings as inappropriate in green belt”
- The area is AONB and the policy document states “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in areas of outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty”
- On P27 it states that building should “promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats”. Any building in the area proposed will have an impact on protected species of bats.

The proposed building site is: an area of outstanding beauty, is adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument, in close proximity to a conservation area, hosts protected species of bats and is green belt land.

Because of this, we do not believe that any building on this site is justifiable.

In addition, the building on the site at Odd Down will lead to increased traffic to an already congested road, and in particular have an impact of traffic going into Bath and Bristol.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4466	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mr and Mrs Beardshaw	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC88		Plan Reference: Policy B3A	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

Having read the Core Strategy 2013 document we cannot see how building houses on the Southstoke plateau achieves more positive than negative Core Strategy objectives. It is an unsound proposal for the following reasons
Additional affordable housing has already been approved for the MOD Fox Hill site.
There is already severe traffic congestion in the Bradford Road, Southstoke Road, Midford Road, Wellsway area each morning and afternoon, particularly since the opening of Three Ways School and the new Sainsbury supermarket. Currently at peak times residents in Southstoke Road, which is used as a rat-run between Midford and Bradford Roads cannot exit their properties by car because of traffic queues. This congestion and impact will only get worse as new residents from the MOD Fox Hill site make their way to work and add to the number of vehicles on the road in the area. The Southstoke Plateau area is a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, visitors to Bath regularly come to the Cross Keys pub then walk along the Wansdyke way, across the fields proposed for housing to the Southstoke Millennium seat. If this area is built on this won't happen and – there will be one less reason for tourists to visit Bath. Finally the proposed Southstoke Plateau fields are a green open space used extensively by local residents from Fox Hill, Combe Down, Southstoke and Sulis Meadows for walking and relaxation. Building on this site will reduce their opportunity to access open space and lead a healthy lifestyle.

Change to the policy requested:

Withdrawal of the proposal to build houses/roads on the Southstoke plateau

Respondent Number: 4467	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Ms Judith A Parfitt	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC88		Plan Reference: Policy B3A	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

PARTICULARLY RELATING TO South STOKE AND ODD DOWN

GREEN BELT
Bath needs to maintain its present boundaries as limited by the Green Belt. No special circumstances have been demonstrated that would permit development in the Green Belt. Coalescence with outlying villages would destroy the special place of Bath as a World Heritage City: In particular the open green belt area is already very narrow. Do not lose Green belt.

AONB
Major development as proposed on the South Stoke plateau would be entirely within the area of Cotswold AONB which is afforded the highest level of protection against development which is not in Local and National Development. This criteria is of major importance to the setting of Bath. Do not destroy an area of AONB.

WORLD HERITAGE STATUS
Bath's tourist industry relies heavily on World Heritage Status. Would-be destruction of the Green setting of Bath gives unsoundness of the two intentions of BANES which conflict: ie supporting World Heritage Status yet risking so much by building on its Green Buffer Zones.. Do not jeopardise Bath's status.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

THE WANSDYKE

This ancient and important piece of archaeology which is registered as a "Scheduled Ancient Monument" has long been ignored and left for destruction. Now is the time to contain further ravages. Sulis Meadows estate Was allowed to develop too near the Wansdyke resulting in much loss. Do not contribute to destruction of The Wansdyke

TRAFFIC/ROADS

A gateway road across Sixty Acre field towards Sulis Meadows would create a rat-run to the A367 from the B3110 Midford Road which is already overused, with traffic regularly flouting the speed limits and weight restrictions. Any access road across Sixty Acre field from the Cross Keys crossroads will also create traffic jams at the Red House Roundabout and Wellsway/Midford Road junction. Road building never diminishes traffic. It would also guarantee that the whole field be open to development thus destroying Green Belt, AONB, The Wansdyke, Bat Habitat, all significant contributors to Bath's World Heritage Status

BANES have been doing their best to slow road traffic access in Bath as exemplified by constrictions on the (dual-carriageway) sections of Wellsway. Do not build a road across Sixty Acre field.

BAT FORAGING AREA

The rare Greater Horseshoe Bat lives and forages on South Stoke Plateau. They are protected by law.. The bats must not be lost.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4468
Comment Number: 1
Respondent Name: Mr Daniel Barnett
Agent ID:
Agent Name:

Respondent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I am writing to object as a local resident to the proposed change to the BANES Core Strategy that would result in development of the South Stoke plateau with potentially new three hundred houses.

The area around South Stoke and Combe Hay is beautiful and it provides local residents and the people from a much wider catchment area the opportunity to enjoy the natural landscape.

The views across, over and around Horse Combe Vale, South Stoke and Combe Hay are superb. The development would have a devastating impact on this area changing its character for good. The area is listed as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which should afford it protection from the development.

Sadly, the Wansdyke, an archaeological feature was severely compromised by the Sulis Meadows development and does our society no credit that we do not protect this feature of our ancient landscape.

As a local resident and an architect by profession, I enjoy the historic architecture of the city of Bath. The setting of the buildings is part of its beauty and power as architecture. The special status that the city was given by UNESCO as a World Heritage Status applies to all of the city including the Green Belt and its immediate setting. This status is not about the famous set piece buildings but also the wider setting. This proposal from BANES Council to build into the Green Belt, the AONB and the Wansdyke is "unsound" because of its collective impact on the World Heritage Status and the damage it will do the character of this part of Bath and its setting.

One aspect that should be considered is the special setting of the architecture (farms, mills and rural buildings contemporary with Georgian / Victorian Bath) that one finds in the rural areas immediately around Bath. The proposed

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

development would compromise the already narrow green belt between Bath and South Stoke. Effectively joining a distinctive rural community to suburban Bath.

The impact on local wildlife, in particular bats, is a major concern. The South Stoke plateau is a feeding area for rare bats and the associated light pollution from the proposed development would have a devastating impact on these animals.

The proposed development would result in new road infrastructure, this in turn would generate further traffic on the Wellsway / B3110 and the route out to Radstock / Peasedown St John / Midsomer Norton. There are no measures that could reduce this impact on this already congested road system.

In summary, the proposed development is "unsound" for all of the above reasons. I can see no support from the local community for this proposal.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4469 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Ralph Wynne-Griffiths

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I do not support the proposed change for the following reasons:

1. The change has been made to accommodate a change in the forecast number of new jobs and new houses that will be required before 2029. This change does not appear to be credible having regard to the other changes made to the forecasts of increased office accommodation and industrial work space. This would suggest that the actual numbers of new jobs and the need for new houses is likely to be less than those forecast.

2. If the forecast for the increase in the number of new jobs and new houses required was found to be sound, I would not support the change for the following reasons.

3. The change to include green belt land within the land for development is unsustainable and unsound:

(a) The fact that land between Odd Down and Southstoke is designated as part of the Cotswolds ANOB. Development of land within an ANOB is only permitted if it is in the local and national interest. This is not shown in the proposal for the change. It is not in the local or national interest for the following reasons.

(b) The setting of Bath as a World Heritage City: its green setting within a landscape bowl. Further development beyond the existing line of housing in Odd Down and in the other parts of the Green Belt will degrade the setting of the city and may even put its WH status in jeopardy.

(c) The existence of the Wansdyke which runs along the side of a large part of the land being considered, including up to the junction with Southstoke Lane and Midford Road. The setting of this ancient monument should be protected from any further development.

(d) The narrowness of the existing green belt separating the city from South Stoke.

(e) The importance of preserving and protecting the special character of the village of South Stoke.

(f) The effect of any development on the foraging area for the Greater Horseshoe Bat, reducing the available area and causing disturbance from noise and light.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

4. Even assuming that the need for the change to the number of houses was found to be sound, that does not mean that the need for those extra new houses should be met. The above are all reasons why it would not be sustainable for Bath, particularly having regard to its unique status, to accommodate the additional housing required by building within the existing green belt.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy B3A should be deleted from the proposed Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 4470 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr A.C.F. Perry

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I am writing because I strongly feel that the recently proposed amendment to BANES Draft Core Strategy is not sound. I write as a resident in South Stoke, and as a former resident of Bracknell, Berkshire. Being quite new to South Stoke, I see it through fresh eyes and don't take its beauty for granted. Also, I have no vested interest; because I am a tenant, rather than a home-owner, I have no stake here in property and cannot be accused of NIMBY-ism. With no ties, if you concrete over Bath, good for you, but I won't be here. Your plans to build new homes are ruinous. Where is the expansion in industry to support the influx? A conservative estimate of the number of empty properties in England is 710,000, of which 69,000 are empty in the South West according to the most recent data available (source url below*); what necessitates building more in Bath? Bath's building plan jeopardises its heritage and puts me in mind of Bracknell. Until the 1950s, Bracknell was a pretty, rural market town. Then, planners set about its vandalisation. Displaying an arrogance that is common among developers who tend to feel they know better or simply don't care, they trammled over centuries of evolution. The effect is a soul-less town whose centre is an ugly and decaying concrete abomination that the children of today will escape if they can, or use to push and use drugs. What a miserable legacy. Other correspondents will better articulate that development of the site from Combe Hay Lane to South Stoke Lane is gratuitous, but from the Bracknell experience outlined above (and Bracknell is not unique), the risk is that developers are unsympathetic, ignorant or both. There will no doubt be the strongest reassurances, but why should we believe them? Why should we volunteer for the risk? Unlike Bracknell, Bath is not designated as a New Town. Is it? It is not part of a tangible government policy to encourage commercial development. Is it? Bracknell had Ferranti, British Aerospace, ICI and ICL, to name a few. What's Bath got? Unlike Bracknell, the infrastructure in Bath is grossly inadequate even for current needs; narrow roads used by heavy goods vehicles, buses and too many cars with no good link to major routes away from the city. It's a disaster, really. (You would help future generations more if you made a serious attempt at job creation, perhaps via more proactive attention to the University.) Where local leaders should preserve the unique and beautiful legacy of this part of Bath for its children, it seems they would gratuitously corrupt it for a cheap fix. I therefore urge that you emphatically reject the consultation proposals, not just for now, but for the foreseeable future; it seems that development threats are merely repackaged and represented every time legitimate objections are made to them. This must stop; No means No.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4471 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Clare Martland

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

This entire area falls within the Green Belt which, I understand, should be preserved at all costs. One of the conditions of such an area is that there should be a substantial buffer between settlements ie. Midford Road, Sulis Meadows, Southstoke village. This buffer is already very narrow and any development between these areas would constitute infilling and merging of settlements creating one large housing area. This is contrary to the purpose of a Green Belt and this proposed development would therefore contravene Green Belt protection and is not sound.

Further, the whole of the proposed site falls within an Area of Outstanding Beauty, which not only has the highest level of protection against development but is vitally important to Bath as a World Heritage City. Development on the Southstoke Plateau could jeopardise this status.

Major access from the B3110 South Stoke Lane junction is of major concern as a new road with street lighting would create light pollution to all houses on Southstoke road and Midford Road together with considerable and continual noise pollution from all vehicles accessing the proposed development site not only during construction but thereafter from residents, visitors and traders and other uses. The elevation of the land above Midford Road would mean that lighting and noise would be a continual nuisance to residents of Midford Road who back on to the Wansdyke. Increased volume of traffic will cause further congestion on the already busy and dangerous Midford Road and Southstoke Road and especially at Wellsway junction. A 'major road with lighting and footpaths' as proposed in the development Plan would create a massive rat run between Midford Road and Sulis Meadows through to the roundabout at the Park and Ride facility at all times of day. Increased traffic and pressure on already busy roads will create further traffic problems in this already jammed area is not a sustainable option.

The Wansdyke is a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and must be protected. Development of houses on the Eastern section of Wansdyke would ruin this protection and visually impair it. The current destruction of habitat through clearing this section of Wansdyke has already altered the wildlife balance on the plateau and further development of this land will continue to destroy important habitats including that of the protected species of Greater Horseshoe Bat.

For all of the above reasons I feel that the proposed changes to the Draft Core Strategy are unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The change I am requesting is that this area should NOT be considered for housing development.

Respondent Number: 4476	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mrs C H Hollingworth
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID:	Agent Name:
------------------	--------------------

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The proposal to build particularly on the area around the football ground at Sulis Meadows estate means that the whole rural aspect of this part of the estate will be destroyed and the use and enjoyment of access to the countryside across the field by Sulis Manor to the road below which leads to Southstoke and footpaths will be limited and the rural views destroyed. This is a popular local amenity and overlooks an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The general well being and quality of life on the estate for current residents would be considerably lowered.

The access to the estate will have to be changed by Combe Hay Lane and will irreversibly alter the whole atmosphere and nature of the estate.

The local roads cannot be improved - traffic coming into Bath at the roundabout on the A367 where Sulis Manor Road joins is already very bad in the rush hour both morning and evenings when it is practically gridlocked – this has a knock-on effect

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

at the Red Lion Roundabout further down towards St Martins, and Midford Road. It is bad until well after 9 am.

Bus services would be insufficient as there is only the Odd Down Park and Ride bus service into town which only operates till 8.30 pm as the No 14 is slow and a good walk away from the estate which would deter people from using it.

It is a good 20 minute walk to local shops and the local Sainsburys is too small to serve a much bigger community. Its location means that access during school term and rush hour times is slow and difficult by car.

The roads in Sulis Meadows Estate are narrow and do not lend themselves to a bus service or more traffic so say a through way to further housing on either side of Sulis Manor would lead to a severe deterioration in the peace, safety and quality of life on the estate. It is already going to be badly affected by the new 6th form at St Gregorys as often when there is something on at present at the school cars are parked all down Sulis Manor Road making access very difficult.

The whole atmosphere and aspect of the village of Southstoke would also be destroyed by joining it up with housing to the outer suburbs of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

That no houses should be allowed to be built on the fields between Sulis Manor and Southstoke nor on the fields and footpath ground between the Manor and Combe Hay Lane.

Respondent Number: 4477 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Robert T Parfitt

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Core Strategy as it stands in relation to the above area is overall unsound and aspects of it i.e. those relating to the Green Belt, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Wansdyke are of doubtful legality. The following are my specific comments:

- **GREEN BELT:** An objective of earlier planning decisions have been to maintain a green buffer between Bath & surrounding villages thus identifying the City as being of special National & International interest. The entire site proposed in the strategy is within the Green Belt and the proposal must be considered as unsound. Other than those of expedience, no very special circumstances have been demonstrated in the strategy. An important function of the Green Belt is to prevent coalescence between settlements and thus incurring serious structural and social damage on the British countryside. The effective coalescence of South Stoke with Bath and Odd Down would damage all three communities and effectively destroy the historic (Charter AD 961) village of South Stoke. Coalescence, among other actions (below) will put Bath's World Heritage status at risk.
- **AOB:** The Strategy attacks the 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' that has, by statute, the highest level of protection against development. No proof or other compelling evidence has been presented to demonstrate unequivocally that development in the AOB is in the 'local and National' interest. On the contrary, development on the South Stoke plateau is arguably against both. In addition such development would compound a case for Bath to lose its World Heritage listing. The amended Draft Core Strategy therefore not only fails the 'local & National interest' test but is contrary to B&NES own policy. The proposal is thus unsound.
- **THE WANSDYKE:** This ancient Saxon earthwork (probably constructed on a Roman Road) dates from around the 6th century and is arguably the most important earthwork boundary in the whole region and as important as Offa's Dyke. The Sulis Meadows development has already damaged this important 'Scheduled Ancient Monument'. The 'Core Strategy' proposals will destroy an important section of Wansdyke. This section is in the 'care' of BANES for its own short tenure; the advancement of the strategy would constitute a major act of municipal vandalism. Included in the destruction, the plan is to divide the dyke with a road at the Cross Keys junction; the very place where the feature and its path and, a possible connection to the Eastern Wansdyke is in need of serious academic study. Clearly, the proposal is unsound.
- **TRAFFIC & ROADS:** The B3110 road past the Cross Keys & on through Midford is already a grossly overused thoroughfare with traffic speeding well beyond any restriction and, of course, no sign of enforcement of speed limits. It is used as a short

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

–cut (rat-run) from the A36 to Bath & via the ‘Glasshouse’ roundabout to Bristol. New roads reduce and/or ease traffic for a short time-then the arteries clog again. The road would offer an excuse for the wholesale development of the South Stoke plateau and, indeed, the village of South Stoke. The easement road is claimed as the most ‘sustainable’ option – sustainable for what? The proposal is unsound and ill-thought through.

- BATS: The greater part of the South Stoke plateau has been identified by European Experts in Wildlife Conservation as a very important, in fact vital, foraging area for the very rare Greater Horseshoe Bat. Noise disturbance & light pollution from the propose road and development would further threaten the existence of this rare species not only in the South stoke Area specifically but also nationally. All aspects of this part of the strategy are unsound.
- WORLD HERITAGE STATUS: Bath sits in one of the most delightful of situations, from the centre one may view the beauty of the surrounding green hills. The setting is an important reason for Bath being awarded ‘World Heritage’ status. To build on the Green Belt and an AOB that borders the Southern extremity of the City makes no sense. Even worse, would be to damage beyond retrieval an important section one of Britain’s outstanding historic monuments, the Wansdyke. Bath’s World Heritage status is an earned attribute for its setting, beauty and national historic importance; that conflicts markedly with damaging an important monument in its care?

Clearly, there is no merit in a plan that does such damage to our heritage & puts the City’s right to World Heritage status in doubt; it should be rejected on the grounds of overall unsoundness.

Change to the policy requested:

The change to the policy I request is the omission of the proposed housing development on the South Stoke Plateau adjacent to Sulis Meadows. In addition I request that the proposal for an easement road fro the Cross Keys junction to the Odd Down Park & Ride should be abandoned.

Respondent Number: 4480 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Mary Bowen

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Houses should not be built in South Stoke / Odd Down as it is just not necessary. The authority should examine increasing the number of houses per hectare on the MOD sites.

I do not want to live on a main road or lose the green areas surrounding my house. I use the areas to walk my dog and have leisure time with my family.

Change to the policy requested:

Build more houses on the MOD sites – can’t understand why this is happening when the MOD sites have enough room for ALL housing needs to be met.

Respondent Number: 4484 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Brooke

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I find the proposed amendments unsound for the following reasons;-

They assume that there are 'very special circumstances' to justify building on Green Belt when there are not.

They assume that there is evidence of 'local and national' interest to justify building on AONB land. In fact the reverse is the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

case.

LOCALLY a large extension of urban housebuilding in this area would damage the internationally important Wandsdyke site.

It would bring a considerable increase in traffic to the Wellsway, the B3110 and Entry Hill. Traffic on these roads is already at a standstill at peak times each day. (The recent bus lane improvements although helpful in no way solved this problem.)

It would create new built-up areas without an identity or centre, leading to urban sprawl rather than community. (Dwellings at either the east or the west end of this site would not be part of Southstoke or of Bath).

In spite of suggestions to the contrary, building on this land means serious damage to country areas to the south by light pollution and by visual impact . It is not the case that a narrow strip of woodland would obviate this.

This land is at the moment a widely used and appreciated recreation area.

NATIONALLY House building in this area would destroy an important part of the surrounds of the World heritage City of Bath, which area is widely used as an amenity and indeed is an integral part of that heritage.

If it is true that Bath must expand in spite of clear decisions in earlier Structure Plans to the contrary, there are perfectly satisfactory ways of finding sites for new building outside the AONB, eg by making proper use of brownfield sites, reconsidering density on the admiralty site at Foxhill. Building to the west of Bath where access to an existing or a new railway station would greatly relieve the severe traffic problems that exist and which are one of the major problems of our city.

To avoid a planning tragedy the present proposals must be abandoned and alternatives found.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4485 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Martland

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The whole of this site falls within the Green Belt which the Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) Council should do everything to preserve, in order to retain Bath’s status as a World Heritage City. New development is discouraged in Green Belt land unless very special circumstances can be shown to exist which outweigh the harm such a development would cause. No such circumstances exist for this site and the harm will be considerable.

One of the most important reasons for maintaining Green Belt land is to prevent the coalescence between settlements. As the Councils own report notes, the space between Bath and South Stoke village is already narrow. This means the amended Draft Core Strategy in respect of the South Stoke plateau is unsound.

The fact that this site is also in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) reinforces this point. Development in an AONB is only permitted if it is in the ‘Local and National Interest’ and there is no evidence to suggest that this is the case for the South Stoke Plateau. Development would affect the rural outlook of this part of Bath and it is this rural outlook that is intended to be preserved by the provision of an AONB. This means this proposed development is unsound as it conflicts with the council’s policy and puts at risk Bath’s status as a World Heritage site.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Another risk to this World Heritage status would be the impact of development on one of the few registered Ancient Monuments in Bath, the Wansdyke. This is one of the few sections of the Wansdyke that is accessible to the public. As BANES own study notes, the Wansdyke immediately to the west has been overwhelmed by the Sulis Meadows development. There is no evidence to suggest the same won't happen again, making this proposal also unsound because of it's impact on the Wansdyke.

One of the major concerns with the proposed development is the proposed access from the B3110 South Stoke Lane junction opposite the Cross Keys pub. An access road with street lighting through the South Stoke Plateau could have an even greater impact on the buffer between Bath and South Stoke village and a huge impact on the rural outlook of this AONB and Green Belt area. It will also create a short cut through to the Park & Ride roundabout on the A367, creating a busy "rat run" through a family housing area including Sulis Meadows. This will mean greater risks to public safety, especially for young children. This means the proposal for this access road is unsound.

Noise and light pollution from the proposed access road and from the housing will result in great harm to a threatened species, the very rare Greater Horseshoe Bat, which uses the South Stoke plateau for foraging.

For all of the above reasons these proposed changes in the Draft Core Strategy to build 300 houses on the South Stoke Plateau are unsound. The development will cause too much harm to make it worthwhile.

Change to the policy requested:

The change I am requesting is that the South Stoke Plateau site should once again be rejected for housing development.

Respondent Number: 4486 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Stroud

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Green Belt Proposed development of 300 houses is all on green belt. A green belts purpose is to prevent coalescence of towns/villages. The green belt between Southstoke village and Bath is already narrow(Arup study)to build on it 300 houses would lead to the mergence of SS and Bath, also no special circumstances have been shown to exist that would outweigh the harm caused by this development. The amended core strategy is therefore unsound on this argument
AONB The entire site from Combe hay lane to Southstoke lane is in Cotswold AONB. Major development is only allowed on these sites if it can be proved it is in local or national interest. No such proofs have been shown therefore the amended core strategy is unsound

The Wansdyke The Wansdyke is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The development at Sulis Meadows has already caused extensive damage to the Wansdyke and further development along it is likely to have an even greater detrimental effect. As sited in the Arup report crossing the Wansdyke again with development will place further strain on the few remaining sections available to the public.. It is surely unsound to consider doing this.

Wildlife A large part of the plateau is a foraging ground for the Greater Horseshoe Bat , building 300 houses with the inevitable increase in traffic and light pollution will have a deleterious effect on a species which is the rarest mammal species in the Uk. The main threats facing them are loss of roost sites and foraging areas. Building 300 houses on a foraging area will only place more strain on their survival.

Inevitably building 300 houses on the Southstoke plateau will lead to the development of this whole area and cause immense harm to the Wansdyke, Southstoke village and its wildlife

World Heritage Site BANES supports Bath as a world heritage site and yet it is proposing to build on green belt sites thereby affecting the largely Green Environment which would inevitably affect Bath's important status and have a knock on effect on it's important tourist industry.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Traffic The proposed access road at the junction of Southstoke lane and B3110 guarantee further development of the whole plateau and cause immense harm to the Wansdyke, Southstoke village and the foraging area of the Greater Horseshoe Bat. I find it hard to understand how a significant buffer will be provided between any new housing and SS village as agreed by BANES council at their meeting on 4/3/13. 300 houses with an average of 2 cars per house will exacerbate an already difficult traffic situation at the B3110/Wellsway junction. This is not a sustainable option and the argument is unsound

Change to the policy requested:

I would like BANES council to remove change SPC 88 from its amended draft core strategy

Respondent Number: 4488 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Ann Green **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I do not feel the proposed development of South Stoke Plateau for housing is justified. The area is part of the Green Belt where no development should take place unless special circumstances apply. Former Mo D land has recently become available and there are also brown field sites available in the Bath area. Development of the Plateau and the proposed access road would mean that South Stoke would be absorbed into Bath, becoming part of the Greater Bath area, something that a Green Belt should prevent.

The Plateau is also within an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Green Belt and AONB are of great importance to Bath as World Heritage City. Any negative impact on the City's setting would be detrimental to Bath's status as a World Heritage City. In addition there is much of archaeological and scientific importance in the Plateau. One of the few remaining parts of the Wansdyke which is registered as a Scheduled Ancient Monument runs through the area in question. Inappropriate development near a monument of this nature will certainly be visually detrimental and would also be likely to cause it actual harm.

The Plateau is also a foraging area for the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat which would be threatened by development.

For all these reasons I feel the plans for development of the South Stoke Plateau are unsound and indeed run counter to other parts of BANES' policy and of the studies it has commissioned, such as the one undertaken by ARUP.

Change to the policy requested:

The policy should not include any development of any part of the South Stoke Plateau.

Respondent Number: 4490 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Antoinette Midgley **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Point e. As mentioned in this point, the landscape of this area is protected by its designation as part of the Cotswold AONB, its Green Belt status and its strategic significance as a rural boundary between the city limits and the historic village of South Stoke. There needs to be agreement with UNESCO for this setting protection to be removed. No special and extraordinary local and national reasons have been given for this protection to be removed. I would argue therefore that building a development of housing on this land is 'unsound'.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Point f. refers to the issue of the heritage assets, the Wansdyke and the South Stoke Conservation area, which should be protected as heritage assets. To destroy the nature and identity of these assets by building on them and around them, is also 'unsound' and would diminish the historic significance of Bath and its immediate historic surroundings.

Point c. and d. It is 'unsound' to consider creating a built up area of housing on a site which is so vulnerable and essential to the well being of the green infrastructure, in terms of local wildlife such as the bats, and also in terms of the green 'lung' of space that divides the ancient village of South Stoke from the borders of Bath city. It has been commented by ARUP that this space is narrow as it stands presently. To fill it up with housing, would change the nature and identity of this village so that it would become effectively an extension of Bath.

In this change (SPC14) it has been stated that 'the identification of land for development has sought to minimise the impact on the environment and the Green Belt and take account of infrastructure requirements'. I regard this to be 'unsound' with reference to the Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau area. In this south west corner of the city, there is already one major housing development underway at Foxhill for approximately 700 homes, a large part of the site being high density housing. This site is only 1500 yards from the proposed South Stoke Plateau site.

There is much concern over the access to the Foxhill site via Bradford Road which is already well used as a by pass to the centre of the city, and is often congested. If the Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau area is developed with up to another 700 houses, this is going to add dramatically to the traffic along these local roads and at the junctions with Midford Road and the A367 Wellsway Road.

As the two sites of Foxhill and Odd Down are in such close proximity to each other, less than one mile apart, it can be argued that the development of two major housing sites does not take into account the drastic changes and burden placed on the environment and infrastructure of this corner of the city.

This burden of excessive development will have a direct negative effect on the 'positive lives' on people living in the local communities, as well as changing the character of the local environment and destroying the rural character of South Stoke.

Change to the policy requested:

I object to the land at Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau being removed from the Green Belt and I argue that there should not be housing developments built on the South Stoke Plateau or on the adjoining Odd Down land.

There should not be building on Green Belt land or on land that is designated AONB in the Odd Down / South Stoke Plateau area, or on any of the land in the South Stoke and Odd Down plateaux that has been deemed to be environmentally important and not to be built on.

Respondent Number: 4493 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Bethany Morris **Respondent Organisation:** University of Edinburgh

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to note my objection to the plans to develop the land adjoining Odd Down. I understand there is a form to complete provided by BANES in order to register complaint but I am sorry to say it is not clear how this works. I am hoping that an email will be enough to register my objection to the proposed development plans.

I strongly disagree with the plans to develop on the land south of the Wansdyke. I do understand that Bath, like most cities in the UK, is in need of new housing developments, but the site of the Wansdyke is of massive archaeological importance, comparable to the more well known Offa's Dyke! The area under threat topographically is a particularly important part of the Wansdyke; this is the last remaining section that can be seen clearly, and that can be surveyed. There is various new research currently underway concerning the Wansdyke and other early medieval dyke systems throughout England, and loosing this archaeological site would mean a huge set back and a loss that we would never be able to recover.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

I am now based in Edinburgh, but I used to live in Wrington in Somerset as a child and so spent many happy visits to Bath to see the Roman remains and the Georgian architecture. But what was always impressed upon me as a child was the importance of Bath during the formative centuries of the early medieval period and the conflicts and settlements of the Anglo-Saxons and Britons. It is because of these visits as a child that I became fascinated by the early medieval period and so chose to study archaeology at university. I am now a second year doctoral student specialising in early medieval archaeology in Britain and the interaction between Britons and Saxons in the fifth to ninth centuries.

Bath does need more housing, but to sacrifice an enormously important archaeological site right next to a city which is only famous because of its fantastic archaeology is downright sacrilegious! This important Anglo-Saxon site needs to be saved and protected.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4494 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Susan Honey **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to object to the proposed changes to the core strategy on the land adjoining Odd Down and South Stoke Bath.

AONB, Green Belt and World Heritage City

I fail to understand how planning can be allowed on the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is also part of the Green Belt that importantly surrounds the World Heritage City of Bath.

The Wansdyke and Wildlife

This is not even taking into consideration the Wansdyke which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument that has already been affected by the development at Sulis Meadows. This area also is a very important for the very rare Greater Horseshoe Bat and other wildlife such as nesting Skylarks.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2013

Building on this land would also have the affect of joining South Stoke with Odd Down which surely is against the councils own report.

Traffic

The building of roundabout and access road on the already congested B3110 will threaten the already compromised Wansdyke and encroach upon South Stoke village

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4495 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Cedric Bufton **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Green belt, Cotswold AONB, South Stoke Conservation Area and Wansdyke Scheduled Monument

The current status of this area recognises multiple unique features and makes further development unsound. Proposed “integrated green space” is a narrow corridor that does not meet the stated requirements for separation or dark habitat. This also has an impact on SAC (Bats). I agree with the Council’s comments at 10.5 of BNES 11 and 10.5.6 specifically: “Therefore, pursuing any development either West of Twerton or Odd Down South Stoke Plateau/Odd Down location would be contrary to PPG2.”

10.5.10 strengthens this decision for AONB sites and 10.5.15 for Wansdyke scheduled monument and 10.5.24 for Special Areas of Conservation.

Transport and Infrastructure

The area is not well supported by public transport and current traffic is heavy at peak times. The addition of an access road opposite the Cross Keys would destroy the green belt, prevent the economic agricultural use of the land and provide a “rat run” for commuters. This, and the additional traffic from the Foxhill development would, in my opinion, make the proposed changes unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The changes proposed to the Core Strategy in SPC 88 should be removed.

Respondent Number: 4496 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Bethan Green**Respondent Organisation:** City Financial Planning**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I have great concerns over the proposals to build homes on the land between Sulis Meadows and South Stoke.

My main concern is that building on the green belt land will ruin the local area. I live on the edge of the Bath so I can be close to the city, yet within walking distance of the countryside around. A set of houses on the open field will completely ruin this. The idea of the green belt land is to stop urban sprawl and protect the countryside around cities. I find it hard to believe that with several brown field areas in Bath that could benefit from development, the option to build on unspoilt land is being considered.

I also have concerns for the village of South Stoke. It will become sucked in to the development and take away the charm of such a lovely old village. If new build houses are built around it, the village will lose its popular identity. Surely with this area being in the Cotswold AONB, any new build property development would go against this principle.

Other areas of concern include increased traffic. The Wellsway struggles to deal with traffic as it is, without adding a considerable amount of properties where the likelihood is that people will travel to the city centre. The traffic in Sulis Meadows will also become congested if this main road becomes the entrance to another estate. It will become a busy road making it unsafe for children to play, and if further speed bumps are put in, more damage will be done to cars that already suffer on these roads.

Change to the policy requested:

request that the proposal to build houses on the Odd Down site is refused.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4497 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Christopher Winpenny**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as the changes were published on 25 February 2013 and voted on by Councillors on 4th March 2013 thus giving inadequate time (4-5 working days) for lobbying and proper briefing of Councillors or Parish Council meetings to take place. The venue and time for this meeting was changed from that originally scheduled resulting in five Councillors being unable to attend. The complexity of the Comment process has effectively excluded many people in our Parish from objecting, particularly the elderly and those without IT skills. In addition Councillors were advised by Council Officers that any delay resulting from the proper democratic processes would put the entire Core Strategy in jeopardy and open the door to uncontrolled opportunistic planning applications. This is an unwarranted interference with the local democratic process which is at the heart of the Government's Localism policy and means that the amended Core Strategy lacks democratic legitimacy.

7b
The Change to the Core Strategy is unsound for the following reasons:

Green belt

The proposed site falls entirely within the Green Belt and thus development can only take place 'in very special circumstances' where the benefits can be demonstrated to outweigh the harm caused. No such case has been made on this site

Also one of the stated purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent coalescence of settlements. In this case the Green Belt between Bath and the South Stoke Conservation Area is already very narrow (BANES recent report by Arrup).

While Local Authorities have the power to amend Green Belt boundaries they must still comply with its principle purposes which in this case is to prevent coalescence.

For these reasons the Strategy is unsound.

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

The site is entirely in the Cotswold AONB where development of this scale is only allowed if there is an over-riding Local or National interest. No such evidence has been proved.

It was only in late 2009 that BANES rejected this site as part of the Core Strategy Spatial Options because 'it is located within the Cotswold AONB'

For this reason therefore the Strategy is unsound

World Heritage Site

This site although just outside the World Heritage Site boundary, is within the 'setting' of the City. This development with access at both ends of the site, roads and street lights would urbanise part of the City's Green Environment which is an important part of Bath's World Heritage designation. To risk damaging Bath's World Heritage Status with the resulting adverse effect on tourism.

The mitigation measures proposed of increased tree planting on the Southern edge will further change the plateau land's Cotswold character. The presence of street lights will spread light pollution further into the countryside (the existing Park& Ride is an example of this).

The Wansdyke

The Wansdyke is a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and therefore enjoys statutory protection against inappropriate development on or near it. Even if development was separated by a buffer zone this proposal would ruin one of the few visible sections of the Western Wansdyke which is accessible to the public. This view is confirmed by BANES (Arrup) own study which stated that the adjacent Sulis Meadows development had damaged the Wansdyke at the western end of the site. Development at the Eastern would be similarly damaging.

Nature Conservation

It is accepted that the plateau site is an important foraging area for the Greater Horseshoe Bat which has EU protected status. It is proposed that unspecified 'mitigation' measures could be implemented. In addition the area now has Sky Larks nesting as well as two species of Owl and a variety of Orchids.

These factors help support the view that the inclusion of this site in the Strategy is unsound.

Highways

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The current proposal is for access to be created from the A367 and from a new roundabout on the B3110 at the Cross Keys pub. This is irrespective of whether the development is at the East or West end of the site (or both). This road will develop into a 'rat run' between the A367 and B3110 which is already the unofficial southern bypass of Bath and the increased traffic generated by this development and from the MoD Foxhill site will be pushed onto the already inadequate local road infrastructure.

Conclusion

When these objections are considered together they make the inclusion of the Odd Down/South Stoke Plateau in the Core Strategy 'Unsound'.

Change to the policy requested:

Any shortfall in housing provision identified in the Core Strategy as a result of removing the Odd Down site from the Strategy should be made up by increasing the density on the existing identified brownfield sites in Bath. If this does not make up the shortfall the NPPF calculated housing total should be reduced.

The justification for this view is set out in (7) and supports the view that Bath has reached its 'Environmental Limit' and further expansion into the AONB would seriously damage the City's World Heritage Status as the only 'Whole City' site in Europe. It also conflicts with many of the Council's own policies in the Core Strategy and elsewhere.

Respondent Number: 4498 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Colin Robinson

Respondent Organisation: Sulis Meadows Neighbourhood Watch

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Following the proposal from the council; the Sulis Meadows Neighbourhood Watch created a survey for the Sulis Meadows community. The survey was created so that the views and concerns of the Sulis Meadows community could be represented and heard in the consultation documentation the council stated that they would collaborate with the local community. The Neighbourhood Watch Group represents the Sulis Meadows Community. Every home in the Sulis meadows community was contacted (375 homes).

The clear message from the Sulis Meadows Community (Q's 1 to 6) for proposals in SPC88 is:

- That 100% of the respondents are opposed to council's proposal to building on AONB/Green Belt.
- That 100% of respondents do not believe the councils own criteria, or the NPPF criteria, for building on AONB has not been satisfied.
- That 90% of respondents believe consultation has been inadequate.
- That 100% of the respondents feel that building extra houses in the area would have a detrimental effect to the existing communities with regards to health and safety, economic, environmental and social factors.
- That 67% were unaware of the potential loss of community assets
- That 100% of respondents are firmly against any connecting or through roads into or through Sulis meadows from any new building developments.

The proposal is considered unsound by the community of Sulis Meadows as it does not meet the councils criteria of NPPF criteria for building on AONB and there are viable alternatives.

Please refer to attached survey results documents for verbatim reasons.

Following the proposal from the council; the Sulis Meadows Neighbourhood Watch created a survey for the Sulis Meadows community. The survey was created so that the views and concerns of the Sulis Meadows community could be represented and heard in the consultation documentation the council stated that they would collaborate with the local community. The Neighbourhood Watch Group represents the Sulis Meadows Community. Every home in the Sulis meadows community was contacted (375 homes) and the results of all the respondents are below.

Survey questions:

1: Do you agree with the council proposal to build 300 houses (approximately the same size as the Sulis Meadows estate) on AONB around ODD Down/South Stoke? (Y/N)

2: Do you think the council has met the criteria for building on AONB (i.e? There is no other alternative) (Y/N?)

3: Do you feel you have had adequate consultation or your concerns listened to: (Y/N?)

4: Do you feel that building extra houses would create some detrimental and/or health and safety issues for the existing communities (Y/N?)

5: Are you aware that the proposal could mean the loss of a) The Odd Down Football club and the facilities available there; b) the Saturday Market; c) Sulis Manor(Y/N)

6) Do you want a connecting road from any new development to existing communities? (Y/N)

7) If the proposal goes ahead what would be your main concerns? And what additional concessions do you think would benefit the current community.

Graph of Results (Questions 1 to 6)

The clear message from the Sulis Meadows Community (Q's 1 to 6) for proposals in SPC88 is:

- That 100% of the respondents are opposed to council's proposal to building on AONB/Green Belt.
- That 100% of respondents do not believe the councils own criteria, or the NPFF criteria, for building on AONB has not been satisfied.
- That 90% of respondents believe consultation has been inadequate.
- That 100% of the respondents feel that building extra houses in the area would have a detrimental effect to the existing communities with regards to health and safety, economic, environmental and social factors.
- That 67% were unaware of the potential loss of community assets
- That 100% of respondents are firmly against any connecting or through roads into or through Sulis meadows from any new building developments.

Question 7 of the survey was an open question for the respondents to express reasons for objections and what would be their main concerns if building was allowed. The following is a summary of the key responses:

The responses are from ordinary people who live happily within a safe and supportive area where the community has worked hard to engender a good and neighbourly quality of life for all residents in the area. The responses are not written in legal speak or are they formatted in the normal council text with cross referencing to every bullet point. The views are simply expressions of concerns at what is seen as the destruction of an invaluable landscape that should be enjoyed by many future generations. Instead it is the perception of the community that there are limited beneficiaries of development in this area; (SPC88) mainly landowners and developers, when there are many viable alternatives (albeit not to the developers and landowners liking). The responses are extrapolated into several main categories.

Green belt/AONB

It is clear that no resident believes that a strong case has been put forward for building on AONB nor that the criteria has been satisfied. The main reasons are that there are viable alternatives such as increasing housing density in areas such as the MOD sites or even existing brown field sites some of which are eyesores.

"Building on green belt land in AONB is criminal when there are perfectly viable alternatives available. By slightly increasing the density on the MOD sites to 35 houses per hectare of land, no extra land would be required"

"Personally I think it is utterly appalling that you could consider covering this beautiful piece of countryside with concrete when there are very simple alternatives to avoid doing so"

"The existing natural beauty would be lost"

"Yet further shrinkage of open fields and countryside"

"The loss of greenfield sites will mean the loss of food production which will never be recovered"

"Personally I think it is utterly appalling that you could consider covering this beautiful piece of countryside with concrete when there are very simple alternatives to avoid doing so"

Quality of life/Health and Safety

“There can be no justification for building on this AONB nor for the huge disruption that it would bring to a now well-established community

“The litter problem would only get worse: (Including dog litter which poses a serious health hazard to children playing”

“Any connecting roads would increase the hazard to children playing in the streets”

“enlarged estate will mean busier access roads and this could be a danger to children and pedestrians if not managed correctly”

“The area will go downhill and loss off green space that is important for the next generation”

“The additional noise, traffic and pollution from this proposed development would be a real blight on the living circumstances and conditions for the many families and others who have chosen to make Sulis Meadows their home. We have been supportive of some developments in the area, including the creation of a new supermarket and the sixth form centre at St Gregory's but this latest proposal is nothing but destructive to what a visitor to our home once called 'one of the most beautiful parts of the world”

Traffic Problems

Traffic jam around on the main road

The increase of traffic would be horrendous and would mean a dangerous increase to the already busy A367

Traffic is already being stretched

“Sulis Meadows should not be joined to the new development via a road, pedestrian access only should be allowed. Sulis Manor Rd is not wide enough to be a 'through road' between the P & ride roundabout & Midford road & would very easily become a rat run for A367 traffic wanting a short cut to access Midford Rd down the hill to join the A36 at Hinton Charterhouse & vice versa. Nor is this road wide enough for a bus route to be implemented safely Sulis Meadows is an established community & should remain separate from any new housing particularly when it comes to access for vehicles”

“No rat run”

Environmental/Wildlife Foraging Area (Protected Species)

“There are protected Horseshoe bats in the area and they can be seen in the gardens at night”

“The skylarks would lose their habitat. At present I can hear the skylarks singing over the fields where they are nesting. To hear the skylarks increases my sense of well-being”

“At the moment there are very few community facilities on this side of Odd Down”

“Important to safeguard the historic Wansdyke earthwork”

Sustainability

The planning proposal is supposed to meet the criteria for sustainability which is economic, social and environmental criteria, but it should not eliminate the sustainability of existing communities. If houses are developed on the Odd Down/South Stoke plateau it will be detrimental in all 3 areas to the existing community.

Environmentally

“loss of AONB, rural setting, hedgrows and trees, wildlife habitat”; “Less safe with more traffic and places for children to play safely”.

Social

“Greater demand on services”.. “ loss of green space”, “Loss of Odd down football club and the facilities”, Loss of Saturday market” “ more people; cars with greater potential for friction”

“People live in Sulis Meadows because it is a quiet, safe and leafy green area in a semi-rural setting”

It is safe because it has only one vehicle access and has leafy boundaries on every border, making it secluded, safe and neighbourly. Building extra houses and integrating with Sulis Meadows will eliminate this and take away the reason for

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

living there.

Economic

“The loss of amenities, community assets and quality of life will make people want to move”

“The greater proportion of affordable houses being built will devalue the houses currently in the area”

Mitigation – should worst case scenario building be approved

Boundaries between any new and existing communities – maintain hedgerows and trees for wild life and to maintain character of existing community, definitely no roads, including bus connections, into Sulis Meadows or across Green Belt. However promoting a healthy lifestyle by including footpaths and cycle tracks could be an improvement.

“The addition of communal allotments would bring the existing community even closer together as well as improving food production”

“Important to incorporate adequate play and green areas for families, dog walking etc”

“if community to be significantly enlarged then it will need better provision: sports grounds/facilities, community meeting spaces etc”

“Better pedestrian routes”

“No loss of amenities/Character (Football Ground, Market, Sulis Manor)”

Summary

The people of Sulis Meadows are sympathetic to the need for appropriate housing for all spheres of the community, old, disabled, young, retired etc.; the emphasis being on appropriate.

However the feeling of this community is that the proposal SPC88 is inappropriate and unsound as it has not been shown that it is necessary to build on such a beautiful landscape; there are other alternatives.

They are also concerned about the impact to quality of life, habitat and the destruction of protected landscapes and historic sites.

Other concerns are practical in that traffic and roads, including bus routes, are perceived as a major problem.

In the event that building development does take place the community has concerns that they will have no say and their requests would be ignored.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove SPC88 change from proposal.

Respondent Number: 4502 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** James & Penny Townsend **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I write to object to the proposed amendments to the draft core strategy, by the inclusion of plans for the building of 300 houses on South Stoke /Odd Down plateau. These proposals go directly against key national planning objectives, and are fundamentally unsound. I set out, below, the reasons. By way of general comment, it should be noted that the Core Strategy Update (pages 6-7 refer) set out “Planning Requirements” which are no more than a list of good intentions (“Protect and enhance.....assess and evaluate....etc.”) which do nothing at all to make a judgement based upon planning criteria, which is surely what is required.

The Wansdyke

The proposals simply doom this section of a very important Scheduled Ancient Monument. B&NES Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2013 document notes that previous development in this area has already caused serious erosion of the monument; the same document notes the likelihood of damage to archeological remains and the “serious concerns” about the visibility of the proposed development and its impact on the setting of the monument.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Green Belt. The planning regime has, to date, successfully prevented the old settlement of South Stoke, a conservation area, from being incorporated into the city's built up area, maintaining the village's identity in a unique way (commented on by Pevsner and others). This would be destroyed: indeed B&NES' own assessment (see above) concedes that it "may prove..difficult" (i.e. impossible) to protect the village. The village's protection is the plateau, currently unlit, maintaining a rural environment from the junction with Southstoke Lane to the village. The amended draft strategy also fails to identify what very special circumstances would justify this substantial development on the green belt. On this ground alone, the draft change is clearly not based upon sound planning principles.

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty & World Heritage Site. I comment on these together. B&NES own policies have repeatedly emphasised the importance of the green belt "buffer zone" and the area around the City to Bath's "setting" as a World Heritage Site.. The 2013 Availability Assessment notes that the proposed development has the potential to have a "high impact on the rural setting of the WHS, newly revealing the urban form to the surrounding rural landscape." A lawful and sound strategy would have to clearly identify the interest (both local and national) justifying departure from the strong presumption against development in the AONB, yet no such justification has been provided. It would also have to justify damaging the WHS status in the context of a City internationally renowned and a major tourist destination. It has simply not done so.

Bat Protection

The Availability Assessment simply notes, "Significant Bat issue to mitigate." The HRA review notes that effects on bats are "likely", in contrast to all the other proposed sites (rated as "unlikely" or "possible"). This adverse effect, even if partially mitigated, does not appear to have been properly considered.

Change to the policy requested:

Removal of change SPC 88

Respondent Number: 4506 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Jill Pizey

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I wish to comment on the above consultation document. I believe it is not legally compliant as it threatens the ecology of land in an Area of Outstanding Beauty

I own some of the land on the south side of Horsecombe Valley. It is within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

My particular concern is that the delicate environmental balance of the Valley would be disturbed by the development proposed in the fields opposite the Cross Keys pub.

The inevitable change in the water drainage to the surrounding area would endanger the natural balance of the land drainage and that of the numerous springs, which are present in Horsecombe Valley. In addition, the resulting inevitable increase of noise and pollution would contribute to worsening the environmental conditions for the rare and precious wild life. The unique ecological environment of this site would be threatened.

1.The fields contain over 200 wild plants, including several rare species of meadow flowers.

2.They are the principal foraging area for the protected Greater Horseshoe Bat as well as numerous other species. BANES commissioned Dr Roger Ransome to conduct a survey of the valley as part of the Combe Down Mines Project. Dr Ransome found that my land at the south-west end of the Valley was the principal foraging area for adult and juvenile bats.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

3. The very rare Green Fritillary Butterfly has recently been identified in the wood on my property by Dr Gerard Cheshire, ecologist.

It would be illogical to spend large amounts of Council resources on one conservation project aimed at protecting rare species and to threaten their habitat by another.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4507 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Captain Victor Windt

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to object to the proposed plans as detailed in change reference SPC88 (i.e the building of 300 houses on the South Stoke Plateau (land adjoining Odd Down) and other related changes) for the following reasons:

The effects of the proposed changes on the Local Communities in this area of Bath

The Council's Vision for Bath and North East Somerset is 'putting people first and communities at the heart of everything it does'. In this south west corner of the city, there are now two new major housing developments being proposed within 1500 yards of each other, one at Foxhill and the other at land adjoining Odd Down (South Stoke Plateau). The Foxhill area has now been purchased and plans for development of high density housing are under way. This is a substantial area which will involve the building of about 700 homes.

There has already been concern voiced over the access to the Foxhill site via Bradford Road/North Road which is already well used as a bye pass to the centre of the City and is often congested.

The second site now being proposed at the South Stoke Plateau (land adjoining Odd Down) is again for high density housing with a new access road to be built opposite to the Cross Keys Pub. It is proposed that a further 300 houses will be built on this land. Once more, traffic will have to use the Midford Road/Bradford Road Junctions, increasing traffic problems.

Although there are separate reports on these two separate sites, there seems to be little evidence in the Council's documents of any analysis into the situation once both the two areas are developed. As they are in such close proximity, less than a mile apart, this would seem to be an overwhelming burden on this part of the city, on its infrastructure and on its local communities.

With the Foxhill, the existing Sullis Meadows and the South Stoke Plateau sites together, I would argue that three areas of substantial high density development all within the same compact one mile area of the City, is too much and it is very likely to destroy the unique local context of this southern plateau.

The proposed changes are, in my opinion, therefore unsound.

The Local Context

Prevent Coalescence: For the people of South Stoke village, the new development on the South Stoke Plateau would destroy the narrow boundary between their community and the city boundary. South Stoke will become an extension of Bath, and so diminishing the historical significance of the extraordinarily beautiful village.

Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty : If the new development was allowed to go ahead in spite of the Green Belt protection and its AONB status, this 'lung' of green space will vanish.

Heritage Sites: South Stoke village and the Wansdyke ancient monument are of equal importance to the heritage of Bath. The proposed changes are, in my opinion, therefore unsound.

City Context

The heritage of Bath is not only about the visual appearance of the city for tourists and visitors who enter the city. It is also about the 'positive lives' of the people who live in it, treasure it and take care of it. Whilst I care passionately about the need for more affordable housing in the city, I feel that this small section of the city has done its bit.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

This heritage is recognised by World Heritage Status for the City and its setting. Destroying even one part of the setting destroys what is been designated as a whole to keep. The Consultation Documents do not explain why this heritage should be destroyed. What are the overriding reasons for the Green Belt around Bath to be breached? The reasons why other sites in BANES are of less value have not been explained.

The proposed changes are, in my opinion, therefore unsound.

Impact on the Environment

In this proposed change to BANES' Draft Core Strategy it has been stated that 'the identification of land for development has sought to minimise the impact on the environment and the Green Belt and take account of infrastructure requirements'.

In the south west corner of Bath, there is already one major (high density) housing development under way at the former MoD site at Foxhill for approximately 700 homes. This site is only 1500 yards from the proposed South Stoke Plateau/land adjoining Odd Down site.

The proposed change is, in my opinion, therefore unsound.

Infrastructure requirements

There is much concern over the access to the Foxhill site via Bradford Road/North Road which as already well used as a by pass to the centre of Bath, and is often congested. If the South Stoke Plateau/land adjoining Odd Down area is developed with up to another 700 houses, this is going to add dramatically to the traffic volume along these local roads and at the junctions with Midford Road and the A367 Wellsway Road (and the junctions of South Stoke Road and Midford Road/Bradford Road).

As the two sites of Foxhill and South Stoke Plateau/land adjoining Odd Down are in such close proximity to each other, less than one mile apart, it can be argued that the development of two major housing sites, next to the recently developed site of Sulis Meadows and the new Sainsbury's site, does not take into account the drastic changes and burden placed on the environment and infrastructure of this part of Bath.

This burden of excessive development will have a direct negative effect on the quality of living in these local communities, as well as changing the character of the local environment and destroying the rural character of the village of South Stoke.

The proposed change is, in my opinion, therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

No further development/building of houses on the South Stoke Plateau/land adjoining Odd Down.

There should be no building on Green Belt land or on land that is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in the South Stoke Plateau/land adjoining Odd Down area.

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC88 (Odd Down) NPPF states "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest." The council is proposing that 12700 houses should be built in the plan period, for Odd Down this represents 2% of the housing proposed, combined with Weston this totals 4%. Overall the level of error of a plan that is 15 years long could not justify the allocation of this site being in the public interest.

The paragraph goes on to say the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; Evidence from the Council shows that there is only a need for 10,000 houses if only the need for jobs is considered in looking at housing number requirement. Further paragraphs say “the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and” This could be met by increasing the density of housing within other brownfield sites, and therefore the allocation should not go ahead.

The proposals don't fit within the final sentence in this paragraph any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated. There are a number of footpaths to

Protection of the Wansdyke should be an important consideration, even though a large stretch is within the council's ownership, a management plan has not been developed, destruct has taken place when the council built Threeways school. These proposals will not enhance the setting of the Wansdyke, with the potential for creating urban development both sides of the Wansdyke.

The village of Southstoke is quite different in character to the surrounding areas, with a lot of the housing built in a different style and from a different time to surround Bath areas to create a co-coalescence of Southstoke with Bath would not be desirable. Currently the village is separated by only 500 meters, to reduce this distance would effectively make Bath and Southstoke one urban entity.

One of the settings of the AONB around Bath is the escarpment at Odd Down, which is viewable for many miles around if building occurs on the plateau there is a distinct possibility that light pollution will be seen from miles fundamentally altering the character of the AONB in this area.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4510
Comment Number: 1
Respondent Name: Nicholas Parry
Agent ID:
Agent Name:

Respondent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I do not believe the change to be sound for the following reasons:

- It will result in the destruction of designated green belt land that is also an area of outstanding natural beauty. Once it has been built on, the green belt can never return. What is driving this pursuit of short term goals at the expense of the long term needs of future generations? It has not been articulated clearly –it must have to pass a very onerous burden of proof for such a major decision to be classified as sound.
- There are many brown field development sites within the Bath area that should be developed before any green belt land is even considered for development. The fact that there is no requirement for brownfield sites to be developed before greenfield ones is quite frankly incredible. A very real risk is that the new housing estimates turn out to be far too high in practice by which time it becomes apparent that there was no need to develop the green belt after all and that the supply of brownfield sites would have been more than adequate.
- The presumption that many thousands of new residents need to live in Bath is itself unsound, particularly if it means that Bath will have to spread out into the surrounding villages, towns and countryside. Bath’s World Heritage status must soon come under threat if this were to proceed.
- Bath’s infrastructure cannot cope with a development in this area. In particular, the roads cannot cope at the moment: Southstoke Road is already treated as a rat run through to Bradford Road leading to many accidents, congestion and pollution. Additional housing will exacerbate this effect.
- Sulis Meadows is not an example of a successful development and is at odds with the surrounding area. The proposed development seeks to magnify Sulis Meadows into a major housing estate that should grace somewhere like Milton Keynes rather than a Georgian City.

Change to the policy requested:

No development on the green belt or areas of outstanding natural beauty.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number:	4511	Comment Number:	1	Respondent Name:	Gareth Herincx	Respondent Organisation:	
Agent ID:		Agent Name:					
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>				Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>			
Change Reference: SPC88				Plan Reference: Policy B3A			
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down							

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

My family are totally against the plan to build homes in the beautiful fields at the end of our road because:

- It is a designated Green Belt
- It's an Area of Outstanding Beauty
- The fields provide a stunning division between the southern boundary of Bath, a World Heritage City, and the beautiful village of South Stoke and the surrounding countryside
- The newly restored Wansdyke way is an ancient important archaeological feature
- The area is recognised by European experts as an important foraging area for the very rare Greater Horseshoe bat which would be disturbed/threatened. The trees and hedgerows are also home/sanctuary to numerous birds including skylarks and birds of prey, plus deer run through the fields and badgers and rabbits are common at night
- The local infrastructure (roads, schools and services) will already be under pressure because of the nearby housing development at MoD Foxhill
- As well as being visually stunning, the fields' pathways are used by residents in Combe Down, Fox Hill, South Stoke and Sulis Meadows for walking, running and dog exercising. They are also enjoyed by other residents of Bath and visitors to our city
- Southstoke Road is a desirable road inhabited by families and some elderly people. It is quiet, though during the morning school run it is already heavily congested, often with tailbacks halfway down the road. The housing development would mean our road would become a main thoroughfare into Bath, resulting in more congestion and pollution
- Safety for children will also become an issue. My son was knocked down on Southstoke Road a couple of years ago by a van who did not see him crossing the road. He got away with bruises and grazes, but it underlined how potentially our dangerous our road is for children, so an increase in traffic is very concerning

Change to the policy requested:

I think the housing development at MoD Foxhill is enough for our area. The other two ex MoD sites at Lansdown and Bathwick will also release huge pockets of land for housing, while brownfield sites should also be used in the west of the city along the Lower Bristol Road. We should preserve our beautiful city – not just the centre, but the stunning countryside on the green belt

Respondent Number:	4512	Comment Number:	1	Respondent Name:	Mr Ian Dale-Staples	Respondent Organisation:	
Agent ID:		Agent Name:					
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>				Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>			
Change Reference: SPC88				Plan Reference: Policy B3A			
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down							

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

Does not support change

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4513 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Rosemary Geake**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I think few people would doubt that it is very important that people should be able to own their own homes. More affordable homes are obviously necessary.

The question of where they should be built is the key to this debate. It is more expensive for the building industry to build on brownfield sites because of the initial clearance that has to be done. However, it is the brownfield and city sites that will end up being more affordable to both present and future buyers, by the very nature of their location.

The more beautiful areas, on greenbelt and AONB sites, which the building companies want to use for "affordable housing" should not be considered for the following reasons:

a) They will soon become unaffordable for those who need them, purely on account of their location, so when these houses are next sold the price will reflect their desirable location (in AONB) and poor people who need housing will be back in the present predicament.

b) Our rural countryside will become urbanized. (eg. rural dim street-lighting will become the aggressively bright lighting of the town). This urbanization will also push the countryside further away, making it less accessible to townspeople.

c) Rural villages like ours at South Stoke will "coalesce", changing their nature from village to town extension - a big change.

d) The laws protecting the creep of cities into the countryside will be set aside, thus negating our legal protections. Until those laws are repealed by parliament, the proposed changes would be illegal.

To allow these measures will diminish us as a society. Gradually, piece by piece, are you proposing to chop away and kill off the "goose that lays the golden egg" that is our green and pleasant land? Is this what we all really want? I think simply making it easier for the building industry, creating an easy "quick fix", is too high a price to pay. It is no less than the destruction of countryside amenities that contribute so much to the wellbeing of society.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4513 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** T. H. Geake**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I submit that the proposed development on land known as "Adjoining Odd Down" is unsound.

The land is in the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that is protected by law against development into built environment unless a special case of national need is made. The Council has made no such case, so its proposal for three hundred houses plus associated infrastructure is unlawful and unsound.

The land is wholly within the Bath Green Belt, the purpose of which is to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of rural villages such as South Stoke into the Bath conurbation. Significant building is only allowed if imperative local need can be demonstrated. No such case has been made, so the proposal is unsound. The expert consultants (Arup Associates)

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

advising Bath And North East Somerset Council have reported that the Green Belt between the Bath conurbation and South Stoke is very narrow, so any development such as the proposed three hundred houses is, in planning terms, unsound and even perverse .

I quote from an official report (BANES Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment E 14 2013) :

".. . the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Wansdyke has historically formed a barrier to development of the World Heritage Site in this area, until the development at Sulis Meadows . This development has caused extensive damage to the Wansdyke due to the pressure of people crossing it inappropriately . Further development along the Wansdyke is likely to have the same effect.

"Development in the southwest comer of this area would have a high impact on the rural setting of the World heritage site, newly revealing the urban form to the surrounding rural landscape ."

The same report is critical of the barrier strip left to protect the Wansdyke when the Sulis Meadows development took place . It has been ineffective to the great detriment of the Monument. On the north side of the Monument there is no protective strip and the extensive damage is easy to see. The proposed development is likely to encourage further degradation and so is unsound .

I can give you many other reasons for the unsoundness of the proposed Strategic Plan, but that would risk this letter being filed in the "Too long" box and ignored .

It is easy to be critical and much harder to be creative. If the three hundred houses on the plateau that are thought to be required by HM Inspector are not to be on the South Stoke plateau (land adjoining Odd Down), where can they go? I will tell you when we have agreed a consultancy fee

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent 4514**Comment** 1**Respondent** Mr Colin Daws**Respondent****Number:****Number:****Name:****Organisation:****Agent ID:****Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

As part of BANES public consultation process I wish to present my views on the above mentioned strategy.

The South Stoke Plateau on which it is proposed to develop housing is within the green belt. It forms a boundary between Bath and South Stoke. It is also one of the last remaining undeveloped land on the Combe Down plateau with original fields with dry stone wall boundaries.

This area should be retained as green belt. There is insufficient evidence to change this status.

The area is in the COTSWOLD AONB, it is not in the local or national interest to allow development in this area and therefore should remain protected.

Development of this area could also affect the World Heritage Status enjoyed by the City of Bath. The surrounding area and setting are a contributory factor in retaining the World Heritage Status.

The Wansdyke

This is an important national and local feature and is a scheduled ancient monument. No further development should take place on or near it. It is a well watched and important part of our heritage which the locals feel an association with. There is not much accessible left.

Bats

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The proposed area for development is very close to the Greater Horseshoe Bat colony in the Combe down Mine project. The area is an important foraging for them. These bats are protected.

Traffic

As there is insufficient local employment to sustain the number of families which may accommodated if the area is developed for housing, an increase in commuter traffic will result. The present Wellsway and Midford Road cannot accommodate any further increase in traffic volume at the junctions and roundabouts.

Possible Access to 2 Tunnels Cycle Route

This is referred to in the consultation documentation.

Access from the development is only possible via the busy Midford Hill to Midford or by crossing Road at very dangerous places. The cycle lane at the Glass House roundabout is inadequate.

It is only a few meters long and terminates when it is most needed. The gradients to the cycle track from the proposed area are not ride-able. Any inclusion in a travel plan for commuting to this area should be discounted.

Please note my objections to your review process.

Amendments to BANES Draft Core Strategy 2013 and Proposed Development on South Stoke Plateau

As part of BANES Public consultation process, I wish to present my views on the above mentioned strategy.

The South Stoke Plateau on which it is proposed to develop and housing is within the Green Belt.

It forms a boundary between Bath and Southstoke . It is also some of the last remaining undeveloped land on the Combe Down Plateau with original fields with dry stone wall boundaries.

This area should be retained as Green Belt; there is insufficient evidence to change this status. The area is in the Costswold AONB. It is not in the local or mentioned interest to allow development in this area and therefore should remain protected. Development of this area could also affect the World Heritage Status enjoyed by the City of Bath. The surrounding area and setting is a contributory factor in retaining the World Heritage Status.

The Wansdyke

This is an important National and local feature and is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. No further development should take place on, or near it.

It is a well walked and important part of our heritage which the locals feels an association with. There is not much accessible left.

BATS

The proposed are for development is very close to the Greater Horseshoe bat colony in the Combe Down Mine project. The area is an important foraging area for them. These bats are protected.

TRAFFIC

As there is insufficient local employment to sustain the number of families which may be accommodated if the area is developed for housing, an increase in commuter traffic will result. The present Wellsway and Midford Road can't accommodate any further increase in traffic volume at the junctions and roundabouts.

POSSIBLE ACCESS TO 2 TUNNELS CYCLE ROUTE

This is referred to in the consultation documentation.

Access from the development is only possible via the busy Midford Hill to Midford or by crossing the Midford Road at very dangerous places. The cycle lane at the Glasshouse roundabout is inadequate. It is only a few metres long and terminated when it is most needed. The gradients to the cycle track from the proposed area are unmovable. Any inclusion in a travel plan for commuting to this area should be discounted.

Please note my objections at your review process.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4518 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr and Mrs. Parsons

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Why is the site referred to as land 'adjoining Odd Down'? It is wholly within the parish of South Stoke and in the green belt surrounding South Stoke. As such it should be referred to as the 'Land adjoining South Stoke'. This green belt land separates the village of South Stoke from the city of Bath and as such prevents the coalescence of village and town- a rural site and an urban one. Is it not BANES' policy to prevent any such coalescence? -so to build on it would conflict with this policy and therefore be unsound.

This green belt land is also an AONB which affords the highest protection to such land from development. It would set a very dangerous precedent to build on it and surely compliant with neither local nor national policy? It contains the very ancient site of the Wansdyke- a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Development on the adjacent land would be very detrimental to this and to cross it with a road even more so and thus an unsound .Policy.

It is a foraging area for the greater horseshoe bat. It is a rare species and to destroy this area for foraging would have very serious consequences to the survival of the species.

Traffic access- to make an entrance to the site opposite the Cross Keys as the principle vehicular entrance to the site would be a disaster. The council mentions the rural character and tranquility of South Stoke Lane. This would be totally destroyed .The B3110 is already very difficult to access from South Stoke during the morning and evening rush hours. Cars pile up behind slow moving traffic coming up the hill out of Midford. This tailback then meets the tailback from the double mini roundabout and creates a log jam. More cars trying to get into this stream of traffic at the Cross Keys would exacerbate the situation. Also many cyclists now use the 83110 to join the cycle path in Midford and no doubt this cycle traffic will greatly increase...in the future. It would be very dangerous for these cyclists if more traffic was added to the B3110 and accidents would ensue.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4520 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Bath's premier industry is tourism and anything which might impair that classification should not be permitted. Destruction of any part of this in the Cotswold AONB and the local Green Belt to the Southern side of Bath and any of the parishes adjacent would not be allowed. I consider therefore that this renders this part of the Core Strategy unsound .

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4520 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr Alexander Neill**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I consider that the proposals so far should emphasise that if any development on the South Stoke/Odd Down plateau can be proven to be needed, that such development should take place at the Western end, close to the existing housing development of Sulis Meadows, the nearby Park and Ride, Public Transport facilities, and the fully developed facilities of Odd Down. Any building should be kept to the Western side of the footpath across the fields and to the south of the Wansdyke housing estate.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4523**Comment Number:** 1**Respondent Name:** Hugh Mackay**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

With reference to the published revised Core Strategy for B&NES, I wish to strongly object to any further development on the fields between South Stoke Lane and Combe Hay Lane on the South Stoke Plateau, Odd Down, Bath, because:

1. This land, as well as being Green Belt, is part of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and should therefore be totally exempt from further development as it would destroy the rural character and conservation area of South Stoke village.
2. If this were to be developed, there would be further severe traffic problems in the area, viz: Firstly, the narrow South Stoke Lane is totally inadequate to cope with additional traffic (even if the exit were to be made at the Mid ford Road junction opposite the Cross Keys), as is Combe Hay Lane on the other side and cause further congestion at the Park & Ride roundabout, where during the rush hour, queues of traffic regularly pile up as far back as Dunkerton 1 Yz miles away. Secondly, we strongly object to any link-up using Sulis Manor Road in the Sulis Meadows estate which is too narrow to become a main road allowing access to the Odd Down Park & Ride. This would become a "rat run" as a convenient diagonal route from the Park & Ride roundabout for anyone from Radstock or Peasedown going to Combe Down/Bath University avoiding the congestion at the Red Lion roundabout. Even with speed humps in place, we have problems with locals in the area speeding in and out of the estate which would become multiplied many times and dangerous to children who tend to play in the roads around the telecom mast. Thirdly, there is currently only one entrance and exit to the whole Sulis Meadows estate- through a narrow chicane by the Combe Down GP Surgery. This is already a bottleneck and on one occasion when this was blocked by emergency vehicles attending a fire, no one was able to get in or out of the estate for half a day. To double the number of houses using only this access would be the height of folly.
3. The proposed area for development is good agricultural land which produces healthy crops each year and the fields would no longer benefit the national need.
4. There are a large number of rare Greater Horseshoe Bats (a protected species) inhabiting the mines under the site who exit from the escarpment to the south of the site each night and forage in the trees and bushes, particularly along South Stoke Lane and around Sulis Manor. If disrupted from this habitat they could suffer harm by any further development in the area.
5. If the density on the other proposed areas of development at the MOD and other brownfield sites in Bath were to be increased from 35 to say 45 residences per hectare, I believe it would not be necessary to develop either here or at Weston.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4524 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cardinal Close Residents

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We wish to object to development at Odd Down SPC88.

SPC14 need to build on greenfield sites.

We object to this as an increase in density on brown field sites would remove the necessity to build on green field sites.

SPC19 the allocation of land at Odd Down would add to urban sprawl on land of outstanding natural beauty.

SPC88 Odd Down planning permission should be refused. A major development in the area designated would not be in the public interest. Increasing density on brown field sites would make this unnecessary. The Plateau has been recognised as a wildlife area for Greater Horseshoe Bats, light and noise pollution would do harm to this threatened species.

The entire site from Combe Haylare to Southstoke is in the Cotswold AONB with a high level of protection against development.

Traffic access the proposed access to the site is in a highly congested area already. The Park and Ride takes half an hour to travel three miles at peak times into Bath. We do not want a RAT RUN through Sulis Mead onto Southstoke lane, not safe for children and residents.

These are sections we object to:

SPC14

SPC19

SPC24

SPC31

SPC47

SPC54

SPC78

SPC87

SPC88

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4524 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cardinal Close Residents

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC88 Odd Down planning permission should be refused. A major development in the area designated would not be in the public interest. Increasing density on brown field sites would make this unnecessary. The Plateau has been recognised as a wildlife area for Greater Horseshoe Bats, light and noise pollution would do harm to this threatened species.

The entire site from Combe Haylare to Southstoke is in the Cotswold AONB with a high level of protection against development.

Traffic access the proposed access to the site is in a highly congested area already. The Park and Ride takes half an hour to travel three miles at peak times into Bath. We do not want a RAT RUN through Sulis Mead onto Southstoke lane, not safe for children and residents.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4525 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs A J Hewitt **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. The whole area is within the Green Belt and would merge South Stoke with more urban settlements.
 2. The site is in the Cotswold AONB, which denotes a protected state against development.
 3. Bath is a world Heritage City, its green environment is vital to the preservation of that status.
 4. Much of the plateau is recognised by experts as an important foraging area for the rare greater Horseshoe Bat; development would disturb and harm the species.
 5. The Wansdyke is an important archaeological feature and registered as an ancient monument, the development would spoil it and also prevent public access to an area important for walkers in the locality.
 6. The development would greatly increase traffic in the area, the new Sainsbury's store has already caused a huge increase in traffic and 300 houses would significantly exacerbate problems.

1. The whole area is within the Green Belt and would merge South Stoke with more urban settlements.
 2. The site is in the Cotswold AONB, which denotes a protected state against development.
 3. Bath is a world Heritage City, its green environment is vital to the preservation of that status.
 4. Much of the plateau is recognised by experts as an important foraging area for the rare greater Horseshoe Bat; development would disturb and harm the species.
 5. The Wansdyke is an important archaeological feature and registered as an ancient monument, the development would spoil it and also prevent public access to an area important for walkers in the locality.
 6. The development would greatly increase traffic in the area, the new Sainsbury's store has already caused a huge increase in traffic and 300 houses would significantly exacerbate problems.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.
 The building of 300 houses and a major access road opposite the Cross Keys pub from the B3110 is an unsound proposal and should be re-considered.

Respondent Number: 4527 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Peter Bennett **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

My comments relate to the Core Strategy 2013 document. The proposal to build houses on Southstoke plateau is unsound for the reasons I express below.

Traffic congestion is severe each morning and afternoon in the area of Bradford Road, Midford Road and Wellsway and this is aggravated by the opening of Three Ways School and the new supermarket by Sainsbury. Even now at peak times Southstoke Road becomes very congested with traffic between Midford Road and Bradford Road and residents cannot get out of their properties because of traffic queues. The proposed development would result in new road infrastructure, this in turn

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

would generate further traffic on the Wellsway 1 B3110 and the route out to Radstock I Peasedown St John I Midsomer Norton. There are no measures that could reduce this impact on this already congested road system.

The proposed development would compromise the already narrow green belt between Bath and South Stoke, effectively joining a distinctive rural community to suburban Bath. Additional affordable housing has already been approved for the MOD Fox Hill site.

The Southstoke plateau area is a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Residents and visitors to Bath regularly come to the Cross Keys pub then walk along the Wansdyke way, across the fields proposed for housing to the Southstoke Millennium seat. If this area is built on this won't happen and- there will be one less reason for tourists to visit Bath. The Southstoke plateau fields comprise a green open space used extensively by local residents from Fox Hill, Combe Down, Southstoke and Sulis Meadows for walking and relaxation. Building on this site will reduce their opportunity to access open space and lead a healthy lifestyle.

The South Stoke plateau appears to be a feeding area for Horseshoe bats and the associated light pollution from the proposed development would have a devastating impact on these legally protected animals.

Change to the policy requested:

Withdrawal of the proposal to build houses/roads on the Southstoke plateau

Respondent Number: 4530 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr T. Johnson

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposal includes an access to the site from the B3110 I Southstoke Lane junction opposite the Cross Keys Pub. As a further amendment has been passed to maintain a significant buffer between the new housing and Southstoke village, an access point at this junction will very harmful to the surrounding community for a number of reasons. I believe it could lead to the 'buffer' land being further developed in the future, it will be environmentally damaging and have a highly adverse visual impact on the immediate area. Most importantly, the proposed change will cause additional traffic to a junction that can be congested and unsafe at peak times.

This proposed amendment is unsound for a number of other reasons. The development of the land may lead to the coalescence of Bath and Southstoke which are already close and therefore susceptible to becoming joined. This is prevented by the land being within the Green Belt but excluding this land from it will cause irreversible damage to the area.

The site is on land in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and therefore is protected from development. The Draft Core Strategy states that the Green Belt and AONB land is very important to the setting of Bath so the proposal conflicts with this.

This Green Belt land contributes to Bath's setting which is an aspect of its World Heritage status. Developing this land by moving the boundary of the Green Belt may put at risk this status and therefore the proposed amendment is not sound.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4531 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Susan Phillips**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I object to taking land from the Green Belt for this development at a time when we need more land for food production.

I object to further destruction of an area of outstanding natural beauty which will result from this development.

I object to the further despoiling of the Wansdyke which will result from the construction of a roundabout and another entrance to the estate at Midford road.

I object to the introduction of at least 300 more vehicles to the estate as a result of the development.

I object to the loss of the open rural character of the area around Southstoke lane and village.

I object to the continued loss of dark skies as a result of more street lighting in the development.

I object to little weight being given to conserve the landscape, skyline and scenic beauty of the area.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4531 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Susan Phillips**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I object to taking land from the Green Belt for this development at a time when we need more land for food production.

I object to further destruction of an area of outstanding natural beauty which will result from this development.

I object to the further despoiling of the Wansdyke which will result from the construction of a roundabout and another entrance to the estate at Midford road.

I object to the introduction of at least 300 more vehicles to the estate as a result of the development.

I object to the loss of the open rural character of the area around Southstoke lane and village.

I object to the continued loss of dark skies as a result of more street lighting in the development.

I object to little weight being given to conserve the landscape, skyline and scenic beauty of the area.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4533 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Pamela Deen**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I wish to object to the proposed changes for the following reasons:

- a) The existing provision for traffic on the Sulis Meadows Estate is already barely adequate to provide for the on-street parking needs and a safe traffic flow, especially on an estate with a lot of children.
- b) The main roads from Radstock into Bath and across from Rush Hill to Combe Down are not designed for the present volume of traffic and are particularly difficult at rush hours. A new development will increase the problems.
- c) Changing the purpose of an approved green belt area makes a mockery of the original approval and is bound to affect the flora and fauna of the region.
- d) The proposed site is a designated area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with ancient monuments and, if built upon, will certainly cease to fulfil the criteria.
- e) I have grave concerns that the infrastructure is stretched to its limits and to add to the demand seems folly.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4534 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Stuart Cochran**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not believe the proposed changes to the Submitted Core Strategy to remove land adjoining Odd Down from Green Belt is justified or consistent with National Policy.

I believe the proposed changes do not demonstrate a consistent approach to assessing the importance of conserving landscape in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The land adjoining Odd Down is protected by both Green Belt and AONB designations, both of which the National Planning Policy Framework states should restrict development.

In particular, the National Policy states that Green Belt serves the purposes of checking urban sprawl, prevent neighbouring towns merging, and preserving the setting of historic towns.

Further, the National Policy states that altering Green Belt boundaries should only happen when they are reviewed for their intended permanence. However, the proposed changes do not indicate that the Council has carried out that review (it is deferred to the Placemaking Plan) and therefore the Council is unable to justify any proposed changes to the Green Belt.

Accepting the proposed changes without knowing what impact the proposed change will have on the very principles of both National Policy (to protect Green Belt and AONB) and on the Policy_defined purpose of Green Belt (to prevent sprawl, merging and damage to setting) is not justified or cannot be consistent with Policy.

Change to the policy requested:

Removing land from Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should not be proposed before it is known how the altered Green Belt boundaries will be consistent with National Policy

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4535 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Diana Cochran**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not believe the proposed changes to the Submitted Core Strategy to remove land adjoining Odd Down from Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is justified or consistent with National Policy.

The land adjoining Odd Down is protected by both Green Belt and AONB designations, both of which the National Planning Policy Framework states should restrict development.

In particular, the National Policy states that Green Belt serves the purposes of controlling urban sprawl, prevent neighbouring towns merging, and preserving the setting of historic towns. As Bath is a World Heritage Site preservation of the green belt surrounding Bath should be considered of paramount importance in keeping this status. Also the proposed building would cause the coalescence of the ancient village of South Stoke with the outskirts of Bath. The proposed amendments therefore contravene these protective designations. The proposed land lies adjacent to the Wansdyke a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument'. This registration should accord it protection against inappropriate development on or near it.

I therefore feel that these amendments to the proposed Core Strategy are unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4536 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sally Wheatcroft**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I would like to strongly object to the proposed building of houses on the Odd Down/Southsoke plateau opposite the Cross Keys pub.

This is clearly Green Belt land and also an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, I walk my dog there all the time and apart from the more usual wildlife I see, deer, slow-worms, shrews and the fields are full of Skylarks, I believe it is also a foraging ground for the rare Greater Horseshoe bat, I presume BANES Council and the planners are happy to destroy the habitat of all of these species?

The footpaths and the ancient Wansdyke path is very much part of the lives of the people who live in the area, we walk the fields every day and meet many other people doing the same, surely there are enough brown field sites in and around Bath, that could be built on, the fields are important to maintaining the health and wellbeing of the residents of Combe Down as well as people travelling to share this rare bit of unspoilt countryside so near to Bath.

The traffic in Combe Down has become heavier since the introduction of Sainsbury's and with the MOD building and whatever they are building opposite Rainbow Wood, there will be a vast increase in the amount of cars for such a small area, doesn't BANES have any concern for the wellbeing of its residents, at the rate of building, in a few years Combe Down will be one great fume belching traffic jam.

There are many unused buildings and building plots in Bath surely it would make sense to maximise the properties already built, before destroying land and wildlife habitats forever and contributing to the ill conceived urban sprawl of Bath.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

No comment

Respondent Number: 4537 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mark Farrant**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not favour the removal of this land from the Green Belt. The development of this land with housing will change its character for ever. It is the field to the west of South Stoke lane which gives the lane its rural feel. Once it is covered with housing it will feel suburban, like South Stoke road, and the city will have pushed south. Now the city ends at the Cross Keys but if the field is developed, the city will extend to the bottom of the hill below the former Packhorse pub to the detriment of many people.

As I cycle to work through the 2 tunnels, I am struck by the fact that the joy of living in this part of Bath is the proximity of city and unspoilt countryside, the variety of sights and experiences and how this variety is available to all, young and old, walkers and cyclists. You don't need a car to get the family from Morland Road to Tucking Mill. And there is a feeling that the BANES council have provided this for us. Which is good and civic and what a council should be doing. So, at the moment, people can walk from Foxhill or Odd Down to this beautiful serene area of birdsong, breathtaking views and great calm and the walk itself is pleasant. Develop that field and that special sense of South Stoke being special and there for everyone as a contrast to their own environment will be gone for ever.

So I do not favour the removal of this land from the green belt.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4538 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ned Garnett & Diana Hopkins**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The case being made for the development of the South Stoke plateau (referred to in the documentation as the land adjoining Odd Down) is unsound. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that development in the Green Belt 'should not be approved except in very special circumstances' and in the AONB only in 'exceptional circumstances'. Neither very special nor exceptional circumstances have been identified. The evidence commissioned by BANES as part of their review does not support the amendments being proposed to the core strategy.

The prime driver behind the development of this site is the convenience of flat land with a willing seller who has undertaken a long running and well-funded campaign to develop on this land. Availability does not equate to suitability. The development of 300 houses in a parish of 186 homes cannot be justified.

The development of houses in this part of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and in the setting of a World Heritage city is not justified.

AONBs are designated by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. The building of 300 houses within this area of the AONB will effectively change the boundary of the AONB. This requires Natural England to put forward a variation order to the Secretary of State, which has not happened.

The National Planning Policy Framework (para 116) states that: Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. No such exceptional circumstances exist and the narrowing of the green belt, the damage that will result to a scheduled ancient monument and the destruction of habitat for protected species are not in the public interest.

Bath is the only World Heritage City in the UK. As the BANES website states 'The landscape of Bath and its surroundings contribute significantly to the special character of the World Heritage Site, and is a key aspect of Bath's Outstanding Universal Value.' Development in the proposed site will encroach in to the surrounding countryside and coalesce with the outlying villages. The green buffer zone around Bath is a key criterion in its status as a World Heritage City and therefore must be protected. Photographs from the South Stoke plateau land are included as a separate attachment.

The development of houses in the green belt goes against the National Planning Policy Framework and would be in an area that has already been defined as being 'particularly narrow'.

Paragraph 79 of the National Policy Planning Framework states that: "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence".

Paragraph 87 states "...inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances."

The proposed development of houses on the South Stoke plateau represents urban sprawl, will significantly reduce the openness and be permanent. There are no very special circumstances to justify it and therefore is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

The independent ARUP report on the green belt around Bath states that: 'The Green Belt in this land parcel protects the individual character, identity and setting of South Stoke and Combe Hay. The remaining Green Belt gap between Bath and South Stoke is particularly narrow'.

The proposed development of the South Stoke plateau will damage a scheduled ancient monument.

The Wansdyke is a scheduled ancient monument that runs along the northern boundary of the proposed site. It is a 5th century territorial boundary that is still a significant landscape feature and is amongst the longest earthworks of its period in England.

As the report from Arup commissioned by the Council points out, the previous development at Sulis Meadows 'has placed considerable pressure on the Wansdyke, and led to serious erosion of the monument.' It goes on to say that 'there are serious concerns that development in this area will lead to similar damage and erosion of the monument. Furthermore, it may prove equally difficult to protect the setting and the rural character of the Southstoke conservation area.'

The proposed development adjoining Odd Down will destroy a habitat that is home to many species including a foraging area of Greater Horseshoe bats and nesting site for Skylarks.

Bats

The area lies within the foraging area for the Greater Horseshoe Bat. The Bath and Bradford on Avon Special Area of Conservation has 15% of the UK population of Greater Horseshoe bats and also populations of Bechstein's Bat. Both species are protected by a wide range of legislation including the Conservation of Habitats and Species Act 2012 and the Wild Mammals Protection Act.

English Nature's paper on the protection of the Greater Horseshoe bat states that: Although the protection of important roosts and hibernation sites is important, the effective conservation of the greater horseshoe bat depends on the management of the farmed landscape around maternity roosts and other sites used by the bats.

The foraging range of Greater Horseshoe bat is typically 4km from the roosting site. The closest roosting site to South Stoke is Combe Down Mines and the entire site proposed for development is within 4km of there.

Skylarks

The plateau land to the east of Sulis Manor is a nesting site for skylarks. From time spent attempting to photograph them in flight the population appears to be greatest in the two fields adjoining the Wansdyke. The plateau land is ideal nesting habitat for skylarks and a habitat not found elsewhere within this area.

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds classifies Skylarks as being 'Red' status. Red is the highest conservation

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

priority, with species needing urgent action. Skylark populations are declining in almost all countries of northern and western Europe. In the UK, the population halved during the 1990s, and is still declining. In the preferred habitat of farmland, skylarks declined by 75% between 1972 and 1996 (reference RSPB website).

Change to the policy requested:

We request that the land adjoining Odd Down is removed from the core strategy as a site for possible housing development and the current levels of protection for this site are adhered to.

Respondent Number: 4540	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mr Lee Engdahl	Respondent Organisation: King Saud University
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

As a member of ISAS I have been informed of a recent desire on the part of the local authorities to build on the grounds of the former site of 'Wansdyke' a development of 300 homes, shops, and a school. This disturbs me greatly. When a postgraduate at Bristol, I often visited the area, and am thus well aware of its medieval significance. It seems passing strange that given the relative lack of medieval evidence remaining in Somerset generally that such a site as this ought be considered for what is, to my mind, a rapacious wedge on to the past for the benefit of a probable few.

Vestiges of the past a worth preserving, no matter how insubstantial they may be, or lacking in spectacle. Notwithstanding the lack of proper housing in modern England, I rather doubt that this spot is the only venue of interest, and would put my voice forth in opposition as a medievalist and former resident of Somerset.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4542	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mrs Rachel Foster	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I wish to object to the land being allocated in the core strategy for Odd Down SPC88 for the following reasons:

Building on this area would have a "detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape..." (NPPF)

- The area is - and has been recognised by experts in Wildlife Conservation as- a habitat and foraging area for very rare and endangered species, including Bats, Owls, Birds, Butterflies... It would be a crime for all that to be wiped out.
- It has been designated an AONB for a special reason, and this would be destroyed if the area were to have more houses built on it, especially if the development were to include the fields South of Sulis Meadows either side of Sulis Manor and indeed including Sulis Manor. The view would be wrecked and the urban sprawl would be right on the edge of the valley which is a designated conservation area. I think it would be foolishness to go that far. It would be damaging the setting for the World Heritage City.

You cannot claim that building on this site would be "in the public interest" (NPPF)

- The whole of South Stoke village would be swallowed up in the urban sprawl. We should be protecting our beautiful villages in this nation and especially around the city of Bath as they add to its charm and contribute to its World Heritage City status.
- The consequent increase of traffic if the site were to be built on would cause increased congestion on the key access

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

points/roundabouts in to the area thus creating more pollution and tail backs. The road would become a 'rat-run' through the area which would have an impact on the safety of the road through the estate.

"...developing elsewhere outside the designated area..." (NPPF)

- Why aren't the near-by Brownfield sites being developed to their full capacity before considering AONB?

Change to the policy requested:

I am not proposing any change as the original council guidelines are sound. Please can they stick to their original plans and not change them.

Respondent Number: 4546 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs June Thomas

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

As we are aware and appreciate, Bath is a World Heritage City, therefore any developments must be dealt with very sensitively. Has any attempt been made by the Local Authority to request Central Government to give special status to World Heritage Sites with a reduction on the demand for development? Tourism would quickly reduce if Bath is to be surrounded by urban sprawl into green belt with its unsurpassed views and unique qualities. Although the needs of local people must be given priority, many of them are employed in jobs associated with tourism which brings wealth and employment into the city.

The proposed building will be on green belt land, which is deemed to be an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I understand that green belt boundaries are in place to prevent urban sprawl, and that planning permission for development should be refused unless exceptional circumstances exist or that to do so would be in the public interest. Neither of these conditions for granting permission apply. Regarding 'the public interest', I would like to invite either a representative from the Local Authority or the Government to sit by my window and watch members of the public, both from this estate and surrounding areas passing by my home on their way to the area proposed for development. It would be noted that there are many of them and are comprised of families, dog walkers and walkers, all on their way to use the area's footpaths and to enjoy the beautiful views and wildlife which exist there.. It certainly would not be in the public's interest to deny so many people that pleasure.

There is also an abundance of wildlife in the area, including the threatened species of the Greater Horseshoe Bat which forage there. I understand that European experts on wildlife deem this area to be important for the bats' survival. Building, noise and lighting would very likely hasten their extinction.

I am also very concerned about future plans for Sulis Manor. It is a pleasant building standing in extensive, attractive grounds..At present The Manor is used as a Language School with residential facilities. The school does not adversely effect the area in any way. The students do not leave the grounds and are quiet and seemingly studious. My concern is that should the Manor and its land be included in any future building plans, many beautiful trees would necessarily be destroyed. I am unaware of any Preservation Orders existing relating to the trees, but there certainly should be, some are not only beautiful but ancient. Again building on this land would be seen for miles across the valley and would be a travesty. I have other objections like increased traffic etc but will now address the issues of, 'what needs changing and why'.

I am of the opinion that the proposed core strategy for the building of new homes on green belt land is wrong and needs to be changed..The Green belt should be preserved. It is there to prevent urban sprawl and to provide pleasant protected areas for the community to enjoy. Once built upon, it is lost forever I would suggest that the following suggestions be considered as a substitute

1. That there should be an increase in the housing density in the brown areas where building is planned, particularly on the ex. M.O.D. sites where existing buildings are due to be demolished. The increase could perhaps be made in building more flats.
2. That infill building take place.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

3. That landlords be encouraged to create flats in suitable buildings and perhaps be given an incentive for doing so.
4. That more student accommodation be built. There are so many houses in Bath, particularly Oldfield Park, which are only occupied during term time. The housing of students out of residential areas would free up many homes for families to occupy. Student accommodation is expensive to build, but this can be helped with the running of Summer Schools paid for by participants, using the student accommodation who clear their rooms for the summer vacation.. This is commonly used in other cities and should be considered here.
5. To investigate properties which have stood unoccupied and deteriorating for perhaps twelve months and which are not on the market for sale. An offer from the Local Authority to take the management of the house over for a temporary period with a percentage of the rent going to the owner might be well received.

I am hoping that my comments will be given serious consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4547 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martin Davis **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

THESE STATEMENTS OF INTENT ARE FLAWED THROUGHOUT.

B3A c. HABITAT CONNECTIVITY AND PROVISION OF WELL INTEGRATED GREEN SPACE WHICH HAS BEEN DESTROYED IS DUBIOUS

B3A d. THE ECOLOGICAL MITIGATION STRATEGY AND MANAGEMENT SCHEME WILL BE HIGHLY UNLIKELY TO SUCCEED FOR REASONS THAT ARE OUTLINED BY THE COUNCIL

B3A e. PROTECT, ENHANCE, MINIMISE OR MITIGATE THE EFFECTS OF DEVELOPMENT ON AONB LAND SANDWICHED BETWEEN A SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT AND SOUTHSTOKE CONSERVATION VILLAGE AND AREA ARE EMPTY WORDS AND STATEMENTS.

THE DAMAGE DONE TO THIS AONB SITE IF DEVELOPEMNT IS ALLOWED TO GO AHEAD WILL HAVE REVERBERATIONS WELL BEYOND THE LOCAL AREA AND ONES WHICH COULD ULTIMATELY HAVE A DIRECT EFFECT ON BATH'S WORLD HEIRTAGUE SITE STATUS

THE CURRENT PROPOSED CHANGE AND PLAN ISHOULD THEREFORE BE SEEN AS - UNSOUND

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4548 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Fiona Gourley **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I attach the Core Strategy Proposed Changes Form Parts 1 & 2. In particular I object to the insertion of clause SPC88, Policy B3A – the proposal to build 300 houses on the South Stoke / Odd Down Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The village has been fighting to preserve this land for over 30 years and I think it is utterly appalling that the Council should make such a proposal which is unsound and goes against B&NES policies.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The multiple references to "land adjacent to Odd Down" should actually refer to the South Stoke/Odd Down AONB as the area is all within South Stoke Parish. This includes references in the following paragraphs: SPC15, SPC24 (page 20, policy DW1, Clause 4), SPC 30 (page 21, diagram 4), SPC54 (page 34, policy B1 (3) a-b), SPC87 (para 2.30 A&B); SPC88 (policy B3A). The most significant is the insertion of SPC88 which refers to building 300 houses on this area.

- This entire limestone plateau area is on the southern edge of the Cotswolds and is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in the Green Belt. It is unspoilt agricultural land, lying within the rural parish of South Stoke. Furthermore it contains the Wansdyke, a unique scheduled ancient monument, and is an important habitat for wildlife, particularly as a foraging area for the very rare Greater Horseshoe Bat. Therefore it should have as high a protection as a national park against development. No case of special national or local interests/circumstances has been made for the development of 300 houses on this area.

- The green buffer zone setting of Bath seen from within the city and from the surrounding area is of extreme importance as a World Heritage Site. The South Stoke/Odd Down AONB is on the southern skyline of Bath, with far reaching views to Salisbury Plain, the Mendips and the Bristol Channel. Any development could be visible from 20 miles away to the south in particular. The university built further along the ridge in the 1960s demonstrates how intrusive building on the skyline can be. Any developments on the South Stoke plateau could threaten Bath's setting as a World Heritage site.

- Furthermore, as this is one of the narrowest sections of Green Belt around Bath (Arup report), it deserves greater protection to prevent coalescence between the city boundary and the village of South Stoke, one of the fundamental purposes of Green Belt. This beautiful, historic village and the surrounding countryside are greatly loved by locals and visitors alike. Building on the South Stoke/Odd Down AONB would ruin this area forever. The core strategy mentions the need for a buffer zone for South Stoke but with no details as to its extent. It would need to encompass all the houses along South Stoke Lane from the Cross Keys junction. The tree belt planted by the landowner some years ago is completely insufficient for this purpose, and indeed it is hard to envisage how such a buffer zone could work as the land is virtually flat.

- The Wansdyke, which runs along the entire northern boundary of the South Stoke/Odd Down AONB, has been this historical boundary between Bath and the countryside for millennia. It should be protected from inappropriate development on or near it. However the Arup study points out that it has already been impinged upon by the development at Sulis Meadows. This proposal will damage it further, particularly if an access road is cut across the Wansdyke from the Cross Keys junction.

- Building 300 houses on the Green Belt in the South Stoke/Odd Down AONB is the thin end of the wedge. The landowner has already turned barns into offices and wants to convert more. Less than 3 years ago he was promoting a plan to build 2,000 dwellings plus industrial and business units on this farmland. So it is not difficult to envisage that he would like to develop more housing or industrial-type units for the farm, particularly if the Cross Keys junction and the narrow lane widened.

- The impact on traffic of developing this area would be felt widely from Odd Down to Claverton, along the B3110 and the A367 from Radstock to Bear Flat. Transport options are limited to buses or cars as the steep hills and narrow roads make the area dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. There could be some three hundred extra cars on the site, with exits limited by the ancient Wansdyke to near the Odd Down park and ride or the Cross Keys on the B3110, adding to already bad congestion in these areas. The village, plateau and land to the south are predominately dark-sky areas but an access road across the plateau with street lights would ruin that forever as well as creating a traffic bottleneck and a rat run.

- For the first time for decades, there is plenty of brown field land available for housing in Bath including Western Riverside and the newly released MoD land. Yet developers will be offered Green Belt land for developments of 60% market rate houses as an incentive to build the 40% affordable houses which B&NES requires. On the South Stoke/Odd Down AONB this could result in 180 market rate houses for 120 affordable houses. Yet this number could be accommodated in sustainable, accessible and affordable units built in higher density developments on Western Riverside, the MoD land or the significant number of industrial and office buildings and former blocks of flats in the centre of Bath which have lain empty for years, earmarked for cheap hotels and supermarkets of which Bath already has an over-supply. It is particularly invidious that the Green Park flats, originally designed as city-centre affordable housing, are lying empty whilst B&NES is planning to allow building on AONB/ Greenbelt. As the provision of more affordable housing is the main driver for development, the threat is that the Green Belt sites will be developed first whilst the brown field sites lie unused and therefore I believe that this change to the Core Strategy is unsound.

- Small developments of housing, particularly starter, low cost and retirement homes are needed in villages around B&NES,

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4549	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: Mandy Wilson-Garner	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC88		Plan Reference: Policy B3A	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

I am writing against the proposed changes outlined in SPC88/87.
 In the NPPF guidance Green Belt requirement is defined as “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open”. I believe word permanent here is rather pertinent to the changes proposed and the allocation at Odd Down is totally against this principle. I believe there are other plans in Bath to expand into the Green Belt e.g. Weston and cannot see how, once the fundamental principle of what Green Belt is, this will prevent further erosion of the countryside in the future. Surely setting such a precedent is not in the interest of any of us, nationally or locally.
 Furthermore, although limited local employment is mentioned, this is not what tends to happen with such developments and infact the main areas of employment will be central Bath, not the outskirts, thus exacerbating the already congested traffic in this area. The road into Bath from Peasedown and along St Martin’s Hospital, past Sainsburys, is often congested and at times can be at a standstill. More traffic on these roads will not only lead to more traffic queues and pollution but also will sooner or later cause an accident or prevent ambulances and other emergency services getting through. Any roads which run through Sulis Meadows would form a rat run. At present children can play in this area in safety but this would no longer be the case.
 I find it hard to believe that in the Odd Down area which has been designated an AONB that limited attention has been given to damage to the Wansdyke, a “Scheduled Ancient Monument” or the environmental effect of the wild life. Odd Down is rich in wildlife and care has been taken to ensure the Sulis Meadows estate has had a limited impact on the surrounding countryside. Bats, including the Greater Horseshoe Bat, are frequently seen in the skies as well as woodpeckers, sparrows and many birds which are getting increasingly rarer.
 SPC14 refers to the need for Greenfield sites which I fundamentally do not agree with. A greater density of housing on brown field sites would mean that the 4% of the overall allocation designated for Odd Down and Weston. The 12700 proposed houses are only an estimate, with a level of error which is 15 years long. There is no justification for building on the Green Belt at all. I believe that evidence shows there is only a need for 10,000 houses. How is building on the Green Belt of either local or national interest? Especially when elsewhere in the document much is made of Bath as a AONB and a World Heritage City.
 Finally, I believe that villages such as South Stoke should be protected. The proposed development in Odd Down would mean absorbing South Stoke to Bath. Protecting small villages from being consumed by urban sprawl is something I believe is important for the future of us all.

Change to the policy requested:
 No comment

Respondent Number: 4551	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Elisabeth Geake	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC88		Plan Reference: Policy B3A	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change: Support:

Please forgive me for emailing rather than submitting your comment form. I am sorry I couldn’t get to grips with the form – it’s quite complex.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

I want to register my opposition to the intention to build 300 homes plus associated facilities near the Wansdyke at Odd Down. We need more homes. But not 300 homes on this site.

Wansdyke is a hugely important Anglo-Saxon site. It fills a gap in the heritage offering of the Bath World Heritage Site and should be celebrated as part of the rich story of Bath. Doesn't it deserve to be part of the WHS?

Housing this close to it would inevitably result in damage – after all, look at what's happened at Sulis Meadows. Not to mention that it's AONB and Green Belt and part of it is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (to the best of my understanding). Interest in the past in the UK is at the highest levels I can remember – and Bath, which has made its name (and living) from history and archaeology for over 100 years, is about to drop a housing development on it? It doesn't add up.

There's also the context to take into account. This eastern end of the earthwork is the last bit to be clear. Until we have some decent research completed, we need to hang on to the remains of this end of the Wansdyke and the landscape it sits within. I heard someone remark that we don't even know the questions to ask about this bit of the Wansdyke, let alone have the answers.

I'm a regular visitor to Bath, seeing friends and family, and I bring international visitors from time to time. I want to be able to show off to them about how serious Bath is about its history – not just the Romans and Georgians (after all there are other bathing complexes, temples and glorious crescents in the world – but not so many Anglo-Saxon earthworks) but also about the rest of the story, that we are still discovering and telling.

Is there something fishy going on? Why have you made it so difficult for ordinary people to respond? Why don't the usual rules on AONB, Green Belt and Scheduled Ancient Monument apply?

Without really convincing answers, I am totally opposed. Please register my opposition – and please withdraw these awful plans.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4552 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

There can be no justification for building on this AONB nor for the huge disruption that it would bring to a now well-established community. The additional noise, traffic and pollution from this proposed development would be a real blight on the living circumstances and conditions for the many families and others who have chosen to make Sulis Meadows their home. We have been supportive of some developments in the area, including the creation of a new supermarket and the sixth form centre at St Gregory's but this latest proposal is nothing but destructive to what a visitor to our home once called 'one of the most beautiful parts of the world - I would rather be here than anywhere' - having just taken a walk down to the South Stoke viewpoint. We were promised when the previous government went out of power that this would no longer be proposed but again it appears that our national and local politicians are letting us down. Only our own local councillors seem to have the courage to stand up for our community. There are so many other options - derelict sites along the Lower Bristol Road and close to Green Park for example - that could be redeveloped to transform eyesores rather than destroying such wonderful countryside.

SPC6 – the choice of a site on AONB land does not have a place in line with guidance. The extent of brownfield and other derelict sites that can be developed in the city means that the number of houses required can be achieved without building on AONB Greenfield sites. The damage to the natural habitats of the rare bat population and the Wansdyke heritage site would also be unforgivable. The distinct characteristics of South Stoke should be maintained and allowing 'urban sprawl' would only permit these a joining up of Bath and South Stoke.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

SPC14 – as stated above, better use of brownfield areas would negate the need to use Greenfield.

SPC19 – again, the Greenfield development would bring significant urban sprawl and at no real benefit to employment opportunities in the area. This holds for SPC24,31,47,54,78 and 87.

SPC88 – this can not be considered to be ‘in the public interest’ – the benefits are so small to the bigger picture and bring no benefit to anyone – only detrimental effects to the stunning natural environment that exists.

There is so much scope for other development in other places that the apparent need for these houses could be removed completely. This cannot be sensibly deemed to be in the local or national public interest. Indeed the traffic access required would only bring further damage to existing communities and the surrounding natural area. Children’s and families’ safety will be seriously compromised by a number of the proposed access routes, including those close to playgrounds and walkways.

Change to the policy requested:

Removing any plans to build on Greenfield areas and reference to any such proposals being acceptable within the protection of such areas and the misguided assumption that this would be deemed in any way to be in the national or local public interest.

Respondent Number: 4553 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Yvonne Aburrow **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

It has come to my attention that Bath and North-East Somerset Council want to build 300 houses, a road, school and shops over the Wansdyke and its adjoining field to the south.

As a former resident of Bath, and an enthusiast for archaeology, I object in the strongest possible terms to this proposed development.

With recent research by Andrew Reynolds and Alex Langlands (2006 article, in People and Space in the Middle Ages) suggesting a re-dating of the dyke to the 8th century, contemporary with Offa's Dyke and crucial to the development of Wessex, the dyke is more important and interesting now than ever.

It's not only bordering the World Heritage Site of Bath, but is also a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in the Green Belt and adjacent to a Conservation Area. The proposed changes make a bit of a mockery of all of these protective designations, and also lower my confidence in Bath and North-East Somerset to protect the archaeology and architecture of Bath itself.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4554 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Lyle Browning **Respondent Organisation:** Browning & Associates, Ltd

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I am hearing some disquieting news about the potential for damage to the Wansdyke by adjacent and ultimately encroaching building construction. My ancestors were from the general area and I have visited the area on more than one occasion. My work is dually in archaeology and historic tourism. There is absolutely nothing worse than ruining what's left

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

of the original setting, which now appears to go as far back as the 8th century, by having a plethora of modern buildings in the viewshed. Planners who approved this concept have no right to be called planners. I do not deem facilitators of ruination as planners. Anyone with a grain of sense would realize that the long-term benefits of tourism far outweigh the short-term "needs" if they can be called that which I doubt, of putting modern construction adjacent to it. For the blissfully ignorant, it will become a playground and further degrade an unique resource.

One would hope for better from the very people responsible for the PROTECTION of this resource. Surely I must be misinformed if your organization is positing such a travesty, surely? If not, then were it in my power, your resignations would be on my table by the close of work yesterday. Protectors you are not, despoilers you are, if this is allowed to proceed.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4555 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Lilla Kopár **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The news of urgent threat to the Wansdyke have reached the United States. As an American scholar of the early medieval culture of Britain and as a tourist to Bath (with family and kids), I would like to register my concern about the potential harm to a significant cultural object of your part of Britain. The Wansdyke is not only an added tourist attraction of Bath and Somerset but also an invaluable artifact of the early history of the former kingdom of Wessex. It is immensely important that it remains for us to study and for our children to admire.

Please make every effort to save this treasure in your care.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4557 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martin Dean **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to object to the proposed changes for the following reasons:
 Further development of the housing estate at or adjoining Sulis Meadows will create increased traffic and a hazard for the existing road users, as well as the potential for actual physical harm the increased stress on parents and the inhibition on children unable to play together safely will have long term social (and therefore economic) consequences.
 The proposal undermines confidence in the governing bodies green belt commitments, an assurance that led people to believe they could buy the existing property secure in the knowledge that they were complying with a respect for nature and local history. To alter earlier commitments is to undermine confidence in society's trustworthiness and will not only have an adverse impact on the current welfare of the community but will further alienate the children and young people, who after all are the future and who need an honorable role model on which to develop their lives.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4558 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Shirley **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I object to these changes on the basis of their being unsound for a number of reasons. Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This proposed development would be in the Cotswold AONB which is, I understand, protected by statute and such major development in this area should only be allowed in cases of local and national interest. I do not see any substantive arguments that such interest exists in the changes to the Draft Core Strategy. Green Belt. The main purpose of Green Belt areas is to prevent coalescence between settlements and B&NES have publicly stated that their plans are intended to prevent Southstoke being effectively joined to the City of Bath. However, the proposed Odd Down development will do just this and the recent Arup report has stated that already this green belt area separating the two is very narrow. I understand that development in the Green Belt is only permissible if very special circumstances are shown to exist, and the proposed changes document does not identify any such circumstances. The Wansdyke. This scheduled ancient monument runs along the edge of the proposed development area and this is the best preserved part of this west end of the Wansdyke. The proposed development will inevitably harm this, and reduce public access to this important monument.

Change to the policy requested:

As I am objecting completely to the proposal to develop this area for housing, I do not intend to suggest alternative wording, other than the deletion to references to the Odd Down development. I appreciate the need to respond to criticisms of insufficient housing allowance in the original core strategy, but consider that B&NES should not resort to using Green Belt or AONB land for this, and I consider that they have not provided any substantive arguments for so doing .

Respondent Number: 4561 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Juliet Coles **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I am writing regarding the amendments to the B&NES draft core strategy, proposed change reference number SPC88 (the land known as the South Stoke Plateau or 'Land adjoining Odd Down').

The entire site from South Stoke lane to Combe Hay Lane is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It has always been my understanding that development on an AONB is only permitted where it is of local and national interest. I do not believe that any evidence has been put forward to prove that developing on this protected land is of local and national interest.

The whole site is also within the Green Belt. As I understand it, development on the Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Once again, there has been no case put forward which outline these exceptional circumstances.

While I appreciate that a need for more housing has been identified, I cannot believe that there are no other areas within BANES suitable for 300 houses that are not AONB or Green Belt. In a recent council report, the council stated that the Green Belt between Bath and South Stoke is already very narrow.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

I understand that the MOD site at Foxhill in Combe Down is being developed, and that originally it was going to encompass enough houses to leave the South Stoke Plateau untouched. I would think it a priority to develop a brown field site to it's full capacity over developing on AONB and Green Belt land. I would also think that this negates any 'exceptional' circumstances, or being of local or national interest.

On these grounds alone, it must question the soundness of the BANES core strategy.

Should the plan be allowed to go ahead, the proposed access road from the B3110 at the South Stoke junction (opposite the Cross Keys pub) together with the pavements, roads and street lighting, will cause a significant impact to the village of South Stoke both in the short term, and in encouraging future development across all of the plateau in the future. In view of the council's own requirements of a significant 'buffer' between any developments and the village, this adds weight to the unsoundness of the core strategy.

Bath is proud to be known as a World Heritage City. Developing over the city's green belt, and over the Wansdyke (which is registered as a Scheduled Ancient Monument) may have an adverse effect on Bath's status. A study conducted by BANES found that part of the Wansdyke has already been beleaguered by the Sulis Meadows development – it suggests an unsound strategy to overwhelm the Wansdyke even more. Considering the Wansdyke's status it is surely protected against development. Would BANES consider building over the Roman Baths?

Finally, the impact on wildlife cannot be ignored. Not only has the plateau been recognised as one of the only breeding grounds in the area for Skylarks, it has also been identified as a vital foraging area for the Greater Horseshoe Bat. Noise and light pollution will cause untold damage to this rare and threatened species. People applying for planning permission when making changes to single dwellings are made to redesign projects or are even turned down if there is a perceived threat to these bats. How does a development of 300 houses counter these planning issues?

I am writing this letter not only as a resident of South Stoke, but also as a resident of Bath. I have lived at various addresses in Bath all my life and one of the joys of the city are the beautiful and protected breathing spaces of countryside that are within easy reach for everybody to enjoy. Once this land has been developed, Bath and it's residents can never get it back.

To summarise, I am asking you to look again at the soundness of the BANES Core Strategy in light of all the points that I make in this letter.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4563	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Prof Catherine Cubitt	Respondent Organisation: University of York
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	
Change Reference: SPC88		Plan Reference: Policy B3A	
Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down			

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I write to protest at the proposed wanton destruction of a unique heritage site in Somerset, the section of Wansdyke which is under threat of being developed to make way for a substantial settlement of houses, a school and shops. I am a professor of early medieval history and an expert on Anglo-Saxon England.

Wansdyke is a very important national monument and is not only part of the local historic landscape but a very significant piece of English heritage.

Destroying part of this ancient defensive monument irreparably damages a unique landscape of the greatest of interest historically which makes a vital contribution to our understanding of the development of England from Roman times to the establishment of Anglo-Saxon power. Archaeological and historical studies are increasingly able to reconstruct the operation of power in the locality from topographical and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

landscape evidence. The new scholarly work at Stonehenge, the Stonehenge Riverside project, has demonstrated to the nation the significance of a very extensive ritual landscape which is an integral part of the Henge itself. New work at Avebury, exploring its role in the wider defensive landscape, has transformed our understanding of 10-11th c government and military defence. Wansdyke has been the subject of considerable recent scholarly attention and it is currently being re-evaluated. Every part of this landscape is significant and the new buildings will destroy its integrity, hamper our understanding of its function and purpose, and destroy forever the pleasure and excitement for local residents of this Anglo-Saxon monument.

Wansdyke is a major piece of national and local history, and is vital to our understanding of the city of Bath itself and its changing role in the transition from Roman to Anglo-Saxon.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC6 – I object to the site at Odd Down being developed for the following reasons:

1. BANES allocation does not comply with NPPF guidance on allocation of land in AONB.
2. Urban sprawl should not be on green belt land.
3. Any employment is too far away.
4. Increased housing density on brownfield sites would negate the need for using green belt land.

SPC14 – by increasing the density of housing in brownfield sites no extra land would be required.

SP15 – economic growth will take place along western corridor which has no good transport routes from Odd Down.

Change to the policy requested:

The brownfield site which the now redundant Gas meter sits on could become a prime site for development – why isn't this included? Why build on green belt in an AONB when there are already sites available for development within the City and ones that have much better access to jobs/City Centre etc.

SPC19 – the green belt policy is there fundamentally to prevent urban sprawl. The site allocated will present urban sprawl and expand the City into the countryside and create urban sprawl.

SPC24, SPC31, SPC47, SPC54, SPC78, SPC87, see above.

SPC88 NPPF states "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest" So the Council proposes to build 12700 homes in the planned period, which means Odd Down represents 2% of the proposed housing and Weston site = 4%. Overall, the level of error of a plan that spans 15 years can't justify the allocation of this site to be in the public interest. The Council shares that this is only a requirement for 10,000 homes if only the need for jobs is considered.

The proposals do not comply with the final sentence "any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated". A large area of the Plateau has been recognised by the European Experts in Wildlife Conservation as an area which supports the very rare Greater Horseshoe Bat which lives along the tree line. The proposed development will cause harm to this endangered species through noise and light pollution and by destroying the natural habitat.

The Wansdyke is an ancient monument and should be protected as such.

The whole of the proposed site from Combe Hay Lane across to Sunstoke here is in the Costwold ANOB, this means the area has the highest level of protection against development. This site will be viewed from many miles and along with light pollution will destroy the area and its characteristics.

Major development in ANOB is only permitted if it is in "local and national interest". No proof has been provided in this proposal.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Traffic/Vehicle Access

Access is very limited to only 2 parts, both narrow roads to the East Sunstoke Road and the West Combe Hay Lane. The Combe Hay Lane junction leads onto the A367 which is already gridlocked at peak times currently, plus there will be additional traffic using this junction once the new 6th form opens at St Gregory's School in September 2013. Any connecting roads through Sulis Meadows will become "rat runs" for drivers trying to avoid the congestion.

Objections would also include the following:

SPC46, SPC85, SPC150, SPC171, SPC183 SPC184 and to the omission of planning policies NE1 and NE2 from the list of "Saved Policies" from the 2007 local plan.

Respondent Number: 4565 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Bernard and Rosemary Roe **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We strongly object to any further development on the fields between South Stoke Lane and Combe Hay Lane on the South Stoke Plateau, Odd Down, Bath because:

1. The land is greenbelt and part of Cotswold area of outstanding national beauty (AONB) so should be totally exempt from further development as it would destroy the rural character and conservation area of South Stoke Village. Also, this is the World Heritage City of Bath character and conservation area of South Stoke Village.
2. The Wansdyke is a very ancient important archaeological feature and is registered as a 'scheduled ancient monument' and must be protected.
3. There would be severe traffic problems in the area – a) Southstoke Lane and Combe Hay Lane are totally inadequate to cope with additional traffic. B) we strongly object to any link up using Sulis Manor Road on the Sulis Meadows estate as if it is too narrow to become a main road and is dangerous with many cars parking on the road and many children playing all round the area, and a tight road would create a rat run both ways and cause major problems to residents and safety would be impacted. Many children can play fairly safely now but that would change. There is one entrance exit – very narrow, to whole of Sulis Meadows estate by the Combe Down GP Surgery.
4. These fields are good agricultural land which produces healthy crops each year to benefit the national need.
5. This is a bat forging area, very important for the very rare Greater Horseshoe bat. The disturbance by noise and light pollution created by the proposed development will cause real harm to this threatened species.

Change to the policy requested:

Do not build on site SPC88.

This is a protected area, the proposed amendments conflict with BANES own policy and so are "unsound".

Respondent Number: 4566 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Simon Le Blond **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Whilst I understand the need to build new dwellings to support Bath's economic growth and general population increase, I whole heartedly reject the proposed plans on site SPC88 for a number of reasons:

1. The proposed access road will lead to an increase in traffic, especially during construction which will disturb the peaceful

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

nature of this suburb (Sulis Manor Estate).

2. The outstanding natural beauty of the landscape will be ruined.
3. House prices will be adversely affected (on Sulis Manor Estate).
4. Will ruin a popular location for dog walkers and local recreation.

Change to the policy requested:

Abandon all plans to build on site SPC88.

Respondent Number: 4568 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr & Mrs A J Ashworth

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We are writing in opposition to the development of the Odd Down Plateau as a sit for 300 new houses. For the various reasons which follow, we consider this strategy to be clearly unsound.

1. The setting of Bath is vitally important to its position as a World Heritage City, so surely it is nonsensical to apply the general government recommended format to access this unique city's housing needs.
2. The three sites released by the Ministry of Defence, plus the Riverside development have greatly increased the number of houses that can be provided within the City. Placing 300 new homes on the green belt of the Southstoke Plateau not only affects the setting of Bath, it will remove the rural buffer for S. Stoke.
3. Furthermore, it will threaten the preservation of the Wansdyke, which has already been blighted by the close proximity of the previous building of Sulis Meadows.
4. We live on the edge of the South Stoke Plateau, bordering the Wansdyke, and are appalled by the prospect of a possible entry to housing on the Plateau involving a roundabout opposite the Cross keys Inn and a road into an extension of Sulis Meadows. This would lead inevitably to further development and the possibility of a rat run from B3110 to the A367.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4568 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We are writing in opposition to the development of the Odd Down Plateau as a sit for 300 new houses. For the various reasons which follow, we consider this strategy to be clearly unsound.

1. The setting of Bath is vitally important to its position as a World Heritage City, so surely it is nonsensical to apply the general government recommended format to access this unique city's housing needs.
2. The three sites released by the Ministry of Defence, plus the Riverside development have greatly increased the number of houses that can be provided within the City. Placing 300 new homes on the green belt of the Southstoke Plateau not only affects the setting of Bath, it will remove the rural buffer for S. Stoke.
3. Furthermore, it will threaten the preservation of the Wansdyke, which has already been blighted by the close proximity of the previous building of Sulis Meadows.
4. We live on the edge of the South Stoke Plateau, bordering the Wansdyke, and are appalled by the prospect of a possible entry to housing on the Plateau involving a roundabout opposite the Cross keys Inn and a road into an extension of Sulis Meadows. This would lead inevitably to further development and the possibility of a rat run from B3110 to the A367.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4569 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Jennifer Whaley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposed development will cause traffic problems around this estate and Odd Down and will be detrimental to the safety of everyone, especially children.

- It will ruin area, as at present, it is a place of natural beauty and needs to be preserved for future generations.
- Disturbance by noise and light pollution created by proposed development will cause harm to precious wildlife and possibly humans.
- Could the space not be used to grow food – crops that would help feed the population.
- People use this area for walks, relaxation, peace, fresh air – which is important for ones' health.

Change to the policy requested:

Please do not on this site, as surely, it is a protected area.

Respondent Number: 4571 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Susan Jones

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. A proposed development in this area contravenes the Council's own policies to maintain the Greenbelt around Bath, preserve historical sites in a World Heritage City and reserve areas of outstanding beauty.
2. The traffic/access route proposed is of particular concern given its proximity to the already dangerous junction of Midford Rd and Southstoke Rod.

Change to the policy requested:

Requesting that the amendment "to request that the Cabinet aims to maintain the rural buffer... "Is given precedence over the proposal to develop 300 houses on the Green Belt in an AONB.

Respondent Number: 4572 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Alison White

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I consider the change proposed is unsound for the following reasons:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1. The entire area of the proposed site is within the Green Belt which should not be built on.
2. The entire site is in the Cotswold AONB – this has a high level of protection and should not be developed.
3. The proposed development would damage the setting of the City of Bath as a World Heritage City.
4. The Wansdyke should be protected against inappropriate development which would damage/ruin its setting.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4573 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Monica Mann **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

This is Green Belt land. It is also an area of outstanding natural beauty. There is an ancient monument at its perimeter. It is a corridor of countryside between the World Heritage City of Bath and part of the sky live. It is a natural and essential break between town and country. It is home to a network of plants and wildlife including Horseshoe bats and Skylarks. There is the “compromise” development Sulis Meadows which is reason enough to STOP further development of this site. The suburban spread of Bath must STOP somewhere and the question of building in this part of the country is wrong. Green Belt land/AOAB land should be protected in perpetuity. We are guardians of our planet. We do not own it. Some are privileged to have the responsibility. Availability to purchase does not make this right.

Change to the policy requested:

1. There should be NO DEVELOPMENT OF THIS LAND. 300 dwellings doubles the existing number of dwellings in the Parish.
2. Sulis Meadows is an eyesore – the best practise is to stop the development.
3. The impact on the Plateau of paths and roads and necessary infrastructure/traffic will be intense.
4. Habitats for wildlife and plant species will be destroyed forever a load across the Plateau will be the end of the Green Belt /AOAB.
5. Enhance the already, perfect landscape try leaving alone and not developing
6. Do not tamper with any of this area, it is fragile and must not be touched.
7. This is just not possible.
8. The group value – leave well alone.
9. Enhanced public transport at affordable fares is a MUST
10. The area will be swamped and traffic.
11. Development should not happen.
12. More schools, more people more pressure on a squeezed corner.
13. Already in place
14. Fullers earth works – will be another “Combe Down?” Stop this plan

Respondent Number: 4574 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Robert James **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Sir, I object to the following changes, all in respect of the proposal to use Green Belt/AONB land at Odd Down to build 300 homes (SPC88).

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

The changes listed above should be removed from the Core Strategy Document on the grounds set out on the attached 2 sheets.

Respondent Number: 4575 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Max Cox**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88**Plan Reference:** Policy B3A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Objection

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4576 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Joyce McCaughey**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88**Plan Reference:** Policy B3A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Do not support change SPC88

Have you considered a new school, doctors surgery ect.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4577 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Anne Salter**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88**Plan Reference:** Policy B3A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Objection

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4579 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Alicia Townsend**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Objection

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent**

4580

Comment

1

Respondent

Mrs Violet Caldwell-Smith

Respondent**Number:****Number:****Name:****Organisation:****Agent ID:****Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Objection

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent**

4582

Comment

1

Respondent

Ann Stewart

Respondent**Number:****Number:****Name:****Organisation:****Agent ID:****Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We would like to register our objections in the strongest possible terms to the inclusion of what is called 'land at Odd Down' in the amended Core Strategy. My reasons are set out below:

1. This land is in the AONB, therefore prior to any major development taking place over-riding local and national reasons have to exist. BANES has made no case in this respect in the amended Core Strategy, which is therefore unsound.
2. This land is also in the Green Belt which rings the World Heritage city of Bath. The NPPF offers protection to such areas. There is a limit to the amount of damage to Bath's Green Belt- it runs the risk of losing its World Heritage status.
3. This land forms part of the Setting of the World Heritage site, and should not be despoiled with hard landscape. Development of this type and scale puts this designation at risk.
4. This so called 'land at Odd Down' is almost totally within the parish of South Stoke- a parish comprising some 183 homes. Part of this parish, which is close to the land in question, is a Conservation Area. To inflict a 300 home development on this rural area would completely destroy its character. It is against government policy to inflict such a huge percentage of homes in one rural parish.
5. The 'land at Odd Down' is recognised as a foraging area for Horseshoe Bats, a European protected species. It would be against European law to destroy their habitat.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

6. How can building a road across The Wansdyke be justified? As a Scheduled Ancient Monument, it should be protected rather than sacrificed for the motor car. It has been severely compromised recently since Sulis Meadows Estate was built, and people crossing it where there is no Right of Way have eroded the surface.

7. Light pollution. The prominent position of this area on the highest area of the Cotswold escarpment means that street lights will be visible from miles away. This is against the government's Dark Skies policy.

With all these levels of protection, this land should not be built on. For all the reasons above, its inclusion in the amended Core Strategy makes the Core Strategy unsound. 'Land at Odd Down' should be removed from the amended Core Strategy.

There are alternatives- housing density on brownfield sites could be increased slightly; empty upper floors of buildings in the City should be brought into use; and more university student accommodation could be built on site, releasing homes for rental.

Please reject this application

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4583 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Beryl Murray

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I was always under the impression that "Green Belt" was safe from development and that it separated, in this case, the village of South Stoke from the City of Bath by a green belt.

"The World Heritage State of the City of Bath" would surely run the risk of losing this title if the "green field sites" were built up on the "green buffer zone"?

To build a main road across the Wansdyke to come out opposite the "Cross Keys" Pub is ridiculous – the A36 from Warminster is always VERY busy in both directions with private cars, vans, large lorries, buses and coaches, to add more vehicles to join at Cross Keys Pub could be disastrous, surely it would be possible to build a road at the western end of the Salis site where it would have access near the park and ride car park and round-a-bout?

The entire land from Combe Hay Lane to South Stoke Lane is in the Cotswold 70NB and is therefore protected from development to provide the setting for the City of Bath as a "World Heritage City". – To build on this area would risk damaging Bath's important status as a "World Heritage City" and might lose its popularity visiting the City and spending money!

The small part of the Wansdyke remaining is very important to protect from any harm, and is registered as a "Scheduled Ancient Monument" of the Western Wansdyke, accessible to the Public

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4584 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs J. A. Summers

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I write to protest strongly at the Council's proposed changes to the Draft Core Strategy and question the soundness of its plan.

As I understand it the Council has previously stated that it would not undermine Bath's World Heritage status by building on its 'green buffer zone' as this would be disastrous for Bath's tourist industry.

The entire site from South Stoke Lane to Combe Hay Lane is within the Cotswold AONB and within the Green Belt where the Council has previously stated that development would not take place unless very special circumstances could be demonstrated. No such 'special circumstances' have been defined or proved.

The inclusion of a major access road, complete with street lighting and pavements on to the already busy minor road B3110 seems non-sensical. It would exacerbate an already existing difficult traffic problem and would cause immense harm to the village of South Stoke and to the Scheduled Ancient Monument, the Wansdyke.

In my opinion for these reasons the current amendments to the Draft Core Strategy are unsound. Surely the release of 3 major MOD sites for development and further brown field sites within the city creates enough sustainable space for further development in Bath.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4585 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** C. W. Stammers**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

For nearly 40 years I have lived within five minutes walk of this peaceful area, which is not only Green Belt but is in addition an AONB.

The Wansdyke is an important archaeological feature; it is a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument'. The area is also deemed an extremely important foraging area for the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat.

Building on the Plateau would produce light and noise pollution, which together with an access road from the B3110 South Stoke Lane, would be greatly detrimental not only to the bat population but also to the inhabitants of South Stoke village.

The access road from South Stoke Lane is likely to be used as a 'rat run' by through traffic wanting to avoid the tailbacks at the roundabouts at the Esso garage, Sainsbury's and the Red Lion.

The Draft Core Strategy itself points out the importance of this precious area to Bath's status as a World Heritage City. Losing that status could be disastrous for Bath's economy, which depends so much on tourism.

The MOD Foxhill site is available, which only emphasises that building on the Plateau is unsound on many points and should be rejected

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4586 Comment Number: 1 Respondent Name: Anne Winpenny

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: Agent Name:

Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment?

Change Reference: SPC88 Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Core Strategy is unsound :

a) The Odd Down Plateau lies not only within the Green Belt but also in An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and as such has a high level of protection, the principles of which have not been taken into account:

- No case has been made to justify development in the Green Belt, indeed any development would contradict Government Policy and B&NES Draft Core Strategy.

- There is no evidence of special 'local or national interest' that would justify development on an AONB that has the highest status of landscape protection', indeed there is no justification that the benefits would outweigh any issues of 'Local and National importance'

b) The proposed development of this site would have a serious negative impact on the setting of The Bath World Heritage Site:

- Damaged and lost views.

- Increase in road infrastructure and light pollution.

c) The importance of The Wansdyke as a Scheduled Ancient Monument has not been recognised:

- Development here would inevitably cause irreparable damage to an Archaeological site recognised as being of National and International Status.

- The role of The Wansdyke as a boundary to the southern edge of the city.

|

d) The role of the Plateau land in Nature Conservation not been addressed, indeed it would be impossible to mitigate the adverse effects on:

- The Horseshoe bat, a rare and protected species that uses the land as a foraging area.

- The lost habitat of nesting skylarks.

As can be seen from the above, the Submitted Core Strategy is unsound and should be deleted .

Change to the policy requested:

A 'Brownfield First' strategy should be followed recognising the unique character of Bath and its surrounding countryside. Therefore the proposed change to the Core Strategy should be deleted.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4590 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Carol Lampard**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1. The proposal for the Odd Down site includes the removal of land from the greenbelt a measure that will move towards the coalescence of Southstoke to Bath. This would jeopardise the World Heritage status that Bath enjoys and no sound reasons for the change in the strategy have been made.

2. The Odd Down land is at the southern end of the Cotswold and is an open plateau in an AONB. This status requires maximum protection and there are no sound reasons shown for its inclusion in the strategy. Indeed, if the plan to have an access road/roundabout at the Cross Keys junction is progressed the beauty of this open plateau will be destroyed forever. With a proposal for 300 new dwellings on the Odd Down land and a further 700 new homes on the Foxhill former MOD site, the supporting and essential infrastructure will be over-powered leading to gridlock on the local roads.

3. The Wansdyke, a scheduled ancient monument, runs along the northern boundary of the proposed Odd Down site. This is one of the few places where the scheduled ancient monument is intact and unbroken and this should be preserved. Any development on or in the setting of the Wansdyke will have a devastating affect on the monument.

4. Bath is the only complete city in the UK that has Unesco World Heritage Status. The city is contained within a 'natural bowl' and any development on the rim of this bowl will adversely affect the unique view when approaching the city and may very well entail the loss of the WHS status. This would be a disastrous outcome for the tourism industry upon which the economic wellbeing of Bath depends and again, the proposal is therefore unsound.

In summary, the inclusion of the Odd Down land breaches the protection afforded to areas in the Green belt and AONB, for which no sound reasons have been put forward, may result in the coalescence of Southstoke to Bath, will destroy the setting of the Wansdyke and could lead to the city's loss of WHS with disastrous economic outcomes for Bath's Tourist Industry and I urge the Inspector to take these views into consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

It has not been possible to fully integrate the change reference numbers into my comments above in view of the extremely short notice I have received of the deadline that has been set for individual submissions. I believe that many of my neighbours have also experience similar difficulties with little or no advance notification of the process from the local authority.

Whilst accepting the real need for additional housing in BANES, the Odd Down site presents unsatisfactory compromises and alterations to the statutory protections afforded to green Belt and AONB giving rise to a potential loss of the WHS upon which Bath depends. The other sites identified could more easily absorb the projected housing need. However, should development have to take place on the plateau, less damage to the environment would be caused if such development were confined to the western side of Sulis Meadow.

Respondent Number: 4591 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Marie Weinel**Respondent Organisation:** Bath & North East Somerset Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

While I recognise the need for new housing and long term economic development, I object to the SPC88 allocation of land in the core strategy for Odd Down on the following grounds:

SPC6 (Broad Locations) - I am concerned that the proposed area of Odd Down is not a suitable site due to existing heavy traffic congestion that would only be exacerbated by the creation of a new housing estate. There is no new employment in this area of the city – the plan is to create jobs in city centre locations, not in Odd Down or the periphery – so houses here

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

will only add to the current traffic problems. The historic Wansdyke is an asset to the city, and the setting of this earthwork (and Cotswold Way footpath) would be very much compromised by building in this area of Odd Down. Apart from this, the site is an essential habitat for rare Greater Horseshoe bats and building on this area will have a detrimental effect on them and other wildlife. There would be no need to build on this green belt site if existing brownfield sites were used instead.

SPC14 (Need for Greenfield sites) – I believe it would be possible to increase the density of building on brownfield sites without need to build on greenfield sites.

SPC15 (Economic Growth) – I do not believe that this is a sustainable site for housing, given that the plan is to create new jobs in the Western Corridor. This area of Odd Down is already transport poor and subject to heavy traffic congestion.

SPC19, 24, 31, 47, 54, 78, 87 – Building on the Odd Down green belt site is at odds with the Green Belt requirement as defined in NPPF: ‘The Fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.’ The current plan (and previous developments) does not show that expansion on the Odd Down site will create significant employment opportunities – new jobs will be created in the Western Corridor and outside Bath. This means that the Odd Down land will effectively be urban sprawl and it is not justifiable to build on it.

SPC 88 – I do not believe it is demonstrably in the public interest to build on this site and therefore planning permission should be withheld (NPPF: ‘Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest.’). The plans for Odd Down account for only 2% of housing proposed. Allowing for margin of error in a 15 year plan, it seems unnecessary to sacrifice this green belt area.

As stated above (see objections to SPC 6), building on the area in question would destroy an important habitat for already endangered Greater Horseshoe bats and further threaten this rare species. The area in question is one of few in which the public are able to access and walk along the ancient Wansdyke (a Scheduled Ancient Monument) – the setting of this would certainly be damaged by the proposed building and there is a real risk that the monument itself could be physically damaged too. Light pollution from the proposed development would irreparably alter the character of the area from Combe Hay Lane to South Stoke Lane (which is in the Cotswold AONB) and is under the highest level of protection by statute from unauthorized development. The current proposal does not persuade that using this area for building is in the ‘Local and National Interest’ as would be required if it were to be authorized.

Finally, I have great concern – aside from previously stated objections on grounds of traffic congestion – that access to the proposed Odd Down area for development could only be via two inadequate access roads (from South Stoke Lane and Combe Hay Lane). Any connecting roads (e.g. through the Sulis Meadows estate) could create serious safety issues on an estate where children currently play in relative safety. Residents would also be very negatively impacted by a heavy volume of traffic using the estate as a cut-through – on roads not designed for such use. Pedestrian routes through this estate are already poor (paths do not follow through all the way from one end of the estate to the other) so this is a real safety concern.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like the council to decide against building on the green belt site at Odd Down (SPC 88). I feel the objections strongly out-weigh the envisaged benefits. By increasing density of building on existing brownfield sites there would be no need to sacrifice this area at all.

Respondent Number: 4592 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Hoddinott

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. The proposal for the Odd Down site includes the removal of land from the greenbelt a measure that will move towards the coalescence of Southstoke to Bath. This would jeopardise the World Heritage status that Bath enjoys and no sound

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

reasons for the change in the strategy have been made.

2. The Odd Down land is at the southern end of the Cotswold and is an open plateau in an AONB. This status requires maximum protection and there are no sound reasons shown for its inclusion in the strategy. Indeed, if the plan to have an access road/roundabout at the Cross Keys junction is progressed the beauty of this open plateau will be destroyed forever. With a proposal for 300 new dwellings on the Odd Down land and a further 700 new homes on the Foxhill former MOD site, the supporting and essential infrastructure will be over-powered leading to gridlock on the local roads.

3. The Wansdyke, a scheduled ancient monument, runs along the northern boundary of the proposed Odd Down site. This is one of the few places where the scheduled ancient monument is intact and unbroken and this should be preserved. Any development on or in the setting of the Wansdyke will have a devastating affect on the monument.

4. Bath is the only complete city in the UK that has Unesco World Heritage Status. The city is contained within a 'natural bowl' and any development on the rim of this bowl will adversely affect the unique view when approaching the city and may very well entail the loss of the WHS status. This would be a disastrous outcome for the tourism industry upon which the economic wellbeing of Bath depends and again, the proposal is therefore unsound.

In summary, the inclusion of the Odd Down land breaches the protection afforded to areas in the Green belt and AONB, for which no sound reasons have been put forward, may result in the coalescence of Southstoke to Bath, will destroy the setting of the Wansdyke and could lead to the city's loss of WHS with disastrous economic outcomes for Bath's Tourist Industry and I urge the Inspector to take these views into consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

It has not been possible to fully integrate the change reference numbers into my comments above in view of the extremely short notice I have received of the deadline that has been set for individual submissions. I believe that many of my neighbours have also experience similar difficulties with little or no advance notification of the process from the local authority.

Whilst accepting the real need for additional housing in BANES, the Odd Down site presents unsatisfactory compromises and alterations to the statutory protections afforded to green Belt and AONB giving rise to a potential loss of the WHS upon which Bath depends. The other sites identified could more easily absorb the projected housing need. However, should development have to take place on the plateau, less damage to the environment would be caused if such development were confined to the western side of Sulis Meadow.

Respondent Number: 4593 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Clare Spencer

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. The whole of the site being proposed for housing development adjoining Odd Down is within the Green Belt – the essential purpose of which is to prevent new development. I cannot see how the proposed development can do anything other than threaten the integrity of South Stoke village and practically join up the village with the City. Preventing this 'coalescence' is one of the prime concerns of having a Green Belt. By altering the Green Belt boundary – in fact building all over it - the Council would be contravening the principle purpose of Green Belt designation which surely makes the amended Draft Core Strategy unsound.

2. Not only is this site Green Belt land it is also entirely within an area designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which is supposed to give it the highest level of protection against unauthorized development. By what overriding criteria of Local and National interest is the Council ignoring this level of protection? Indeed the Council mentions the significance of both the AONB and the Green Belt to Bath's setting as a World Heritage City. So to destroy this AONB by development is surely in conflict with the Council's own policy of safeguarding the World Heritage status of the city and the 'soundness' of the plan

3. As if these were not enough the proposed development seriously threatens the ancient Wansdyke an important archaeological feature which is even registered as an Ancient Monument and therefore by definition to be protected from the very thing you are proposing to do.

4. I have recently become aware that this area is also an important foraging area for the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat. The proposed development can only cause harm to this already threatened species.

5. I also fail to see how developing the whole of this site is sustainable from the point of view of the already considerable

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

traffic problems that exist at peak times in particular

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4596 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Williams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposed large scale development at Odd Down is counter to the long held policy of conserving the Green Belt and would increase urban sprawl. This is of particular importance as the proposed site is in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The proposed development is in the wrong location as there is little employment to the west of Bath so occupants would have to commute either towards Bath or Bristol along already congested roads.

The proposed development would overwhelm the local community

The proposed development is not needed. There are more than sufficient brown field sites, particularly since the closure of MoD facilities to meet the foreseeable requirements for housing within Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

Reduce the proposed development at Odd Down so that it does not overwhelm the local community and infrastructure and complies with the NPPF guidance on the allocation of land within the AONB.

BANES have in the past demonstrated their incompetence and lack of understanding regarding planning and highways. In particular, allowing the awful monolithic river side development which is totally out of keeping with the architecture of our historic city. Their lack of a strategic plan for the land vacated after the closure of Stothert and Pitt Ltd. Their inability to develop a traffic strategy after more than fifty years. Their inability to control the recycling and waste management adjacent to the Odd Down Park and Ride.

Respondent Number: 4597 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Dawson

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

There are a number of key issues:

1. Traffic
2. Wildlife: impact of Greater Horseshoe Bat
3. Wandsyke: Scheduled Ancient Monument
4. World heritage status
5. Green Belt: Coalescence
6. Area of outstanding natural beauty

Traffic

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- The building of 300 houses on the South Stoke (Odd Down) Plateau does not take into account the impact on traffic on the already very congested route into Bath via Wellsway. As an employer in Bath with employees travelling in from Radstock, it can already take them over an hour at rush hour. The provision of new houses here plus those in the Norton St Philip area will make this impossible.
- The relief road across the plateau will become a rat run
- The relief road across the plateau will have a detrimental effect on the Greater Horseshoe bat feeding habitat
- The proposed “gateway” at the Cross Keys Public House will have the effect of producing another traffic bottle neck
- Given Bath’s near traffic grid lock at rush hour, this cannot be mitigated

Wildlife

- The plateau is an important foraging area for the Greater Horseshoe bat. This will be put at risk by development on this site especially from lighting and the relief road.
- This will lead inevitably to a serious decline in numbers of this protected species.
- The Great Horseshoe bat is recognised by European experts. It is difficult to see how the loss of the foraging area can be mitigated.
- It is also an important area for other species notably the skylark

Wansdyke earthwork

- The Wansdyke has been the traditional boundary being Bath and the surrounding countryside.
- It’s archaeological importance has been put at the same level as the Roman Baths in the centre of Bath
- It is a ‘Scheduled Ancient Monument’.
- It is also extremely fragile. The Council recognise that significant damage has already been cause by inappropriate development at Sulis Manor estate.
- This is very difficult to mitigate. The Arup report commissioned by the council points out that “it may prove difficult to protect the setting and the rural character of Southstoke Conservation Area.

World Heritage status

- Bath’s status as a World Heritage City will be put into doubt by inappropriate development of the open and rural aspects surrounding the city if these are further developed.
- Bath is hoping to provide new jobs of approximately 6950. These will largely to support the tourist industry
- Inappropriate development effecting Bath’s green environment will potentially seriously effect Bath tourist industry and therefore the jobs it is trying to create.

Green Belt

- The location of the plateau falls almost entirely within the rural parish of South Stoke.
- Very little of it is located within Bath City Council boundaries
- The green belt on the south side of Bath is already very narrow.
- One of the key purposes of green belt is to prevent coalescence between settlements.
- The impact of developing the plateau will be for South Stoke to be subsumed into the City of Bath
- The key purpose of the green belt will therefore to have been negated.
- There is a presumption against new development in the Green Belt unless ‘very special circumstances can be shown to exist which would outweigh the harm that such development would cause’. No such ‘very special circumstances’ have been defined in this case.
- Whilst the local authority can overturn Green Belt in specific instances, it would seem that the issue of coalescence will happen in this instance and therefore this is “unsound”.

Cotswold Area of outstanding natural beauty

- The area of outstanding natural beauty covers the entire plateau.
- The purpose of AONB status is provide the highest level of protection against unauthorised development.
- This can only be overturned if it is in the “Local” or “National interest”
- It is difficult to argue that development should be allowed in this particular area of ANOB as it does not seem to be either in the local or national interest.
- This is therefore “unsound”

Change to the policy requested:

Given that it is going to be extremely difficult (I not impossible) to mitigate a number of key points together with the development of the Green Belt and removal of the Cotswold Area of Natural Beauty is “unsound”, it is clear that this

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

proposal should be removed from the Core Strategy.

In particular it is vital that South Stoke does not become coalesced with the City of Bath.

Respondent Number: 4599 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Frances Smith

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I WISH TO OBJECT TO THE LAND BEING ALLOCATED IN THE CORE STRATEGY FOR ODD DOWN SPC8. PLUS THE OTHER SPC NUMBERS SHOWN ABOVE.

THE ALLOCATION OF LAND FOR BUILDING HOUSES IN THE LAND AROUND SULIS MEADOWS WILL TURN THIS AREA INTO A MINI TOWN INSTEAD OF A SMALL, QUIET ESTATE SITUATED IN THE AREA OF NATURAL BEAUTY, AND IT IS A GREENFIELD AREA, NOT A BROWNFIELD SITE IF PLANNING PERMISSION IS GIVEN TO BUILD ON THIS LAND.

THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION WILL BE INCREASED, AND THE PARK AND RIDE AND LOCAL BUSES WILL BE AFFECTED WITH THE INCREASE OF TRAFFIC AND PEOPLE USING TRANSPORT INTO AND AROUND THE CITY. WE ALREADY HAVE NUMEROUS HOUSES ON THIS ESTATE THAT ARE BEING LIVED IN BY TAXI DRIVERS AND THEIR CARS! AND, MAY I SAY, NOT ONE CAR TO A HOUSE! IT'S MORE LIKE A TAXI PARKING LOT!!!

WITH AN INCREASE IN PEOPLE LIVING IN THE PROPOSED BUILDING AREA WILL MEAN MORE DOGS AND CATS ETC. HAVING TO BE EXERCISED ETC., WHEN THE LAND THAT IS CURRENTLY USED FOR FAMILY PETS COULD BE COVERED IN HOUSES, GARDENS AND GARAGES.

THE WILDLIFE WILL BE AFFECTED, ESPECIALLY THE BATS THAT FLY IN AND AROUND THE PROPOSED BUILDING SITE.

Change to the policy requested:

PLEASE DO NOT BUILD MORE HOUSES ON THE AREA AROUND SULIS MEADOWS!!! AS A BATHONION BORN AND BRED, IT SADDENS ME THAT THIS AREA, WHERE I OFTEN WALKED & PLAYED AS A CHILD, WILL BECOME YET ANOTHER VAST HOUSING ESTATE!

Respondent Number: 4602 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mark Simmonds

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I am writing to expression my grave concerns about the proposal to allocation of land at Odd Down within the core strategy (ref SPC88).

In the context of SPC6 and SPC19: My wife and I have lived in our house since the Sulis Meadows estate was first built.

There are few facilities on Odd Down for the population that already lives here and little local employment. Further building here will only create spreading housing estates and remove the one major local amenity that we do have, which is access to the beautiful countryside, including exceptional views, of the adjacent AONB. The countryside is an essential element of Bath and important to the well-being of those that live here. It should be protected as zealously as the rest of the World Heritage Site.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

There appears to be considerable wildlife here, although I am not aware of any formal assessment, my own observations include bat species, other small mammals and many birds species. This diversity is maintained by the patchwork of local habitats including hedgerows, fields and small wooded areas.

I do not believe that there is an overwhelming need for development in the AONB with its potential detrimental affects on the local community and local wildlife. This is not in accord with Green Belt policies and development in the AONB would not be in the best local or national interests.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4615	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Gerard Cheshire	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Horsecombe Vale and its environs have been designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, because they harbour a quintessentially English remnant of original habitat, which is why the Bath greenbelt begins in that area. Any housing development will inevitably denature a broad peripheral zone, due to the impact of human disturbance in one way or another, which is why it is important to prevent the proposed green-field site from being developed.

The science of ecology has come a long way over the past thirty years, so that there is no excuse for ignorance about the potential for the degradation of pristine habitats that may appear to be a safe distance away, either directly or indirectly. So, it is far better to avoid this potential as far as possible by choosing development sites that are well away from such area of ecological value, as once they are lost they cannot be restored.

I am aware that the flora and fauna of Horsecombe Vale and its environs include some rare species, which are already threatened as it is. Thus, we must do all that we can to ensure that the vital components of their delicate ecological requirements are maintained and improved, rather than being encroached upon and deleteriously affected further.

In the Summer of 2012, I discovered a colony of Dark Green Fritillary butterflies along the bottom of Horsecombe Vale. As far as I know, this is the only colony remaining in the Bath area, due to changes in land use and management. Clearly this habitat is of considerable ecological value to the residents of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like the proposal for a housing development at the site in question to be dropped in favour of developing other sites (brown-field or green-field) where the disturbance of pristine habitats is not an issue.

In the 1970s development destroyed many pristine habitats across Britain because people didn't know any better. We no longer have that excuse, and we now need to preserve/conservate as much as we can so that something is left for future generations.

In point of fact, I became a qualified ecologist precisely because I witnessed the wanton developmental destruction of natural habitats during my formative years in Dorset and Hampshire, so I willingly carry some of the burden of responsibility for countering the actions of those who are ignorant enough to be more interested in the anthropocentric world and therefore lack affinity with wildlife.

It pays to be mindful that we emanate from nature ourselves, and that many of the socio-political failings in society can be attributed to people living in overcrowded manmade environments, where quality of life and values become eroded.

I would therefore question any desire to extend and perpetuate such manmade environments as a short- term solution,

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

when it will inevitably result in further decay of the qualities that currently make Bath and its environs a desirable place to live and work.

Respondent Number: 4615 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Gerard Cheshire

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

As a qualified ecologist, I am particularly concerned that such a development would inevitably affect the ecological balance in Horsecombe Vale, which lies only a short distance from the proposed development. This is because we know enough about ecological complexity to realize that a considerable peripheral margin surrounding any new development will affect the environment in one way or another, not least because a public footpaths traverse the vale, so an anticipated rise in footfall and associated human disturbance would be deleterious.

In the summer of 2012, whilst surveying part of Horsecombe Vale for insects, I discovered a colony of Dark Green Fritillary butterflies (*Argynnis aglaja*). This is the only known colony in the Bath area and is therefore of considerable importance, as the species has suffered a marked decline nationally due to changes in land use and management. It requires a particular habitat comprising dog violets growing within bracken scrub. Furthermore, the vale also harbours a diverse flora and fauna, the like of which one would be hard pushed to find anywhere else near Bath, including a number of rare bat species. Horsecombe Vale contains a remnant habitat, which is representative of the wild state that the Bath area would once have comprised and should therefore be greatly valued by the community. It pays to be mindful that we are not the owners of our environment, but the merely the custodians, so it is our responsibility to safeguard any quintessentially English ecological habitats for future generations to enjoy.

With regard to the proposed site itself: once a green-field site has been lost beneath the tarmac and foundations that some people regard as progress, then there is an inevitable zone of human disturbance radiating from that area. Far better then, to develop in area where that zone cannot affect pristine habitat. Brown-field sites should always be considered first, regardless of any additional expense in purchasing and redeveloping them. Failing that, green-field sites surrounded by generous swathes of existing development or farmland will always be preferable.

On a more general note, I feel it is also relevant to question the received wisdom that such housing development are really necessary, and that they aren't the result of hyperbole. For one thing, Bath is unique in sitting within a valley and therefore has a finite capacity. Increasing the peripheral population will inevitably have disastrous consequences to the infrastructure of the city and the very qualities that make Bath a desirable place to live. Think of the additional numbers of people pouring down into an already overcrowded and congested city centre.

Secondly, the phrase 'to dress a wound without removing the knife' seems apt, because building more and more homes does nothing to address the sociopolitical problems that have generated the problem in the first place. Thus, there is an amusing and tragic irony here, as the 'Makingspace' policy will only succeed in extending the anthropocentric environment in which such sociopolitical problems are fermented.

It would be inspiring to see the B&NES 'Core Strategy' administered by councilors able to think intelligently and analytically about the long-term consequences of their town planning decisions. It would be even more inspiring if they took an innovative and imaginative approach to local governance by addressing the root cause of the sociopolitical problems and not opting for quick-fix tactics, which can only leave a legacy of environmental degradation, both for the natural and human communities involved.

As a fundamental scientific rule, one must never be confused between correlation and causation. That is to say, that it can be easy to come to the wrong conclusions about how to provide solutions, because the perceived causes of problems are easier to describe than the true causes. In this instance, the council is reacting to a perceived requirement for 'affordable housing and jobs' when the real problem to solve is the flawed sociopolitical environment that generates those perceived requirements. No one would sensibly wish to extend and perpetuate that very environment, yet that is currently the ambition of B&NES council, which would suggest a curious lack of prognostic vision with regard to the future of Bath and its environs.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4617 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Joel Hirst **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whilst broadly supporting the need for B&NES to accept the 12,500 houses, I am especially very concerned about the specific proposal SPC 88 which I would like to object to, with respect to developing on the green belt between Odd Down and South Stoke.

The broad reason why I object are as follows:

1. This area is beautiful and protected as an area of outstanding natural beauty. My family and I often walk from the Park and Ride through to South Stoke and back and enjoy this lovely protected strip of green belt.
2. This area is of green belt is narrow and creates a clear break between Bath and South Stoke – a development of 300 houses will ruin this area and create a feeling of South Stoke no longer being a separate rural village.
3. I belief that the planners could be more ambitious about creating higher density areas of planning elsewhere in planned new developments rather than having to build on this area that has previously been designated as outstanding.
4. I am concerned that already the Wansdyke as a monument from our history has been over developed close to it. The ability to enjoy the monument and get a sense of its historic importance will be eroded by any additional development in this area
5. I am concerned about the volume of traffic that any additional development will bring. I work at St Martins Hospital and live at the top of Rush Hill. Every day I witness and experience high levels of congestion at both “rush hour” periods. This congestion has been made worse by the Sainsbury development and will face additional challenges when the new housing proposed at the MOD sites come on stream and the new 6th form come into operation in September 13. Already the congestion around the main A road into Bath is so severe that cars are cutting through other rural villages to find routes to Bristol and elsewhere. This is leading to real problems form traffic getting out of Englishcombe village.
6. Traffic access to the new houses in this proposal. I am concerned that which ever of the proposal about traffic access to the Odd Down proposal is highly problematic. It would be totally unacceptable to allow access through the Sulis Meadow Estate – as already the volume of traffic for this family residential area is more busy than would residents would like. Access from Combe Hay lane would be really challenging due to already heavy volumes of traffic coming into Bath from Peasdown and beyond, the additional traffic from the St Gregory’s school. Access from South Stoke / Midford Road would then lead to unacceptable volume of traffic on what is already a very busy road and would breach the whole concept that this is an urban extension of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4618 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Cedric Bufton **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Green belt, Cotswold AONB, South Stoke Conservation Area and Wansdyke Scheduled Monument

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The current status of this area recognises multiple unique features and makes further development unsound. Proposed “integrated green space” is a narrow corridor that does not meet the stated requirements for separation or dark habitat. This also has an impact on SAC (Bats). I agree with the Council’s comments at 10.5 of BNES 11 and 10.5.6 specifically: “Therefore, pursuing any development either West of Twerton or Odd Down South Stoke Plateau/Odd Down location would be contrary to PPG2.”

10.5.10 strengthens this decision for AONB sites and 10.5.15 for Wansdyke scheduled monument and 10.5.24 for Special Areas of Conservation.

Transport and Infrastructure

The area is not well supported by public transport and current traffic is heavy at peak times. The addition of an access road opposite the Cross Keys would destroy the green belt, prevent the economic agricultural use of the land and provide a “rat run” for commuters. This, and the additional traffic from the Foxhill development would, in my opinion, make the proposed changes unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

The changes proposed to the Core Strategy in SPC 88 should be removed.

Respondent Number: 4621 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Dr Helen Geake

Respondent Organisation: Portable Antiquities

Agent ID: 154 **Agent Name:** Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

If this area is proposed for development, a significant threat to the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Wansdyke will ensue.

Legal problems to the proposed change

The proposed change to the Core Strategy is incompatible with the Wansdyke’s status as one of the country’s most important Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monuments are protected from destruction or disturbance and the impact on the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument by development is also a material consideration in the planning system. In more up-to-date guidance, Scheduled Ancient Monuments are designated ‘in order to secure their legal protection in the national interest, and to secure their long-term preservation in situ’ (English Heritage guidance from DCMS, March 2010, p. 11). It is not justified to destroy part of this exceptionally important monument to build housing, and BANES’s promise to ‘protect and enhance the open landscape character of the area’ are incompatible with building 300 homes, a school, shops and a road over it.

The only effective way to protect this monument is to leave it within the Green Belt. Any development in this area will have a serious impact on the landscape setting of the site. The current proposals to a change to the Core Strategy to include this area will unavoidably conflict with the protection afforded to the monument by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Monuments Act, and contravene the UK’s commitments to the protection of the historic environment set out within the Valletta Convention (1992).

The proposed changes are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. Under the NPPF, development should sustain or enhance the significance of a heritage asset, and these changes to the Core Strategy fail to accomplish this as they will destroy the open landscape context of the Wansdyke and physically destroy part of the monument itself. (NPPF PPS5 Practice Guide, June 2012, section 79.1).

It is also not sustainable development, as once the open landscape of the Wansdyke has been destroyed, it cannot be recreated. In addition, once the archaeological deposits of the monument itself have been dug away, they cannot be put back, and current understanding of the monument and methodologies to study it are tentative and under-developed (see below).

The proposed development area also lies adjacent to a conservation area and an UNESCO World Heritage Site, both designations which afford protection to the adjacent built environment. The loss of the open land and the impact of 300 new buildings and the associated infrastructure will inevitably diminish the historical context of the southern part of the city of Bath, and bring the UK's commitment to its Heritage Assets into question.

Significance of the Wansdyke

Recent research (Reynolds and Langlands 2006) has suggested a very different origin from the traditional view. Traditionally the Wansdyke has been seen as an immediately post-Roman earthwork, forming a boundary between post-Roman Bath and the Saxon precursor of Wessex. It seems more likely now that it should be dated to the late 8th century, when it could have been constructed by the Kingdom of Wessex, in similar political circumstances to those in contemporary Mercia, which famously constructed Offa's Dyke. Offa's Dyke is a thriving tourist attraction for day trippers and long-distance walkers; it just missed gaining World Heritage Site status itself in 2011, showing the importance of these long-distance boundaries.

The area which runs along the southern boundary of the Bath WHS and apparently ends close to the Cross Keys pub is of exceptional importance in understanding the monument. Beyond this to the east the route of the dyke is shadowy, until the more famous Eastern Wansdyke starts at Morgan's Hill near Calne. It is suggested that the stretch of Wansdyke along Odd Down was constructed by the Men of Somerset, and the eastern part by the Men of Wiltshire, resulting in the different character of the two stretches. But these hypotheses need testing. Topographically this is an important part of the western, Somerset Wansdyke - the last bit clearly visible. The junction between the 'known' and the 'unknown' is crucial and should not be lost to modern development at present, when we have not even formulated the right questions to ask of survey and excavation.

The boundary zone along the Wansdyke, to north and south of the monument, is also of exceptional interest. Its Roman towns (with the singular and remarkable exception of Bath, which may be significant) do not develop into medieval towns. The open landscape character of the dyke is thus particularly important in our appreciation and understanding of it and should be retained.

The Wansdyke therefore represents the creation of Wessex – which did not include Mercian Bath at that point – and shows us how early-medieval societies could come together to construct vast earthworks running over many miles.

Economic implications of the proposed changes

The proposed development would firstly entirely destroy the open landscape context (already gone to the north) and secondly remove one of the most potentially important parts of the dyke.

This neglect and destruction of visible archaeology (as well as the designations of AONB, Conservation Area, WHS and Green Belt) will spoil the 'brand' of Bath as a World Heritage Site and detrimentally affect its tourism economy.

Using the Wansdyke as a tourist attraction in its own right (as with Offa's Dyke) would improve the economy of suburban Bath, as well as other parts of North-East Somerset; destroying part of the monument in this way will not.

Legal problems to the proposed changes

The proposed changes to the Core Strategy are incompatible with the Wansdyke's status as one of the country's most important Scheduled Ancient Monuments. Under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monuments are protected from destruction or disturbance and the impact on the setting of a Scheduled Ancient Monument by development is also a material consideration in the planning system. In more up-to-date guidance, Scheduled Ancient Monuments are designated 'in order to secure their legal protection in the national interest, and to secure their long-term preservation in situ' (English Heritage guidance from DCMS, March 2010, p. 11). It is not justified to destroy part of this exceptionally important monument to build housing, and BANES's promise to 'protect and enhance the open landscape character of the area' are incompatible with building 300 homes, a school, shops and a road over it.

The only effective way to protect this monument is to leave it within the Green Belt. Any development in this area will have a serious impact on the landscape setting of the site. The current proposals to a change to the Core Strategy to include this area will unavoidably conflict with the protection afforded to the monument by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Monuments Act, and contravene the UK's commitments to the protection of the historic environment set out within the Valletta Convention (1992).

The proposed changes are incompatible with the National Planning Policy Framework. Under the NPPF, development should sustain or enhance the significance of a heritage asset, and these changes to the Core Strategy fail to accomplish this as they will destroy the open landscape context of the Wansdyke and physically destroy part of the monument itself. (NPPF PPS5 Practice Guide, June 2012, section 79.1).

It is also not sustainable development, as once the open landscape of the Wansdyke has been destroyed, it cannot be recreated. In addition, once the archaeological deposits of the monument itself have been dug away, they cannot be put back, and current understanding of the monument and methodologies to study it are tentative and under-developed (see below).

The proposed development area also lies adjacent to a conservation area and an UNESCO World Heritage Site, both designations which afford protection to the adjacent built environment. The loss of the open land and the impact of 300 new buildings and the associated infrastructure will inevitably diminish the historical context of the southern part of the city of Bath, and bring the UK's commitment to its Heritage Assets into question.

Significance of the Wansdyke

Recent research (Reynolds and Langlands 2006) has suggested a very different origin from the traditional view. Traditionally the Wansdyke has been seen as an immediately post-Roman earthwork, forming a boundary between post-Roman Bath and the Saxon precursor of Wessex. It seems more likely now that it should be dated to the late 8th century, when it could have been constructed by the Kingdom of Wessex, in similar political circumstances to those in contemporary Mercia, which famously constructed Offa's Dyke. Offa's Dyke is a thriving tourist attraction for day trippers and long-distance walkers; it just missed gaining World Heritage Site status itself in 2011, showing the importance of these long-distance boundaries.

The area which runs along the southern boundary of the Bath WHS and apparently ends close to the Cross Keys pub is of exceptional importance in understanding the monument. Beyond this to the east the route of the dyke is shadowy, until the more famous Eastern Wansdyke starts at Morgan's Hill near Calne. It is suggested that the stretch of Wansdyke along Odd Down was constructed by the Men of Somerset, and the eastern part by the Men of Wiltshire, resulting in the different character of the two stretches. But these hypotheses need testing. Topographically this is an important part of the western, Somerset Wansdyke - the last bit clearly visible. The junction between the 'known' and the 'unknown' is crucial and should not be lost to modern development at present, when we have not even formulated the right questions to ask of survey and excavation.

The boundary zone along the Wansdyke, to north and south of the monument, is also of exceptional interest. Its Roman towns (with the singular and remarkable exception of Bath, which may be significant) do not develop into medieval towns. The open landscape character of the dyke is thus particularly important in our appreciation and understanding of it and should be retained.

The Wansdyke therefore represents the creation of Wessex – which did not include Mercian Bath at that point – and shows us how early-medieval societies could come together to construct vast earthworks running over many miles.

Economic implications of the proposed changes

The proposed development would firstly entirely destroy the open landscape context (already gone to the north) and secondly remove one of the most potentially important parts of the dyke.

This neglect and destruction of visible archaeology (as well as the designations of AONB, Conservation Area, WHS and Green Belt) will spoil the 'brand' of Bath as a World Heritage Site and detrimentally affect its tourism economy.

Using the Wansdyke as a tourist attraction in its own right (as with Offa's Dyke) would improve the economy of suburban Bath, as well as other parts of North-East Somerset; destroying part of the monument in this way will not.

Change to the policy requested:

In the first sentence, I would like the word 'three' revised to 'two'. I would also like the words 'land adjoining Odd Down' to be removed from the first sentence of SPC87. In the second sentence, I would like the word 'two' revised to 'one'. In the penultimate sentence, I would like the word 'both' to be removed and the words 'at Odd Down' to be removed, and the word 'three' revised to 'two'. These changes will also require a number of other minor changes throughout the document, to adjust the numbers of homes to be provided and to adjust the accompanying diagrams.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

I would like the Land adjoining Odd Down Bath, change SPC 88, removed from the Core Strategy proposal. This will entail a number of other minor changes throughout the document, to adjust the numbers of homes to be provided and to adjust diagrams.

Respondent Number: 4623 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** The Council For British Archaeology

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This comment from the Council for British Archaeology, relates specifically to change reference SPC24, to remove land from the Bristol-Bath Green Belt for development.

Whilst the Council for British Archaeology is mindful of the need for new housing provision in the city and accepts and understands the pressures inherent in delivering a successful core strategy for such development in Bath, it is deeply concerned for the pressures that new development will exert on the land adjoining Odd Down, in particular, the Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument.

NPPF is clear about the significance of Green Belt and it's value

Clause 88 states

“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”

Currently, our understanding of the significance of this earthwork is limited and it is clear that further archaeological study is required. NPPF is quite clear about the importance of recognising the archaeological potential in heritage assets, Clause 28 concludes that -

“Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”

The CBA would suggest that despite the LPA’s assurance that, ‘carefully designed development’, with the necessary safeguards in place to ensure the protection of Wansdyke, the very nature of what is proposed will almost certainly destroy the potential of the SAM to be properly read, understood or studied further. Our understanding of this fundamentally important period of national history is limited and it is therefore in both the local, regional and national interest for the Wansdyke to be better protected.

Recent studies have shown that the Wansdyke dates from the 8th Century, is contemporaneous with Offa’s Dyke and that it was vital in the formation of Wessex. However, much more work is needed. These proposals have the potential not to enhance the SAM but to destroy part of it and with it, the potential to understand it’s archaeological significance.

Overall, the LPA’s policy seems contradictory in relation to this particular site. Situated on the edge of a World Heritage Site and Schedule Ancient Monument, in a Conservation Area and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Odd Down is a highly designated area. Once again, the CBA accept the need for new houses and agree with the Inspector’s recommendations that have led to these changes. However, we cannot accept the potential harm to the Wansdyke inherent in these changes and we would urge Bath and North East Somerset to look again at the implications of these alterations.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4625 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ann Harding**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The changes make the Core Strategy unsound with regard to

- 1) Green Belt. The proposals favour coalescence between Bath and Southstoke and severely threatens the openness of the Green Belt.
- 2) AONB. Development in an AONB is only allowed if it is within "Local & natural Interest". No proof of this has been provided in these proposals
- 3) World Heritage Site The setting of Bath which is an important aspect of its World Heritage status is threatened by these proposals
- 4 The Wansdyke. needs protection from inappropriate development in particular the access road proposed under SPC88j

Change to the policy requested:

If density on brown field sites was increased development of this land would not be required

Respondent Number: 4626 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Neil Butters**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The "land adjoining Odd Down" is not suitable for development. Casually, it may look so – but there are many reasons against -

First and foremost the land is AONB and also Green Belt.

Secondly, it is close to both the World Heritage Site and the Wansdyke – a Scheduled Ancient Monument of great historic importance. This has been underlined to me several times over recently by prominent academics, from many parts of the world indeed. The AONB land at Tetbury was not subject to these additional factors. Note that even if only the land at the west end of the plateau were developed, a threat would remain of a road going across to the Cross Keys public house – which would sooner or later inevitably lead to infill, right by the SAM; also, there would need to be a roundabout/signalled junction right on the course of the SAM.

Would permission be granted for a block of flats within easy view of the Royal Crescent...?

Thirdly, coalescence with South Stoke. Pevsner remarked on its separateness, as a gem, from Bath. It is now in danger of becoming a suburb.

Change to the policy requested:

Removal of reference to land referred to.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4629 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Kenneth Foster**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We believe that the proposed housing development on this site as indicated within the draft Core Strategy is not sustainable as it is within a designated area of outstanding natural beauty. AONBs are supposed to be protected from development in the highest degree. We cannot see why this development should be considered within the Core Strategy or how it can be of Local or National interest when we already have a large housing development bank in vacant MOD and various brown field sites in Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

We propose this development area proposal is removed from the draft core strategy as it is not in the Local or Nation interest to develop within this AONB.

Respondent Number: 4630 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Jo Caruth**Respondent Organisation:** Rescue, The British Archaeological Trust**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Rescue - The British Archaeological Trust is a non-political organisation dedicated to supporting archaeology and archaeologists in Britain and abroad. We do not receive any state support and are entirely dependent on the contributions of our members to support our work.

We believe that change SPC88 to the Core Strategy for Bath and North-East Somerset will have an unacceptably negative impact on both the western Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument and Bath World Heritage Site. Western Wansdyke forms part of a series of defensive, ditched and banked earthworks running from Maes Knoll in Somerset to Savernake Forest in Wiltshire. The line of the western Wansdyke is relatively clear throughout its length until it reaches the eastern terminus where it reaches the ridge south of Bath and disappears under the Cross Keys pub. Its route beyond there is unclear, and difficult to trace due to both natural topography and historical activities (e.g. Fullers Earth digging), therefore this easternmost part of the route is topographically important, as the last part that can be clearly seen and surveyed. Recent research into this monument has suggested that it may have its origins in the Middle Saxon period and therefore comparable with Offa's dyke, but such research is in its infancy and there is, as yet, no consensus on its date or the appropriate methodologies to study or understand it. The change to the core strategy in this area will destroy the open landscape context of the Wansdyke, which has already been lost immediately to the west of the proposed development area, and the construction of the new road scheme will risk causing physical damage to the monument itself. Such monuments are vital to our understanding of our development as a nation from individual kingdoms, and defining and understanding the termini of these linear monuments, is often key to interpreting the boundaries reflected by them. The loss of any part of this highly significant monument is unacceptable.

Under the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979, scheduled monuments are protected from destruction or disturbance and the impact on the setting of a Scheduled Monument by development is also a material consideration in the planning system. Any development in this area will have a serious impact on the landscape setting of the site even if full survey and excavation takes place as part of it (as it most certainly should under the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, the relevant planning guidance document). We believe that the current proposals to a change to the core strategy to include this area, conflict with the protection afforded to the monument by the 1979 Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Monuments Act, and contravene the UK's commitments to the protection of the historic environment set out within the Valletta Convention (1992).

The proposed development area also lies adjacent to a conservation area and an UNESCO World Heritage Site, both

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

designations which afford protection to the adjacent built environment. World Heritage Sites are considered to be heritage assets of the highest significance (National Planning Policy Framework 132ff) and, as the UK is a state party to the World Heritage Convention, are recognised in International law. There are two examples of Case Law (Bath Society v. Secretary of State [1991] 2 P.L.R.51 and Coal Contractors Ltd v. Secretary of State [1995] J.P.L. 421) whereby the impact on a World Heritage Site has been deemed to be the most significant material consideration. Both cases were successfully found in favour of the WHS; and it is notable that the Coal Contractors v. Secretary of State related to the visual impact of opencast mining for only a short period (unlike permanently as here) within the setting of the WHS (i.e. outside its boundary, as in this case).

The loss of the open land and the impact of 300 new buildings and the associated infrastructure will inevitably diminish the historical context of the southern part of the city of Bath, and bring the UK's commitment to its Heritage Assets into question.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4632 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Robert Wilkins

Respondent Organisation: Bath/Wansdyke Residents Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

At a meeting tonight on 7th May 2013 the members complained about the poor publicity that a Consultation period had started, what the changes were, the length of documentation to be found, retrieved and considered, and then responses made. The local community north of the Wansdyke were only alerted to the process by Southstoke Parish Council's notices for Council Meetings at the Parish Hall. The only Meeting for those living north of the Monument was a St Gregory's School at Odd Down very late in the Consultation period. The Group considered that the consultation process was flawed because of the shortness of time for Bath local residents to informed by Council Meetings and then the time to respond.

Comments made by members result in the following.

We wish to object to the development of the land adjoining Odd Down for the following reasons which make the proposal unsound.

1 The key issue is that the surrounding area to the City of Bath is, Green Belt, partly Area of Outstanding Beauty and the Setting for Bath's World Heritage Site Status. These environmental criteria together give the highest possible protection against any development. All require extra ordinary reasons at local and national interest, and UNESCO approval for any development to take place, no reasons have been given for any of these criteria to be breached, there fore the proposal is unsound

1.1 Before any development can be approved each criteria requires:-

a) for Green Belt against development unless "very special circumstances unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other consideration, for the local area; it is

unsound to have not identified what the ' other considerations 'were in comparison with the Green Belt characteristics

b) for AONB the "very special circumstances are extended to that of National interest as well as local interest; again it is unsound not to have identified what these' very special circumstances' for both local and national interest were.

c) for the World Heritage setting status it is further protected by the 'Interested Party', the government, concluding an agreement with UNESCO as to the extent the Government provides protection up to the recommended standard set by UNESCO. It is unsound to not provide evidence how the development in the setting complies with the required 'openness ;

and states "" that the State Party enhance the protection of the surrounding landscape of the property to prevent any future developments which could have adverse and cumulative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property" etc ' as required UNESCO. The response due by 1 February 2011 is not mentioned and should have been referred to for completeness>it is unsound to omit important constraints on the development of the site referred to.

1.1 Core Planning Principles includes " contribute conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of ' lesser environmental value', where consistent with the other policies in this framework." Where was the land of greater environmental value identified to be of greater

importance? It is unsound not to have identified those areas of higher environmental value to that of the areas in question around the City of Bath. It is also unsound not to identify what the ' other policies ' which are implied to be of higher value than the existing environmental benefits.

2 The overall BANES View

2.1 Even though our main objection relates to the Odd Down/Southstoke Plateau the problem of where housing should be accommodated in the World Heritage Setting indicates a serious problem that is relevant to all the surrounding areas of Bath. The Setting of Bath has to be considered as a continuous whole around the City. It is unsound not to consider the incremental effect on the World Heritage Status and the implications of losing the status. It is unsound not to have included specific discussion on the likelihood of losing World Heritage Status with the proposed break in the setting of Bath.

3 The Odd Down / Southstoke Plateau

3.1 The ARUP report for Southstoke uses the Urban Expansion Plan of March 2007. However, the Government, as the 'interested party' was required by UNESO, by 1 February 2011 to produce a revised management plan which includes 'the enhanced protection of the surrounding landscape of the property to prevent any future development which could have adverse and cumulative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Property'. The Government response to this request is not mentioned in the Consultation document but must be several years later than the date of the document used by ARUP. As commented above the use of the ARUP document is unsound because it was not based on the latest criteria for consideration of the World Heritage Setting.

3.3 This unsoundness has further implications to the rest of the submission because each parcel of land to the west and north of the City of Bath in the Draft revision should be considered using consistent and up to date criteria. The whole of the Bath setting has not been considered on the correct and consistent criteria and the three sections must be unsound.

3.4 Coalescence of Southstoke with Bath:-

Coalescence is a key factor in determining any development in Green Belt, AONB and World Heritage Status. The suggestion of 'mitigation of a tree belt', to prevent the developed site coalescing with Southstoke can be seen as unsound by visiting the existing tree belt planted by the Hignett family to the north of Southstoke. It can be visualised that this belt provides nothing as a visual barrier between the village and any proposed plateau development. Any development, including the resiting of a playing field will not detract from the thin band of trees between the site and the village. The tree belt is only a reminder of the 10% set aside scheme for farmers and is totally inadequate as a barrier screen. The proposed eastern and improved junction at the Cross Keys public house junction and access road will only increase the impression that Southstoke is just another urban part of Bath. The Document states that "Access to the study area would therefore be provided from along Southstoke Lane which runs north south along the eastern edge of the study area. A portion Southstoke Lane would require upgrading to suit this purpose" hence this portion of Southstoke lane will look like any road in Bath. The village will be just another extension of the City of Bath and be considered as such, coalescence with the urban area. The development of the eastern end of the plateau is unsound because coalescence from the physical structures and road upgrade impact will be unavoidable. All of these points demonstrate that the proposal for any development on the Southstoke plateau is flawed because of physical coalescence.

3.5 The Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument :-

The Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument currently provides a unique and discrete southern boundary to the City of Bath leading to open country. It is the longest length of the Dyke as a complete section. The development at Sulis Meadows has already shown that development adjacent to the Dyke and the access point through it causes unrecoverable damage to the dyke. From this experience any development near the Dyke will significantly reduce its longitudinal visual quality as a visual barrier between north and south. The Sulis Meadows experience also highlights the problem of a Dyke crossing. Any development of the eastern field will mean a greater usage of the Dyke crossing at the Threeways School. This crossing will not be able to sustain the usage seen at Sulis Meadows and irreparable damage will again be made to the Dyke. Because of the harmful experience of the Sulis Meadows development adjacent to the Dyke and such new development is unsound.

Any development to the south of the monument will destroy the open aspect of the monument and what it represented as a demarcation of boundary between the two adjacent nations. Without the open aspect its original reason for being built will be lost for future generations. It is unsound to negate the original purpose of the monument.

3.6 Proposed East West Access Road:-

The plan options for the plateau include an access road across the site east to west linking the Cross Keys B3110 junction with A367 at St Gregory's School. In previous attempts to develop the plateau such a proposed link road was thought to be inappropriate because it created a 'rat run' both east to west and west to east. The rat run will run through the Sulis Meadows development whose roads were not designed for through traffic. It is unsound to route a rat run through a residential area.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

It is also unsound to route a rat run which shifts traffic pressures from part of the road network to another less well able to cope ie cross roads at Cross Keys Midford Road and Southstoke Road and Bradford Road. Bradford Road being already at peak capacity now as is Midford Road

The Consultation document states that mitigation measures for lighting and noise will need to over come the problem with interfering with the passage of bats through and over the site. Any such measures will only partially over come these disturbance problems and not over come them. Any development for residential etc, will incur lighting and noise at night time, how this over come is not stated but will be more intrusive than the spine road on its own. In this case mitigation will be more difficult. The proposed road, and site development, even with mitigation, is unsound.

3.7 The Bat Problem:-

The Greater Horseshoe Bat is a protected species and their conservation is of the utmost importance. The noise and light disturbance has been identified in the above section. The mitigation proposed is lightly glossed over by 'mitigation' elsewhere to the east. Nothing in the document identified how this will be achieved when owners of properties which need to be approached to change their local habitat and lighting environment say no. The mitigation suggested relies on the goodwill of land owners to change their habitat for the long term which cannot be guaranteed. The mitigation proposals are unsound because unknown cooperation is not guaranteed to the required long term level.

4. The Domino Problem

4.1 A major concern is that the western end of the plateau adjacent to Sulis Manor and Sulis Meadows could be considered to accommodate 300 houses without using the Southstoke plateau to the east.

This siting of a new development here will break completely the open view from east to west and hence once having broken the open view it lessens the environmental value of the whole plateau. To reduce the 'open landscape' value of one the highest protected value land possible is unsound. If land is allowed to be used piecemeal for development then domino by domino the plateau will be covered in housing and other developments.

5 Alternatives for Housing

5.1 It was thought given the scale of other housing sites considered for development that the 300 properties was such a small number, relative to the whole number, that a small increase in housing density at all the other sites could be accommodated. No explanation was made as to why this small incremental change in housing density could not be applied. It is unsound for the plateau to be considered for development given its triple protected status with out the development density being specifically stated as to why the housing cannot be spread across the other less protected areas. We apologize for not finding a reference number for this to be linked to.

I have been recently made aware of the additional motion proposed by Katie Hall and Neil Butters and carried without opposition at the special Council Meeting in the Assembly Rooms on March 4th 2013.

The motion being " To request that Cabinet aims to maintain the rural buffer between South Stoke and Bath during the place-making process for 'land at Odd Down'. "

I wish to make an objection in that there is reasonable doubt as to the legality of the exclusion from the sections in the Draft Changes regarding the Southstoke plateau. The Southstoke Parish boundary encompasses the area in consideration. Not including a consideration of the BANES Council's amendment in the published Consultation Document is therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

- 1 All references to the use of the Land adjoining Odd Down should be deleted.
- 2 The density of housing through out or just in Bath be amended to accommodate the 300 houses

Respondent Number: 4637 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ann Green

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not feel the proposed development of South Stoke Plateau for housing is justified. The area is part of the Green Belt where no development should take place unless special circumstances apply. Former Mo D land has recently become available and there are also brown field sites available in the Bath area. Development of the Plateau and the proposed access road would mean that South Stoke would be absorbed into Bath, becoming part of the Greater Bath area, something that a Green Belt should prevent.

The Plateau is also within an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Green Belt and AONB are of great importance to Bath as World Heritage City. Any negative impact on the City's setting would be detrimental to Bath's status as a World Heritage City. In addition there is much of archaeological and scientific importance in the Plateau. One of the few remaining parts of the Wansdyke which is registered as a Scheduled Ancient Monument runs through the area in question. Inappropriate development near a monument of this nature will certainly be visually detrimental and would also be likely to cause it actual harm.

The Plateau is also a foraging area for the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat which would be threatened by development.

For all these reasons I feel the plans for development of the South Stoke Plateau are unsound and indeed run counter to other parts of BANES' policy and of the studies it has commissioned, such as the one undertaken by ARUP.

Change to the policy requested:

The policy should not include any development of any part of the South Stoke Plateau

Respondent Number: 4643 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Joanna Campbell

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1) SPC14 (Need for Greenfield sites) I object to the this paragraph as I believe that if the density of houses on the brownfield sites were to be increased there would be no need to build on the greenfield sites. Council's assessment has shown to sustain the number of houses required for job creation that only 10,000 hours would be required, this would exclude the greenfield sites.

Green Belt requirement is defined in NPPF as "The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open;" The allocation at Odd Down would oppose this policy. Allocation on these fields would constitute urban sprawl expanding the city

SPC88 (Odd Down) NPPF states "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Further paragraphs say "the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and" If the density of housing within other brownfield sites were to be increased. There would be no need to build at Odd Down

The proposals don't fit within the final sentence in this paragraph any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated:-

a) The entire site from Combe Hay Lane to South Stoke lane is in the Cotswold AONB. This, by law demands the highest level of protection against unauthorized development. Added to this, the site can be seen for many miles, light pollution from any development would be detrimental to the AONB in this area.

Major development in an AONB is only allowed if it is in the "Local and National interest".

No proof of this has been provided in this proposal. Indeed elsewhere in the Draft Core Strategy there is specific mention of the great importance of the GB and AONB to the Setting of the World Heritage City of Bath.

The proposed amendments conflict with BANES own policy and so are "unsound"

4) Rare Greater Horseshoe bats forage in the area designated for development. These bats are recognised by European Experts in Wildlife Conservation. Any disturbance would endanger this already rare species. This area is a unique area for

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

these bats, and should not, therefore, be disturbed.

5) The Wansdyke an ancient and important Archaeological feature, and one that is registered as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument'. By definition it must be protected against inappropriate development on, or near it, that might cause actual or visual harm. If the proposed development were to go ahead it would ruin one of the few remaining sections of the Western Wansdyke, accessible to the public. It is important to consider protecting it. Even though a large stretch is within the council's ownership, a management plan has not been developed, destruction has taken place when the council built Threeways school. These proposals will not enhance the setting of the Wansdyke, with the potential for creating urban development both sides of the Wansdyke.

Change to the policy requested:

I propose that the houses required by the government to be built in the Bath area be built on existing Brownfield sites at a greater density that has already proposed.

Respondent Number: 4646 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Bill Geake

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I have just been made aware of your revised strategy which includes housing development very close to Wansdyke ("land adjoining Odd Down"). I am unable to use MS Word on my phone so very much hope you are able to take into account strong views expressed by email.

Wansdyke is a rare example of a long earthwork in the UK. Most others, such as Hadrian's Wall, the Antonine Wall and Offa's Dyke, are cherished and regarded as assets. Bath, so aware of its Roman and Georgian heritage, would be well served if civic leaders could similarly protect its history from other periods.

One of the other ways in which Bath is unique is the feeling of closeness of the countryside. Even from the city centre people can look up and see green space. This is only possible because successive planners have had the courage to resist development close to the city boundaries and the absorption of surrounding but separate communities into the city itself.

Once development impinges on Wansdyke, the space can never be restored. A feature of this size needs space around it to appreciate the scale. And Wansdyke is, as yet, not well studied, perhaps because it isn't famous enough. You have a fine historic asset that could add even more to the draw of Bath as one of the key heritage destinations in Europe.

You don't need me to tell you of the statutory protections this site and the locality has - World Heritage site, AONB, Scheduled Ancient Monument, Conservation Area, Green Belt and so on. These are there for a reason. Over the last 100 years, Britain has understood that the pressures in some places for development should be resisted, because irreplaceable features should not be lost.

I understand that the justification for more housing needed in Bath includes a large number of new jobs that are expected but by no means guaranteed. This expansion of commercial activity in Bath must depend partly on the willingness of planners to support it. At a time when the wider area needs jobs more than the city itself does, is it too much to expect new employers to make use of the hinterland of Radstock, Midsomer Norton, Melksham and Trowbridge, where land is not so hard to find that ancient monuments must be compromised?

If housing is built on this site, principles against development of protected areas will be flaunted, historic South Stoke will be subsumed into urban Bath, and an irreplaceable monument will be compromised for ever.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4647 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Gerard Coles**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not consider the amendments to the B&NES draft core strategy to be sound, particularly proposed change reference number SPC88 .

The South Stoke plateau is within the established, but already narrow Green Belt. Building on the Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances; the Core Strategy fails to explain what the exceptional circumstances are in this case.

It is also an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Development on an AONB is only lawful where it is of local and national interest. No evidence has been put forward to prove that developing this land is of local or national interest. As a popular area to visit by the residents of the city of Bath, I'd say it is in the local interest to maintain it as countryside.

Bath is a World Heritage City, renowned for it's Georgian architecture and as an early example of town planning. With their innovative use of terraces and tall buildings, the Georgians achieved a density of comfortable housing not before seen.

Those fine Georgian terraces now contain everything from studio flats to highly desirable town houses, a true mix of affordable and "executive" housing. A modern day "Georgian quarter" built on the Foxhill MOD site would provide enough housing to negate the need to build on the South Stoke Plateau. Bath must embrace and preserve it's World Heritage status.

Proposed Change Reference number SPC88 must not be adopted.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4648 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Elizabeth Bloor**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1. The area of the site is entirely in Green Belt where there is a presumption against new development and there are no circumstances here that mean the development of the land would outweigh the considerable harm. Green belt is intended to prevent the coalescing of villages with conurbations and the strip between South Stoke and Bath is already narrow as acknowledged in the recent study by ARUP. On this basis the amendment to the Draft Core Strategy is unsound.

2. Part of the site is in an AONB and should therefore be afforded the highest level of protection from development. Other parts of the BANES Draft Core Strategy describes the importance of the AONB in maintaining the setting of the City of Bath as a World Heritage City, the proposed amendment therefore conflicts with BANES own strategy and is unsound.

3. In its review of Bath in 2009 UNESCO it made the following recommendation:

"Also recommends that the State Party enhance the protection of the surrounding landscape of the property to prevent

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

any future developments which could have adverse and cumulative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;" The development proposed would have an adverse impact on the surrounding landscape and could threaten the World Heritage City status of Bath, therefore the amendment is unsound.

4. The Wansdyke is an ancient archaeological feature registered in the Schedule of Ancient Monuments; it must therefore be protected against development on or near it that will have a detrimental impact. BANES own study has shown that the section of the Wansdyke to the west of the site has already been overwhelmed by the development at Sulis Meadow so it is entirely unsound to allow the same damage to the eastern section.

5. The construction of 300 houses and the introduction of an access road linking Sulis Meadow and the B3110 will bring significant traffic on to an already congested road exacerbating the existing problems at the B3110 and Wellsway junction. In addition it will push traffic down Southstoke Road further burdening the junction with Bradford Road and Entry Hill. It is unsound to create a development which will cause traffic log jam and this cannot be considered the 'most sustainable' option.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like to see the change set out in SPC88 deleted from the Draft Core Strategy.

If the increased number of houses is shown to be necessary then consideration should be given to increasing the density in already designated appropriate areas such as Foxhill rather than looking to a green belt area that threatens the Wansdyke and allows the coalescence of Southstoke and Bath

Respondent Number: 4650	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name: Mr Geoff Davis & Ms Tania Rodrigues	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

As residents of South Stoke this proposed amendment is quite clearly unacceptable and UNSOUND from our perspective. This is not NIMBYISM, but just a straightforward assertion as to why, when there are SOUND alternatives, would we risk damage to the World Heritage setting of the City of Bath, the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, significant viewpoints, the Green Belt, a Scheduled Ancient Monument of National importance, an area of ecological importance providing sustenance for a range of endangered species, the integrity of a vibrant village community and conservation area, and an area of countryside of significant leisure importance to very many people in the City of Bath.

All of this is paid 'lip-service' in the amendment, which mutters on about ecological surveys, landscape assessments, and environmental impacts. Many of these surveys and assessments have been done, they just don't accord with what is proposed, and so their conclusions are not stated.

Quite frankly, if you violate the Green Belt by just re-drawing the boundaries at a whim, and facilitate development on this Cotswold Plateau you inevitably damage all of the above, and it is lost forever. This piece of Green Belt is one of the narrowest to be found already, for it to become less so will render it ineffective. Discussions of an access road emerging at the Cross Keys (Item j) are simply impossible to contemplate, the loss of night sky, of wildlife corridors, and inevitable coalescence of the historic village of South Stoke with the city of Bath must lead to the outright rejection of this amendment.

Nowhere in the entire Core Strategy document is there any attempt to set out any reasons of such compelling Local and National importance that such damage and loss should even be contemplated.

Change to the policy requested:

The amendment points d – h cover all the reasons why this location is of special importance, European protected species, significant aspects of landscape (AONB World Heritage Setting), Heritage Assets (Bronze Age, Roman), Conservation Area, and the manifest dangers of its urbanisation. It then goes on to describe that very urbanisation in the other points, provision of Green Infrastructure, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, Cycle and Pedestrian Links, Good Public Transport provision, Junction Improvements, A primary school, waste management infrastructure.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The amendment is wholly inconsistent, self contradictory, and wholly UNSOUND. It can only be removed in its entirety, and the current Green Belt boundaries retained and any proposed development then so constrained.

Respondent Number: 4653 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mary Wynne-Griffiths **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

The proposed need for new accommodation in this area before 2029 does not seem to match the changes being made to office workspace and industrial development. Therefore the number of new jobs and the need for new houses is likely to be less than the proposed amount. If however the proposed developments were found to be sound, I would oppose the change for the following reasons.

1. The land between Odd Down and the village of South Stoke is designated as part of the Cotswolds ANOB. Development of land within an ANOB is only permitted if it is within local and national interest. It is not within local or national interest for the following reasons.
2. The development would degrade Bath's reputation as a World Heritage City. Building beyond the existing line of houses in Odd Down would spoil the setting of the city and jeopardise its WH status.
3. It is important to preserve the special character of the village of South Stoke.
4. The green belt separating the village of South Stoke from the outer city is already very narrow, but is also an area of outstanding natural beauty.
5. The ancient Wansdyke exists on a large part of the land being considered, the setting of this monument should be protected from development.
6. The development would have a damaging effect on the foraging area of the Greater Horseshoe Bat, which has a protected status, reducing the available area and causing noise and light disturbance.
7. Traffic is already a serious problem in Bath that has not been successfully resolved. The proposed development would result in a greater influx of traffic on to roads in the area that are already overused.

The above reasons outline the need for the preservation of the green belt area between Odd Down and South Stoke, and show that it would not be sustainable for Bath to accommodate development in this area.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy DW1, clause 4 should be deleted from the proposed Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 4656 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr & Mrs SR Pennock **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

We are writing to comment on the proposal to build 300 homes on the South Stoke plateau and urge you to reject this plan. Building across the plateau area to the east of Sulis Meadows will naturally produce coalescence between the city of Bath and the village of South Stoke. An avenue of trees along Southstoke Lane and bordering Brantwood will only superficially separate Bath from South Stoke. The proposed number of new houses in the development will significantly outnumber the dwellings in South Stoke, and the village will lose its identity and become part of the conurbation of the City of Bath. The building would be across an already quite narrow Green Belt area, and we do not see that there are any special circumstances that have been put forward to warrant building across the Green Belt. The area is also part of the Cotswold AONB, and building 300 new homes will not maintain the beauty of the area.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

We live in South Stoke and enjoy the Parish Council's decisions to maintain low level street lighting. The development of the Plateau and its associated roads must lead to greater light and noise pollution across the area and its surroundings. The area is a known foraging area for the threatened Greater Horseshoe bats who enjoy living in this environment. The B3110 is already a tremendously busy road, especially at peak travel times. The A367 clearly has a greater capacity for traffic, has better public transport in the number of bus routes and frequency of buses, and the very good Park and Ride facility at Odd Down. We believe that a road crossing the plateau from the Cross Keys through to a new development of housing will become a "rat run" and make the local roads even more dangerous. Also the local wildlife will be detrimentally affected.

South Stoke nestles tranquilly in it's peaceful setting, unlike other villages which have been consumed into the city sprawl. We would like it to stay that way. The green belt is a haven for walkers who have nowhere nearer to walk. The South Stoke Plateau area is currently used for agriculture, and is a pleasant area enjoyed by the residents and dog walkers of South Stoke, Odd Down and Sulis Meadows. Surely this green belt is important to maintain the World Heritage status Bath enjoys at the moment. Do you really want to jeopardise this status?

Of course, we also have the Scheduled Ancient Monument, The Wansdyke. This should be protected for all to enjoy and walk along. Any development will ruin this and it must be protected. The development of Sulis Meadows has reduced part of The Wansdyke to a rather wide grass route where the Wansdyke is rather hidden and breached by unofficial pathways. The proposed development of the South Stoke Plateau will further obscure the Wansdyke and probably lead to more damage. Surely, in it's way, it is as important to our heritage as the Roman Baths and Georgian buildings. It should not be desecrated any more by inappropriate development.

We urge you not to ruin the rest of this beautiful plateau with any more building, and end it as a haven and amenity for wildlife and people alike. This part of the plateau is the natural Green Belt area that prevents the coalescence of South Stoke and the City of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

We urge you to reject the building of 300 houses on the Green Belt land adjoining Odd Down and South Stoke.

Respondent Number: 4661	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Debra Mann	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The area in question – land adjoining Odd Down is entirely in the Green Belt. One of the important uses of Green Belt is to prevent the merging between settlements, in this case between Bath and Southstoke. According to the Council's own report on Bristol/Bath it states that the open Green Belt area between Bath and Southstoke is already too narrow. Thus the amended draft Core Strategy fails this test and should be considered unsound in principle. The beauty of this Green Belt site sets it apart from an ordinary Green Belt site. For example, this area has open panoramic views, stone walls, and an ancient monument which is of great historic importance. The entire site is classed as an Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is in the Cotswold AONB. This has by statute the highest level of protection against development. Major development in a AONB is only allowed if it is in the local and national interest. No proof of this has been provided in this proposal. In fact, development on this site would be against local and national interest because it could potentially affect the setting of the World Heritage City of Bath.

Building on green field sites in a World Heritage site would damage the setting of Bath and damage it's World Heritage status. This would have a massive impact on tourism in Bath and would have an effect both locally and nationally. BaNES support the World Heritage site on the one hand but is putting it at risk with this development proposal. This makes the Core Strategy unsound.

The Wansdyke is a very important archaeological feature and surely any development on it or near it would cause actual or visual harm. BaNES own study states that parts of the Wansdyke has already been affected by the development at Sulis Meadows. This is unsound in principle. The area is also of significant importance and has been recognised by European experts in wildlife conservation as an important foraging area for the very rare Greater Horseshoe bat. The noise and light pollution would cause real harm to this already threatened species .

The amount of traffic on the B3110 / Wellsway junction will be exacerbated by this development especially if the nearby

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Foxhill development goes ahead as planned.

Change to the policy requested:

Rather than build on a Green Field site of AONB it would be better to increase the development density on an already proposed brown field site such as Foxhill.

Respondent Number: 4666 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Jane Hellard

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This land lies mainly within the rural Parish of South Stoke.

It is also:

- Within the Green Belt.
- Within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Land in which a Scheduled Ancient Monument, The Wansdyke, lies.
- A foraging area for protected species of bats and 'rare' birds.
- A narrow and natural open space separating the urban area from the distinctive and ancient village of South Stoke which lies within a Conservation Area (Ref. South Stoke Conservation Area Appraisal). As such it is both important to the setting of the World Heritage Site and to the setting of South Stoke village.

I believe that B&NES' plan to use any of this land for development is both 'unjust' and 'unsound' for the following reasons:

- The NPPF seeks to give 'great weight to conserving AONBs', recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, the need to reinforce local distinctiveness, to protect tranquil areas from noise, to limit light pollution and to protect the setting of historic assets.
- Reports commissioned by B&NES have identified a considerable number of 'problems' with this sight, in relation to development, and the difficulties posed by trying to mitigate them; in particular:

The SHLAA (2013)

The Green Belt Review (2013)

The Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L

The Landscape and Visual Impact Report

These reports suggest that a decision to remove this land from the Green Belt and to develop in this AONB and so close to a Scheduled Ancient Monument and a unique village protected within a Conservation Area would be 'unsound'.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like SPC 88 to be deleted from The Amendments to The Core Strategy, together with all other references to 'development' on the 'Land adjacent to Odd Down'. I strongly believe that Bath should be treated as a special site and spillage beyond the current city boundary should be prevented, available areas within the city should be used sensitively and the area should not be overdeveloped.

Respondent Number: 4671 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Colin Webb

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Under the National Planning Policy Framework Greenfield sites and unprotected countryside have become easy targets for development. While the country need more affordable housing those making development decisions must listen to local

people about how best to provide it, and in this case there has been no consultation with the residents of Southstoke Road on the immediate northern edge of the proposed development (at the junction of which with Midford Road improvements are suggested (88J) - Point 10) (which of necessity would be major as it appears there will be only two entrance/exits to the development – this is described as ‘the principle vehicular access’.)

There is no indication of an adequate review of the infrastructure to support the development in conflict with A3 Key Objective L6 of the original Local Plan as posted on the Council’s website and which presumably is therefore still relevant

The development conflicts with many aspects of the earlier B&NES local plan – specifically:

A2.8 Bath’s unique environment should be conserved – ‘ It emphasises the need to give a high priority to reducing road traffic and congestion affecting the City and other urban areas.’ With one major entrance/exit of the development onto an existing traffic bottleneck is hardly a high priority. Congestion here is already significant and Southstoke Road is already used as a rat run in peak times through to Entry Hill and the further blockage at the cross road at Bradford Road. Congestion on these perimeter roads will be increased not reduced.

A2.14 (6) 2 “There should be no strategic changes to the Green Belt” – this is major strategic change.

A3 Key Objectives L. 5 ‘To reduce all forms of pollution and emissions including air, noise and light, pollution’ The development will have the opposite effect with regard to noise and light pollution.

A3.20 “The LP strategy is to continue to safeguard the countryside for its own sake and policies to protect and enhance environmental resources will continue to take a high priority” Clearly in the case of this proposed development this is a platitude of the highest order.

A3.26 There is no evidence submitted whereby the development will need to be “sensitive to the character of existing settlements and conserve historic, wildlife and landscape resources.” The proposed development is blatantly insensitive to these issues.

A5.24 With only two entrance/exit points the development hardly has “ as many safely designed access points as possible” and there is no evidence that the development will “ successfully integrate with their wider context” and if the “wider context” is all areas south and north of the development the answer is “no it will not successfully integrate into the wider context” despoiling as it will do the established green belt land which does successfully integrate with the wider context which successfully provides a defining barrier between the city and the environs and village settlement of South Stoke.

As at C1.1 in which the characteristics of Green Belts are defined having been “designated primarily in order to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.” Exactly so and something the development ignores.

A5.33 “The character of an area should take precedence over the desire to maximise density.” Indeed how true and something that the development fails to recognise.

C1.8 Again here the significance of the Green Belt is emphasised in relation to the City of Bath in which it “ plays a vital role in maintaining the setting of the World Heritage Site and the surrounding villages.”

“It is also important in preventing the coalescence of these villages with the city.” The proposed development will cojoin the village of South Stoke to the city to become another example of urban sprawl.

C1.31 “ there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the GB. “

Any development should only be contemplated in context to “very special circumstances where the harm to the openness and purposes of the GB is clearly outweighed by other considerations.” The other considerations as proposed by this development do not constitute such special circumstances.

C2.1 The Local Plan identifies issues to do with the protection of the natural environment and recognises that some recent changes have already proved “harmful to our natural assets with a decline in biodiversity and degradation of the countryside.” The development will further contribute to this process and erode further what is recognised as “The District’s high quality environment” as a key asset in which “The distinctive villages, diverse landscapes [etc etc] reflect centuries of human settlement.”

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

C2.6 “ Landscape contributes significantly to the identity of an area, forming the setting for day to day life, in village, town, city and countryside. It is a resource for recreation, a reservoir for recreation and an environment for plants and animals.” The development will erode all these core values.

C2.8 The Local Plan state that “ The Council seeks to limit development of Greenfield sites and directs limited development to rural settlements” “This embodies national guidance that the country side is an asset in its own right and buildingshould be strictly controlled.”

In summary this is a massively complex set of changes in relation to this specific locality. The due process of change to the core strategy has not been adequately promoted by the Council for residents to fully comprehend and respond with anything like a fully informed understanding of the process.

Change to the policy requested:

To remove all new wording and reference to the proposed development on the Land Adjoining Odd Down Bath.

Respondent Number: 4673 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Alexander Campbell **Respondent Organisation:** Bristol city Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC88 (Odd Down) NPPF states “Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest.” Further paragraphs say “the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way;” AS I understand it, were the existing brownfield sites to be developed with increased density there would be no need to build on a designated AONB.

I do not believe that it can be argued effectively that the current proposals fit within the final sentence in this paragraph “any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.” Clearly an AONB, enjoyed by many hundreds of local residents will be for ever lost. Habitat used by foraging Horseshoe bats will be obliterated and the Wansdyke – a Scheduled Ancient Monument’ will be altered irrevocably. AONB’s such as this one, protected by statute are protected for a reason – they are areas of outstanding natural beauty, these proposals ride rough-shod over this concept. The existing housing development, were it to be linked to the new development would become a major traffic route into Bath/Combe Down – the resulting impact on the quality of life for those living along Sulis Manor Road and others would be significant.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4675 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Anna Whitson **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to register my objection to the amended proposal for 300 houses to be built on the south stoke plateau for a number of reasons:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The Wansdyke memorial is of great historical importance and should not be impacted.

The area concerned is of outstanding natural beauty, appreciated by many, especially as part of the southern tip of the Cotswolds.

The fields concerned are an essential area of green belt land between the village of South Stoke & the city of Bath.

700 houses are due to be built on the old MOD site at Foxhill. There will therefore already be a substantial increase in traffic within a mile of this new proposal. Houses are needed & the MOD site would be a perfect re-use of land. Destroying valuable green belt areas is not.

The proposed change / addition of traffic access via South Stoke Lane would have a huge impact on those people living in South Stoke road & the immediate area. These roads are already extremely busy at rush hour alone, never mind at other times of the day & night. The community has fully accepted the need for housing at the MOD site, this extra development would be terrible for the whole image of Bath both within and from outside as a world heritage city.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4676 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Annie Saberwal

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I write to protest at the proposed building of 300 houses on Southstoke Plateau. I am astonished that this Green Belt group of beautiful fields in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty has been targeted for development as it already serves a very useful purpose in providing a wonderful green area with a network of walks for all people who choose to take advantage of that as well as providing lush, productive soil on which to produce excellent crops.

I see from the Information Leaflet that there is a presumption against new development in a Green Belt Zone unless "very special circumstances can be shown to exist....." - so what are the special circumstances and who decides whether these apply? Is this decision made in consultation with and with the agreement of local persons who are very significantly affected by these huge decisions and which may well have a negative effect on the balance and lifestyle of their lives and of the neighbouring area. That lifestyle and the conditions in which people choose to live are a major part of our understanding of rural life and should not be ridden rough shod over by a predatory building plan which sees a green space and wishes to gobble it up without a sound reason.

Village people live without many of the advantages available to 'townies' yet they pay for them as part of their Council Tax. They choose to do this as the benefits of rural life are quite different to that of town dwellers and their lifestyle also deserves recognition and consideration. To get in the diggers and concrete the whole space is a travesty of town planning - where is The Plan and why haven't we heard of it before now? Some people have brought up the Bat problem but I say People first - and shouldn't rural people be protected from predatory interlopers who ruin their way of life - it is tantamount to village cleansing ie telling them to shut up, stop being a nimby and just learn to have the same lives as everyone else.

Surely the most crucial consideration for all this importing of huge numbers of new Council Tax payers, must be JOBS - and where are they? I understand that the council have said that they will encourage light industry in the city. Why haven't they been doing this for the past 20 years? Small business are crippled by Bath rates and it is an unproven case that people will come here and be able to afford to employ others as well as pay the Business rate. Many of the newcomers are likely to be unemployed - do you really want to develop all this, the housing estates, the roads, the infrastructure, so that people can make their way to the city to pick up their benefits?

Developing Foxhill, Bathampton and Endsleigh will bring lots of people to the City - let's see how that goes first and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

welcome these new residents by ensuring they have work and all facilities. How many people do we need in Bath? - and where are they coming from? - what about those areas now denuded of residents? There are several large and small developments in the city - even in Combe Down itself there are 40 flats in the process of being built. The development of the whole of the Southstoke plateau will have a huge impact on the life of people up here on the Down. I urge you to listen to local people. We definitely do not want this development. We are tired of accepting everything you throw at us in the interests of Heritage Bath. Please remember that as members of the public and long time citizens we too are part of Bath Heritage. We love this city and want it to be welcoming and available to people from all walks of life so that they can enjoy the traditions of our past and our present; our town and our countryside. As Combe Downers and Southstoke Residents, we know we need to protect this Ancient Area, Wansdyke, from people who have no idea of the subtleties which are so valued in our lives. We know that if this happens we shall just be another satellite of Bath. We urge you to hear our voice

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4678 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nick South **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

B&NES proposed change to the extent of the green belt directly contravenes almost every aspect of its own green belt policy and will do irreparable harm to the setting of the South Stoke Conservation Area.

The first purpose of Green Belt is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. To further emphasise the importance in this case, B&NES includes a 6th (local) purpose of Green Belt: To preserve the individual character, identity and setting of villages and hamlets within the Green Belt.

As is pointed out in the council's Green Belt Review (Final Draft Feb 2013), "in particular the Green Belt gap between Bath and South Stoke is very narrow, to the extent that even relatively limited developments could threaten coalescence with the large built up area". The construction of 300 houses on land between Odd Down and South Stoke will certainly result in that irrevocable and unacceptable coalescence.

Moreover, the countryside that it will encroach upon is part of the Cotswold's AONB and therefore features highly in landscape value and enhancement and visual amenity (Purpose 3A).

The Green Belt also exists to assist in urban regeneration (purpose 5), by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Three Bath MoD sites have just been sold to developers IM Properties, Square Bay and Curio, planning to build over 1,100 residential units. Crest Nicholson is also planning the next phases of their 2,200+ unit Bath Western Riverside development, aided by the award of LEP funds to remediate the former gas holder site.

In fact, according to the SHLAA Site Assessments (Feb 2013), there are brownfield sites in Bath, which are available and have a high suitability for a total of 5,199 housing units. A further 235 are available and of moderate / high suitability.

Ward Housing Potential (High suitability / Available) Ward Housing Potential (High suitability / Available)

Abbey 360+ Odd Down 80

Bathwick 133 Oldfield 118

Combe Down 700 Twerton 195

Kingsmead 394 Walcot 41

Lambridge 46 Westmoreland 2411

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Lansdown 441 Weston 78
 Lyncombe 18 Widcombe 14
 Newbridge 170 TOTAL 5199

B&NES has a duty to ensure that brownfield sites are developed before greenfield, and if there is further need for housing towards the end of the term, then that is the time that Green Belt boundaries should be examined, NOT when there are adequate brownfield sites to meet the housing needs of the foreseeable future.

Although developers will always seek easy returns by building on greenfield sites, rather than investing in unlocking brownfield sites for development, B&NES is entrusted with the custodianship of a World Heritage Site and of large swathes of AONB, Green Belt and Conservation Areas, and its citizens have a right to expect it to preserve these highly valued assets for the benefit of current and future generations.

Planning for the future is vital and a well-structured Core Strategy is central to this process. However, these changes to Green Belt, and removing Land adjoining Odd Down in particular, are an ill-considered short-term decision to meet an arbitrary housing provision number that may or may not be needed in the next couple of decades. Despite the best intentions of B&NES, employment number in Bath have been falling, not rising, and there is no certainty that the level of houses that are being provided for, will be needed within the timeframe of the plan.

We should monitor demand and bring forward changes to Green Belt only when it is absolutely necessary. That time is not yet upon us.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy DW1, Paragraph 4: Retaining the general extent of Bath Green Belt with B&NES, with no strategic change to the boundaries to land adjoining Odd Down, nor Weston.

Respondent Number: 4682	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: David Webster	Respondent Organisation: Verhoef Training Ltd
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I would like to see changes to the proposed 300 houses on SouthStoke Plateau as it is unsound on the grounds of trafficability. If the main entrance is to be opposite the Cross Keys then Southstoke Road and Entry Hill will become a major thoroughfare giving access to and from the city centre. Inevitably this will also impact Greenway Lane. None of these roads are suitable for this purpose. Wellsway and Bradford/North Road suffer heavy congestion already and could not cope with more, particularly when considering the additional impact of the proposed development in Foxhill as well.

Change to the policy requested:

I propose, therefore, the plan be stopped.

Respondent Number: 4682	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: David Webster	Respondent Organisation: Verhoef Training Ltd
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I would like to see changes to the proposed 300 houses on SouthStoke Plateau as it is unsound because of the destruction

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

of green belt land. The area proposed for development lies in an area of natural beauty, close to a world heritage city and immediately adjacent to a scheduled ancient monument.

Change to the policy requested:

For this reason I propose the plan be stopped.

Respondent Number: 4683 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Christina Sandford

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Submitted Core Strategy is unsound because it is questionable whether the number of houses needed will be as many as forecast. The land at South Stoke has been added as a default measure when the number of houses said to be needed was increased.

The land at Odd Down should not be included in the changes because:

1. It is entirely within the Cotswold AONB and is a significant wildlife area on the edge of the city of Bath, including foraging bats and nesting skylarks.
2. Bath's World Heritage status would be compromised if its cordon sanitaire of green fields on the South side were further eroded.
3. The Wansdyke runs along the side of the fields in question and is a precious ancient monument which should be protected.
4. The conservation area and village of South Stoke would be subsumed into greater Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove land adjoining Odd Down from the proposed additional strategic development at Bath.

Respondent Number: 4686 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Felicity Gourley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I attach the Core Strategy Proposed Changes Form Parts 1 & 2. In particular I object to the insertion of clause SPC88, Policy B3A – the proposal to build 300 houses on the South Stoke / Odd Down Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I am disappointed that this is even being proposed at all as I believe it is harmful and unnecessary.

The multiple references to "land adjacent to Odd Down" should actually refer to the South Stoke/Odd Down AONB as the area is all within South Stoke Parish. This includes references in the following paragraphs: SPC15, SPC24 (page 20, policy DW1, Clause 4), SPC 30 (page 21, diagram 4), SPC54 (page 34, policy B1 (3) a-b), SPC87 (para 2.30 A&B); SPC88 (policy B3A). The most significant is the insertion of SPC88 which refers to building 300 houses on this area.

- The apparent need to build dwellings on registered areas of natural beauty seems to be unnecessary – there are a number of brown field areas closer to the city centre (and therefore more convenient for future residents) which, although

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

more expensive to build upon, would improve the appearance of the city and help to preserve World Heritage status.

- The proposed development space is extremely close to the village of South Stoke, indeed, within both seeing and hearing range. This is an issue; traditional villages like this are increasingly rare in the UK and should be preserved from a historical point of view. South Stoke in particular adds to the tourist destination feel of Bath as it is a 'quaint' and pretty village for tourists to visit and walk around. Development of any kind so close to the village would have a severely damaging effect on that quality.
- The Wansdyke is a unique and ancient walk; the proposed development is extremely likely to cause environmental damage to it, especially to the Greater Horseshoe Bat species which forages there. It should be protected from inappropriate development near it and yet the Arup study points out that it has already been threatened by the development at Sulis Meadows. If the core strategy is put into place then it is almost definite that further damage will be done, perhaps irreparably.
- The proposed development site is in a very visible area and would spoil views from Bath, potentially harming its World Heritage status. The University of Bath already provides proof for this being a very real threat. Although the core strategy mentions a buffer zone for South Stoke, it is unclear what the extent of this will be. It would need to be from the Cross Keys Pub and encompass all the houses along South Stoke lane. There is a tree belt planted by the landowner, however, this is laughably insufficient.
- The proposal is the start of a slippery slope. A recent proposal for 2,000 dwellings from the same landowner has been denied and although that particular proposal is no longer being debated, it would be foolish to ignore it. It is entirely possible that, after 300 houses have been built, a push for more development could surface.
- Traffic in the area is already an issue, especially along the B3110 and the A367. Adding another 300 cars minimum would make congestion intolerable, as well as having an extremely negative impact on the environment. Although there are buses, these are limited, unsustainably expensive and would not necessarily reduce congestion as the lack of routes and ticket prices mean that people are still likely to drive. The increased congestion would make it dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. There are also schools and a lot of families with young children in the area, heavy traffic when children are walking to school would be very dangerous. Light pollution from street lights would also ruin the natural beauty of the area.
- Small developments of housing, particularly starter, low cost and retirement homes are definitely needed in areas around B&NES, however, these should be developed to fit in and enhance the area in smaller groups so as not to put pressure on a city which was never designed for so high a concentration of populace. It seems as though the easiest and cheapest route has been taken rather than the route which is not only in the best interests of the locals people who benefit from the area (i.e. tourists) but also in the best interests of potential future residents of proposed houses.

Change to the policy requested:

I want SPC88 Policy B3A - the proposal to build 300 houses on the South Stoke/Odd Down AONB - to be removed completely. Seems to be an easy but damaging course of action, rather than a route which will improve B&NES as a county.

Respondent Number: 4690

Comment Number: 2

Respondent Name:

Respondent Organisation: Savills

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We are extremely concerned that the affordable housing policy is not founded upon robust and credible viability evidence and is not therefore justified.

The viability evidence which has informed the policy position appears to have adopted very simplistic and unduly optimistic assumptions in relation to a number of the important viability inputs. The evidence is also inconsistent with key elements of the helpful cross-sector guidance in 'Viability Testing Local Plans'.

Our principal concerns in relate to the evidence relate to the following:

- Threshold / Benchmark Land Value;
- Development Costs;
- Site Coverage;
- Code for Sustainable Homes;
- Viability Buffer; and
- Planning Risk.

Threshold / Benchmark Land Value

There is very little commentary or explanation within either the original June 2010 Viability Study or the update in December 2012 regarding the appropriate 'threshold' or 'benchmark' land value against which development viability should be judged. Reference is made in paragraphs 3.52 – 3.55 to residential and industrial benchmark land values across the south west from the Property Market Report, however, there appears to be no explanation as to how these have been taken into account in the viability testing process and what, if any, premium has been attached to existing value to incentivise a landowner to dispose of land.

It is extremely important that this information is provided in order that it can be properly tested to ensure that the hypothetical residual land values derived from the viability testing process are sufficient to incentivise the release of land, consistent with the provisions of paragraph 173 of the NPPF.

Development Costs

The Viability Study incorporates a very simplistic approach to development costs. Appendix 3 of the evidence confirms that the build costs are based on BCIS data and, in response to comments made at the stakeholder workshop, an uplift has been applied to reflect the cost of building within Bath and North East Somerset. This appears to be a reasonable approach to base build costs as the requirements for design quality and materials in Bath in particular often result in significantly higher than the average. However, no allowance appears to have been made to cover site service costs, infrastructure requirements or abnormal development costs.

BCIS provides average build costs based upon a cleared and serviced development plot. As the guidance in 'Viability Testing Local Plans' explains (see Appendix B), the cost indices "rarely provide data on the costs associated with providing serviced housing parcels, i.e. strategic infrastructure costs, which are typically in the order of £17,000 - £23,000 per plot for large scale schemes". There does not appear to have been any allowance made within the viability testing process to take into account the infrastructure costs associated with residential development other than an allowance for Section 106 contributions. Section 106 costs are separate and in addition to the site infrastructure works which are necessary to enable a developer to "open up" a site for development.

Furthermore, there is no allowance within the viability testing for any abnormal costs which may be associated with, for example, demolition, remediation, flood risk mitigation, strategic landscaping etc. It is important to note that whilst these costs are often referred to as 'abnormal', they are only abnormal in the sense that they are not incorporated into standard cost assumptions. They are not abnormal in the sense that they are uncommon, or the exception to the rule. Abnormal costs are extremely prevalent in Bath, particularly given the reliance upon the redevelopment of previously developed sites within the urban area in delivering the strategic housing requirement. Indeed, many of the sites within the central area and on the river corridor will require demolition and on-site flood mitigation measures as a minimum.

The inclusion of an allowance for non-standard development costs is endorsed by the RICS Professional Guidance entitled 'Financial Viability in Planning' (2012). This states at paragraph E.3.2.4.1 that:

"a typical viability assessment includes provisions for exceptional costs. This might include an unusual sewerage connection facility, high levels of site contamination and the need for extensive remedial works, flooding, site boundary and stabilisation works, particularly if there are substructure obstacles to overcome.

These exceptional site costs, or 'abnormals', inflate costs as well as adding to the timeframe for the delivery of a scheme. Historic costs may also be reasonable and appropriate."

Given the nature of abnormal costs in Bath, in order to provide sufficient and robust evidence of viability across the Authority area, we consider that the viability evidence should reflect the economics of development, incorporating an allowance for non-standard development costs.

This concern is exacerbated by the fact that there is also no allowance within the viability evidence of any contingency on the build costs. We have assessed a number of viability studies produced to inform the production of Local Plans and CIL Charging Schedules and the general approach is to include a 5% build cost contingency in the analysis of residential developments. For example, the GVA report (June 2012) for Swindon Borough Council and the BNP Paribas (August 2012) report for Wiltshire Council both include a 5% contingency.

In our experience this is a relatively standard assumption and one we would fully expect to be included in the Viability Evidence in addition to an allowance for 'abnormal' development costs.

Site Coverage

The methodology used in the viability evidence tests only a notional one hectare site and smaller development site case studies. In so doing, it fails to recognise the difference between and gross and net site areas and to incorporate an appropriate allowance to reflect the coverage of larger sites.

Appendix B of Viability Testing Local Plans is again helpful in this regard. Here it states that:

"in all but the smallest redevelopment schemes, the net developable area is significantly smaller than the gross area that is required to support the development, given the need to provide open space, play areas, community facility sites, public realm, land for sustainable urban drainage schemes. The net area can account for less than 50%, and sometimes as little as 30% on larger sites, of the sites to be acquired. Failure to take account of this difference can result in flawed assumptions and inaccurate viability studies".

The difference between the gross area of land which a developer needs to purchase for the development and the net developable area from which they can extract profit, is extremely important. In order to properly test the viability within an area it is therefore necessary to make an appropriate allowance in order to take this factor into consideration.

Code for Sustainable Homes

Reference is made in both the original Viability Study and the 2012 Update to the impact of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Despite clearly recognising the implications for build costs that the introduction of Code Level 4 would have, the evidence simply dismisses this rather than acknowledging the implications in the viability evidence and making robust assumptions based upon forthcoming changes to the energy and sustainability requirements for new development.

Furthermore, the evidence completely ignores the Government's commitment to achieving zero carbon development by 2016 and the implications that this would have on build costs which will come into effect in less than three years.

The approach to testing viability over time is addressed on page 26 of 'Viability Testing Local Plans' (June 2012). In general it concludes that current costs and values should be used in viability testing, however, there is one exception to this rule. On this matter it states:

"The one exception to the use of current costs and current values should be recognition of significant national regulatory changes to be implemented, particularly during the first five years, where these will bring a change to current costs over which the developer or local planning authority has little or no control. A key example of this is the forthcoming change to Building Regulations arising from the Government's zero carbon agenda."

Since the additional costs of Code Level 5 for all developments will come into effect in such a short period of time it is, in our view, reasonable to include this within the Viability Evidence. This approach accords with this guidance in 'Viability Testing Local Plans' and provides a far more reasonable position than relying upon viability evidence which will be out of date at such an early point in the plan period.

The approach adopted in the viability evidence is quite clearly contrary to the guidance within 'Viability Testing Local Plans'

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

and does not provide any justification as to why it is preferable to ignore the implications of tightening energy and sustainability requirements rather than address these within the viability evidence.

Viability Buffer

The Viability Evidence draws its conclusions based upon evidence which uses average assumptions. Very few development sites will however ever come forward with costs which are the same as those within the viability evidence, or revenues the same as the average. It follows therefore that only those sites where the assumptions are equal to or in combination are more profitable than the average will be achievable.

There will inevitably be a large number of sites which come forward within Bath & North East Somerset where the average figures are not achievable and thus the affordable housing policy requirement presents a significant risk to the delivery of the strategic housing requirement. In order to overcome this it is necessary to build into the methodology a 'viability buffer' which reduces the residual land value to be tested against the threshold figure.

We strongly advocate the inclusion of a suitable viability buffer within the methodology used in the Viability Evidence to ensure that the affordable housing policy requirement is not set at the maximum achievable for an average scheme within the authority area.

Planning Risk

The developer profit included in the Viability Evidence makes not allowance for the cost of risk inherent in the planning process. Whilst a developer would expect a return of circa 20% of GDV for immediate development opportunities, where there remains a risk in the planning process, for example in the promotion of strategic sites through the development plan process, then a significantly higher profit level is required to offset this risk.

This approach is endorsed in Viability Testing Local Plans which addresses this matter on pages 31 and 32. The guidance concludes that the planning risk should be accounted for in the treatment of the threshold land value. Whether planning risk is accounted for through threshold land values or the profit margin is not important. What is important is that the financial cost of the planning risk is taken into account at some point in the process.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above we not consider that the viability evidence produced on behalf of the Council in support of the proposed affordable housing targets provides a sufficiently robust and credible understanding of the economics of residential development across Bath & North East Somerset.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4692 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Grainger plc

Agent ID: 123 **Agent Name:** Savills (L&P)

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support much of the policy wording introduced through the Core Strategy revisions to Policy B3A. The land adjoining Odd Down is, in our view, the most appropriate and suitable location for a strategic urban extension to Bath. We also support the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan in accordance with Criterion (B) and the incorporation of appropriate Green Infrastructure within the masterplan proposals (Criterion C). The land available at Odd Down is of a scale such that it can incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage systems and pedestrian and cycle links within the site (Criterion C).

Furthermore, the site is of a size capable of incorporating ecological mitigation measures to address the Bradford-upon-Avon Bats and Mells SACs (Criterion D). Appropriate landscaping can be incorporated within the proposals to reflect the location of the site and preserve the integrity of the AONB (Criterion E) and the masterplan can address the presence of heritage assets in a positive manner (Criterion F and G).

Development of the scale proposed is also capable of addressing its infrastructure requirements in relation to public transport (Criterion I), transport infrastructure (Criterion J), education facilities (Criterion L) and waste management infrastructure (Criterion M).

Grainger do not therefore consider that there are any provisions within Policy B3A which are either inappropriate, unnecessary or would put the deliverability of development in jeopardy. Indeed, subsequent application proposals are capable of accommodating all hard and soft infrastructure requirements and integrating the development effectively with the urban area to the north and AONB to the south.

Where Grainger do however object is to the scale of growth proposed and the rigidity of the affordable housing policy requirement.

Scale of Housing Growth

The land adjacent to Odd Down is allocated for a total of 300 dwellings. It is unclear how this figure has been derived and what evidence has been produced by the Council to indicate to the Council that 300 dwellings is the appropriate scale for the allocation.

We consider that 300 dwellings represents a significant under-estimation of the capacity of the site and would not make the most efficient and effective use of the land available adjacent to Odd Down.

Considerable work has been undertaken on behalf of the Hignett Family Trust to investigate the key planning considerations pertaining to the land under their control. Full details of this are provided in the representations submitted on behalf of the Trust and in order to avoid duplication these are not repeated in these representations. The work that has been undertaken on behalf of the Trust confirms that there are no over-riding constraints to development of the wider area under its ownership which cannot be addressed through careful masterplanning and incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures.

This conclusions is substantiated by work undertaken on behalf of the Local Planning Authority by Arup entitled "Land Adjoining Odd Down: Development Concept Options Report" (April 2013), the "Transport Evaluation" (February 2013) and the "Odd Down Landscape and Visual Impact Study" (April 2013).

The Arup Report provides the most comprehensive assessment of the site produced by the Council and contains a helpful analysis of the land, the constraints and opportunities and development concept options. Whilst we recognise that the Report is not the work of the Council and, as stated at paragraph 1.1 "it has no planning status", it nevertheless represents an independent and informed analysis of the development potential for the land adjoining Odd Down.

There are a number of references within the Arup analysis which support our contention that the land adjoining Odd Down is capable of accommodating an increased scale of development. Relevant extracts from Section 3.2 are as follows:

- The study area lies to the south of Odd Down and offers the opportunity to support the future sustainability of the existing neighbourhood. Development at this location could be potentially connect well to existing facilities and improve the critical mass within the community to enhance the sustainability of the services provided.
- Primary access to the east and the west provide good access to public transport corridors with the potential to connect bus services through the study area.
- The study area provides the opportunity to respond positively to the topographical constraints, the unique environment and existing conditions found on this southern slope. The design can respond to visual constraints and integrate public access, ecological services and improve biodiversity to improve the relationship that the City has with the countryside along this edge.

- The site layout will provide a good opportunity to enhance the environment to the south and utilise existing ecological assets and biodiversity to help define the character of development in this area. Furthermore, sensitive treatment of the green space within the development would help enhance wildlife corridors and improve the green infrastructure value.

Section 3.3 of the study applies an analysis of topography, designated land, existing facilities and visual impact to define the development strategy area. This analysis, on pages 25 – 26 of the document, clearly demonstrates that the important considerations, which have been taken into account in defining the development area, exclude only a small triangle on the western edge of the study area and the land surrounding Sulis Manor from the identified developable area.

Two development options are subsequently provided and a development quantum identified on the basis of a simple assessment based upon average densities. Under both options, the identified quantum of development is approximately 760 dwellings, considerably more than the 300 dwellings that the land is allocated for within the Core Strategy. It is important to note that this quantum of housing is derived from a thorough, independent assessment of the constraints and opportunities pertaining to the site and therefore provides a constraint-based assessment of development capacity within the land adjoining Odd Down.

Section 6.1 of the study provides a general overview of the residential development land market and deals specifically with delivery of land adjoining Odd Down. The study correctly identifies on page 41 that the site was in the ownership of the Hignett Family Trust and Crest and that it has been identified as available by the landowners. It should be noted that the Hignett Family Trust now own all of the land identified in the Arup Report and hence can reaffirm that there are no legal or ownership constraints to deliverability.

The subsequent bullet points indicates that there is a market preference for smaller, market-ready sites within Bath and that there have been very few large tranches of land of a comparable scale to Odd Down that have come forward for residential development. The latter point is true, however, this is only true because of planning policy constraints restricting development of this scale, not because there is no appetite in the market for housing delivery on land tranches of land.

Grainger can confirm unequivocally to the Local Planning Authority and Inspector that should the land adjoining Odd Down be identified for 1,000 dwellings then there should be no doubt that this scale of growth is deliverable within the plan period. Grainger have considerable expertise of delivering significant urban extensions. Examples of sites promoted by Grainger include:

- Longstrops | Martlesham, Ipswich – circa 1,000 dwellings;
- Berewood, Hampshire – circa 2,550 dwellings; and
- Aldershot Urban Extension, Hampshire – circa 4,500 dwellings.

With their expertise and experience in this area and market knowledge of Bath, they can state with full confidence that in the remaining 16 years of the plan period, if not sooner, even at a conservative market absorption rate, it is entirely reasonable to expect the delivery of 1,000 dwellings on the land adjoining Odd Down.

For the reasons set out above we strongly endorse the increased size of an allocation on land adjoining Odd Down and strongly advocate an increased allocation within the Local Plan.

Affordable Housing

We are concerned that the level of affordable housing proposed for the land adjacent to Odd Down is not reasonable and is not based upon robust and credible evidence. Further details are provided in separate representations by Savills to the affordable housing policy.

Change to the policy requested:

For the reasons set out above and in other representations, we strongly endorse the identification of land adjacent to Odd Down and the majority of the associated changes to the Local Plan.

Notwithstanding, we propose an increase to the scale of the allocation from 300 dwellings to 1,000 dwellings.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

In addition, due to the concerns Savills have raised over the robustness and credibility of the viability evidence underpinning the affordable housing policy, we consider it appropriate to incorporate a degree of flexibility into the policy approach to affordable housing.

Respondent Number: 4702 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Richard Cross

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to comment on the proposal to place a mixed use development of around 300 dwellings on the land adjoining Odd Down detailed in Change SPC88.

I believe that the proposal to site 300 houses on this land is not sound for the following reasons;

- The entire proposed site from Combe Hay Lane to Southstoke Lane is part of the Cotswold AONB and is a vital part of the setting of the City of Bath as a World Heritage Site. Because development of an AONB is only permitted if it is in the local and national interest, sites for the proposed 300 homes should be found on existing brown field sites within BANES.

- The site is the last remaining open piece of Cotswold limestone plateau in the South of Bath and is an essential part of the Green Belt that is in place to prevent the joining of Bath with the village of Southstoke.

- The site borders on the "Wansdyke" which is a scheduled Ancient monument. An ancient monument must be protected against inappropriate development on or near it. Any development on this site will cause visual and actual damage to the Wansdyke and the proposed access road at the Cross Keys junction will cut right through it.

- The development will have a negative impact on the wildlife in the area, in particular, protection species such as the Greater Horseshoe Bat.

- The change proposal also includes provision for a new access road from the B3110/Southstoke lane junction at the "Cross Keys" public house. This new road will cause environmental damage and will also ensure there is no significant buffer between any new housing and the village of Southstoke. It will also cause light pollution on the southern edge of the plateau escarpment which will be highly visible over long distances.

In summary, I believe that the proposal to develop this AONB/Greenfield site is not sound. The site is a vital part of the setting of the World Heritage site of the City of Bath and development of this land is not in the local or national interest. Provision for the 300 homes proposed on this site should be found from existing brown field sites within BANES.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4705 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sara Taket

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1. The proposal for the Odd Down site will be on greenbelt land which once gone is gone. The current greenbelt is a valuable amenity to Bath and the green surrounds are what make Bath special to visitors. The result of the proposal will be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

to join Southstoke to Bath creating an urban area out of character with and detracting from the current separateness of the village. This urban sprawl will surely jeopardise the World Heritage status that Bath enjoys.

2. The Odd Down land is at the southern end of the Cotswold and is an open plateau in an AONB. This status requires maximum protection. It will be completely compromised by this development.
3. The Bradford Road and Glasshouse roundabout are already challenged at peak times so adding a further roundabout/access road at the Cross Keys pub to service a significant number of new homes, together with the extra traffic generated by a Foxhill development will likely gridlock the area.
4. The Wansdyke is unlikely to be preserved in its current state if there is a significant increase in human traffic using it as a short cut to Sainsburys. Again, once gone its gone.

In summary, the plan swaps greenbelt, a beautiful Cotswold village, an ancient monument and an area of outstanding natural beauty for some houses which could be built elsewhere with less environmental impact and I urge the Inspector to take these views into consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

As per my neighbours, I have had very little time to prepare this and have had no advance notification of the process from the local authority.

Whilst accepting the real need for additional housing in BANES, the Odd Down site does threaten green Belt land and an AONB and the Wansdyke. As these are important amenities to Bath, the plan is surely ill thought out, especially if there are other sites identified which could more easily absorb the projected housing need. At the very least, there would be less impact to the environment if such development were confined to the western side of Sulis Meadow.

Respondent Number: 4707 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ms R Harvey

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Do not consider the proposed changes to include land adjoining Odd Down sound, justified or effective :

1. Green Belt position : No “very special circumstances can be shown to exist which would outweigh the harm that such development would cause” .
 2. This location is in the AONB. No sound, justified proof given for what would be unauthorised development as not shown to be in local and national interest.
 3. Coalescence will be inevitable consequence of development in this location. A major purpose of Green Belt is to prevent coalescence. The recent ARUP report makes clear that the belt in this area is too narrow currently. South Stoke, Combe Hay and Midford outlying villages will all be impacted.
 4. Detrimental effect on World Heritage setting, risking future status. The inevitable infrastructure & light pollution will have significant impact on Southern bath slopes which currently provide a soft and natural transgression with the City. This will impact World Heritage location.
- Banes stress the great importance of the Green Belt & AONB to WH setting in the Draft Core Strategy. To progress would be contrary to their own policy and therefore not sound.
5. S Stoke Conservation area is on the doorstep of the proposed location. This is a historically important village the setting of which is extremely important to its Conservation status. We must do all we can to preserve and sustain the future status of this village. The proposed development, anywhere on the plateau will impact the position and social infrastructure.
 6. Current traffic congestion on Midford Rd/Frome Rd and associated junctions ,the Wellsway, Rush Hill/Whiteway/A367 will be exacerbated. Midford Rd is a B road, B3110. It is in a poor condition and is suffering from ever more traffic using it as a Southern bypass. This road has a weight and height restriction and was never built to accommodate current levels of traffic. Current position is not sustainable.
 7. Ancient monument the Wansdyke needs to be protected. Once again the ARUP report highlights the lack of positive and effective planning which permitted the development of Sulis Meadows which has allowed this archaeologically important ancient monument to have been destroyed in this area.
 8. Real threat to the very rare Greater Horseshoe Bat which forages in this area. Proposals are not sound nor sustainable.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

9. Proposals for development of this site were shown at Public consultation 10/4 in S Stoke. Representatives were unable to substantiate the justification for the proposal when asked questions on eg housing density/traffic studies conducted/traffic management. That the placemaking process would apparently pick up these points would appear to be the tail chasing the dog. Many such detailed enquiries would in my opinion negate misinformed justification for the proposal.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4710 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Rushgrove

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

As I understand it and according to Green Belt UK Politics the main purpose of the government's green belt policy is to protect the land around larger urban centres from urban sprawl, and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide habitat to wildlife. Green belt offers a number of benefits for both urban and rural population. By preventing the urban sprawl, it helps protect agricultural activities and the unique character of rural communities. Urban population, on the other hand, is provided an access to an open space which offers opportunities for outdoor activities and an access to clean air. The land adjoining Odd Down is essential in preventing Southstoke village from becoming simply part of the conurbation of Combe Down and Odd Down. The green belt is already very narrow and if this land were built on then the green belt in this area would be non-existent. We are extremely lucky in Bath to have such beautiful villages in our surrounding area. However, to maintain their historic and unique nature it is imperative that they be kept separate from the conurbation of Bath. On this basis the amendment to the Draft Core Strategy is unsound. Part of the site is in an AONB and should therefore be afforded the highest level of protection from development. To take land out of an AONB for development then the reason for doing so should be of national importance. To build on the site adjoining Southstoke Lane and Midford Road cannot be of national importance. In no way does the proposed development enhance the character and landscape of the ANOB. In fact, it should be of national importance that we strive to maintain AONB so that this and future generations can enjoy our countryside and heritage.

Other parts of the BANES Draft Core Strategy describes the importance of the AONB in maintaining the setting of the City of Bath as a World Heritage City, the proposed amendment therefore conflicts with BANES own strategy and is unsound. The setting of the City within a green environment is an important aspect of its status as a World Heritage City. The City of Bath is built in a unique setting and much of its attraction lies in the fact that you come upon Bath from the countryside and see the city in the valley and also that once you are in the City you can look up and out onto open country. Building on Bath's green belt sites will damage the unique setting of our City and may put our World Heritage status at risk.

Furthermore, one of our scheduled ancient monuments, the Wansdyke borders part of the proposed site and by definition must be protected against inappropriate development on, or near it, that might cause actual or visual harm. This is one of the few remaining sections of the Western Wansdyke that is accessible to the public. It is of national archaeological importance and it is a privilege to walk along the Wansdyke and to look at a view that has been unchanged for centuries. It would be sacrilege to build an inappropriate development bordering the Wansdyke and to cut an access road through it opposite the Cross Keys pub.

Finally, the traffic flow throughout the Odd Down, Combe Down area is already heavy. The current situation is already going to be exacerbated by development at the Foxhill MOD site. Surely it is not sensible to further add to an already overloaded traffic system with more development on the land adjoining Odd Down.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4714 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Joanna Livall**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I live in the Southstoke Road area of Bath and work in Southstoke Lane. This area is one of outstanding beauty. To have green fields on the doorstep, is a dream for most people – to be so near a town but so near to open fields, is an enviable position to be in. Green Belts should be left as such.....green!!

It appears that where there is land, the mentality in Bath is “build on it”. There are so many newly built houses in this area that are still empty, they are clearly not needed, so why (potentially) build 300 more!!

The infrastructures of the roads could not cope with (minimum) of another 300 cars on it at rush hour – already you can wait anything up to 4 to 5 mins to find a break in the traffic – at either end of Southstoke Road. Odd Down and the Wellsway are clogged from 8am onwards – I cannot believe another 300 + cars added to these already clogged roads, is going to add much to the “environmental/green” issues that surround Bath and it’s already bad problem with exhaust fumes.....There is just too much traffic congestion on the surrounding roads, to burden them further, with potentially upto another 300+ cars – eventually the whole area is going to grind to a massive halt – especially with yet another massive housing estate is proposed for the MOD Foxhill site.....we are nearly there already, sometimes the traffic doesn’t move at all, so to add yet hundreds more cars onto these roads would be suicidal!!!!

I feel that it’s going to turn 2 of the most desirable places to live in Bath – South stoke/Combe Down into a massive housing estate – and that inturn will have a derogatory effect on the price of my house. I bought my house because of the fields on my doorstep – I’d like to keep them that way!!!!!!

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4724 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Ian Symonds**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The land is designated as a Green Belt, and fulfills all five purposes as stated in the N.P.P.F.

It is situated in an A.O.N.B – No exceptional circumstances have been specified in the changes to the core strategy, it should therefore be deemed unsound.

The area is a foraging site for extremely rare greater horseshoe bats which are protected under European guidelines.

The site contains the Wansdyke, a scheduled ancient monument. Any development would cause ‘actual’ and ‘visible’ harm. In the changes to the Core Strategy; no plan has been advanced to prevent such harm. These proposals should therefore be considered unsound.

No evidence has been given showing the ‘exceptional circumstances’ required for this development; it cannot be in the local or national interest and should be considered unsound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Not to develop the South Stoke Plateau.

Respondent Number: 4737 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sue and John Crookes**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88**Plan Reference:** Policy B3A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

I would just like to comment on the above. I think it would be such a mistake to build on those beautiful fields. South Stoke is a wonderful little village and should stay dis-connected to Bath. There is lots of wildlife, the Wansdyke historic site which are bound to be affected. I have only just found out where to send this e-mail and time may have run out. I realise people need homes. However the traffic coming up from Midford is already heavy and this would make it a lot worse.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4745 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Gordon Campbell**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC88**Plan Reference:** Policy B3A**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

I would like to express my objections to the land being allocated in the Core Strategy for Odd Down SPC 88.

We have lived in Sulis Meadows for many years and thoroughly enjoy and value the beautiful Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The setting of The Wansdyke is of great historical importance and our children have grown up with a keen interest in the local wildlife and green belt area. The possibility of losing the green belt land where they have seen deer, bats and the wonderful restorative views over South Stoke and the valley has been most upsetting to them and as I write, they are urging me to mention their concerns.

In addition, to propose building more houses in an area where traffic congestion has greatly increased since the opening of the new Sainsbury's seems ill considered.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Respondent Number:** 837 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell**Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Would like to see further housing allocated to this location with higher densities to meet the housing waiting list. The site is on a good showcase bus route from Bath City Centre bus station.

Change to the policy requested:

Extra housing needs to be allocated in a very suitable site with good public transport bus links to the Royal United Hospital and the City Centre.

Respondent Number: 4529 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Hannah Dale-Staples

Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I object and ppose the proposed changes concerning developments at Odd Down I South Stoke Plateau on the grounds that the proposed changes are non-compliant with local BANES, National and EU policies and, therefore, are unsound:

The location is currently an Area of Outstanding Natural. It has not been demonstrated to be in either local or national interest to destroy this AONB.

The area is Green Belt that prevents coalescence between settlements. There appears to be too few 'very special circumstances' to warrant building on this land.

The Wansdyke is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. There can be no justification for removing this archaeological site.

Building additional housing will increase the current traffic congestion problems and significantly reduce the quality of life of people in the present dwellings.

Change to the policy requested:

All references to housing development on the Odd Down I South Stoke Plateau must be deleted.

Respondent Number: 4556 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Gooch

Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Green Belt and World Heritage Status

Myself and my wife moved to Bath one year ago. We were attracted by the a) World Heritage Status b) immediacy of the green belt around Bath c) designated areas of outstanding natural beauty and d) conservation status. We are completely aghast that BathNes is now proposing to remove land / redefine the green belt around our City and are proposing to build 300 homes on our doorstep:

- why has there not been greater notice regarding the proposed Core Strategy?

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- why has there not been greater public engagement with the people of Weston and other affected areas?
- we are frequent walkers and can state with absolute certainty that the affected greenbelt is in constant use by walkers, hikers, dog owners, families, cyclists, and offers access to the Cotwold Way. The affected green belt space is used for recreational and health / keep fit purposes.
- World Heritage Site (WHS) – surely the erosion of the green belt land will undermine Bath’s WHS status. How has this been addressed?

Why did the Core Strategy process not appear as part of the Searches conducted when we purchased our apartment one year ago (we will contact our solicitor to commence investigation),

I can think of two sizeable commercial properties in the Green Park area of Bath that appear to be available / unoccupied / boarded up. Why are these properties not being re-cycled to provide “affordable accommodation”? This has to be a far greater priority than reducing the Green Belt land around Bath.

I note that the Arup report states: “Development within the Lower Slopes at Weston study area is considered to be capable of adversely affecting the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity, authenticity and significance of the Bath World Heritage Site”. Has this warning been fully considered?

Change to the policy requested:

I would like to record my objection to the proposed Green Belt erosion and to pose the questions listed above.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt

Respondent Organisation: Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Crest Strategic Projects supports strongly the principle of the allocation of the site adjacent to Odd Down for the provision of much-needed residential development in Bath (Policy B3A). Crest also supports the requirement for the development of a comprehensive Masterplan for the site, which would include the sensitive incorporation of Sulis Manor (point b). Point c of the Policy notes that cycle and pedestrian links should be provided through the site to the existing network, particularly towards Bath City centre and the Odd Down local centre. This is supported strongly and the presence to the west of the site of the Park & Ride scheme and St Gregory’s Catholic School should be a consideration in the future masterplanning exercise.

Connectivity with existing development and services and facilities is key to the success of sustainable new development; in the absence of further details of, or indicative routes for, access, Crest considers the Policy to fail the test of soundness as it is not certain that the policy is effective and deliverable. Crest’s only objection to Policy B3A is that further clarification is required on connectivity to existing development.

Change to the policy requested:

Further detail is required on how the site will connect with local services and facilities. An indicative plan would be supported, which would demonstrate that the policy could be deliverable.

Respondent Number: 3152 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.

The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Reserve the change

Respondent Number: 4459 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Keith Biggs

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I have spent over 20 years doing voluntary “warden” work in the Cotswolds AONB – specifically South Stoke and Combe Hay parishes. I know the complete area falls within the AONB, is classed as Green Belt and “contains” the Wansdyke Ancient Monument.

Proposals are contrary to Government guidelines (i.e. no building developments in Green Belt areas).

I do not consider the proposals (any of them in SPC 88) legal!

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Respondent Number: 4478 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Betty Marsland-Bulley

Respondent Organisation: Sulis Meadow Organisation

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC88

Plan Reference: Policy B3A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We believe that it is unnecessary to build on AONB. If the houses on the brownfield sites were increased to 45 houses per hectare there would be no need to use AONB. The protected horseshoe bats living in the area would lose their habitat and areas of foraging. Another important reason not to build on AONB is the loss of food production which once lost will never be recovered. The A367 is already at capacity at peak times of the day it can take over 30 minutes to get from Sulis Meadow to the town centre, and the increased traffic would make travel impossible, and the cost of public transport is too much for most people to use. We have a historical monument which will be under threat. There is a protected badger set. All of this is detrimental to both wildlife and the current communities., especially as it is not totally necessary. Why instead can we not have allotments which would save the AONB and increase food production rather than decrease it.

Change to the policy requested:

None

Change Ref. SPC89**Plan Ref.:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 93	Comment Number: 4	Respondent Name: Mrs Jacqui Ashman	Respondent Organisation: Highways Agency
------------------------------	--------------------------	---	---

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions . These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements .

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Land adjoining Weston

Generally the Agency has no objection to residential led mixed use development on land adjoining Weston in the North West of Bath. We welcome the requirement for a comprehensive Masterplan to be produced to reflect Best Practice as well as ensuring good public transport provision. The development will potentially impact on the SRN at the A46/A36 and M4 Junction 18, so any development proposals that are drawn up will need to include a robust transport assessment and any mitigation proposals for impacts on the SRN before the Agency is able to make detailed comments.

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 106	Comment Number: 6	Respondent Name: Mrs Kathy Curling	Respondent Organisation: Pro Planning
-------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Policy B3B: delete or edit criteria under “Planning Requirements”

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**

Respondent Number: 281 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy

Respondent Organisation: Natural England

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Weston slopes

The proposed development land at Weston slopes forms part of the green separation between the urban edge and countryside within the city bowl. The proposed development land comprises small irregular fields of pasture with traditional boundaries such as hedges, walls and wet ditches, which are characteristic of the landscape in this area. Development here would be visible from a number of distant and closer viewpoints.

While we recognise the resulting landscape change from development in this area would be incremental, and acknowledge there may be some scope to accommodate limited housing here, we are most concerned about the effects of the proposed scale of housing and associated development on the AONB and the extent to which this could be moderated.

The proposal land is also within the foraging zone for Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat SAC; while we recognise that the Plan policies seek to protect the interests of the designated site and its notified features, we remain concerned that there is currently insufficient survey data to conclude that the amount of proposed development in this area would not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the European site. Please also see our comments on the HRA below.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**

Respondent Number: 84 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Roger Chapman

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am writing to object to the proposed changes in the core strategy, which designate land adjoining Weston for 300 houses.

Firstly I would like state that I support the need to build more housing, in particular affordable housing for those who currently struggle to find suitable, affordable housing. Secondly, I am not opposed in principle to such housing being built near the area where I live.

However, I have a number of practical objections to the proposals included in the Core Strategy.

1. As a lover of the countryside in general and the environment around Bath in particular, I oppose the designation of green belt land when there are substantial brownfield sites to be built on in Bath.
2. I oppose the strategy that would allow developers to apply to build on green belt land at a time when development of the Western Riverside is proceeding only slowly and the development of the MoD sites at Foxhill and Warminster Road has not even begun. The strategy must give every incentive to use these sites before any others around Bath are considered suitable for development.
3. Given these three substantial sites in Bath, I believe that more of the additional sites for affordable housing should be sought in Keynsham and Norton Radstock to balance the overall position in B&NES. This is an important aspect, as I believe developers jumping on any opportunity to build in Weston would not be giving priority to affordable housing, which is what is needed.
4. If housing was built on any of the proposed land near Weston, vehicular access would be a major problem. For most of the proposed area traffic would need to gain access either via Purlewent Drive or Eastfield Avenue and neither have the capacity to provide access to such numbers of additional housing.
5. I regularly walk on the hillside between Weston and Beckford's Tower and from November 2012 until mid-February the whole hillside was running with water and new springs have appeared all over the place. As you move beyond the existing housing, the hill becomes increasingly steep, and the risk of flooding in the village below is a very significant one, which would be greatly increased by construction of further housing and roadways on the steeper hillside. Flooding through over-development is a major issue across the UK and the proposed site risks making a similar mistake in Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 224 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Ms Caroline Kay

Respondent Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Council has been wrestling with the considerable dilemma placed upon them by the economic drivers in the NPPF and the Inspector's preliminary findings of creating a clearer methodology for determining a compliant housing need, and then attempting to meet that need. At the same time, the NPPF recognises that constraints may limit the capacity to fulfil the housing need (NPPF 14) and the Council also needs to be sensitive to the requirements of the NPPF to protect Green Belt (NPPF section 9), AONBs (NPPF (115) and World Heritage Sites (NPPF Section 12).

The Trust recognises that there is a need the need for AFFORDABLE housing in Bath and that allocation of land to achieve the public benefit of affordable housing is imperative. However the allocations indicated in the Core Strategy will be nearly 60% market housing and we do not see sufficient indication that the open housing market in Bath is capable of delivering the housing benefit assumed.

In turn we therefore question whether the housing development proposed provides sufficient public benefit (as distinct from economic benefit to development companies only) to outweigh the potential harm to Bath's green belt (as required in NPPF 88) AONB (as required in NPPF 116) and WHS setting (as required in NPPF 132) . In addition by conceding some

areas of green belt and AONB as potentially appropriate for development the Council has undermined the clarity of Bath World Heritage Site's protections of its setting and risks opening the City up to inappropriate and speculative developments, possibly even in advance of the brownfield sites of the City being developed, in contravention to NPPF (a). By the nature of its history, designation and topography Bath has an absolute environmental capacity and this is borne out rather than countermanded by B&NES' own evidence base.

Evidence Base for Constraints

The NPPF required that the local plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence (NPPF 158). There is a substantial evidence base for this Core Strategy, though some has been produced so recently that it cannot inform the plan (EG Arup reports on Development Concept options in the Green Belt sites of Bath, dated April 2013 and only functionally available on the website on 2 May 2013). Some elements which should have formed an evidence base (eg an up to date character appraisal for the Bath Conservation Area) does not currently exist and this does not meet the consideration in NPPF 170 to having an up to date historical evidence base.

Notwithstanding these gaps, much of the provided evidence base support the idea of Bath having a limit to its environmental capacity eg:

- Arup Stage 1 Green Belt review (which clearly states that the Green belt areas considered for development fulfil all the purposes for which the Green belt exists)
- World Heritage Site Setting Study (now adopted as SPD, which emphasises the rural setting of Bath being a key value as part of its inscription)
- Building Heights Strategy, which implicitly limits the economic capacity of individual sites;
- World Heritage Site Management Plan, which refers to planning policy, in particular green belt, AONB, and Article 1(5) of the GPDO as providing specific protection and removal of PD rights to the WHS and its setting;
- UNESCO mission report
- AONB boundary
- SSSIs, Birds and habitats directive.

These tie in closely to the list of reasons why development might need to be restricted (NPPF para 14, footnote 9) in a locality.

It is difficult to see from this evidence base how the Council draws the conclusion that it is appropriate to override these constraints in order to deliver developments consisting of 60% or more market housing in the Green belt and AONB, let alone have a SHLAA trajectory which assumes that that the site at Odd Down starts being built out in 2015, which is in advance of several of the brownfield sites and seems to contradict therefore the encouragement of effective use of previously developed land (NPPF 17 bullet 8)

Harm caused by core strategy not accepting these constraints

The evidence base points to various harms or potential harms which would be caused to the various designated sites if developed. The Council appears to be saying that the placemaking plans will determine new boundaries for green belt and how any harm can be mitigated; however the placemaking plan does not have the authority to redraw the boundary of the AONB.

The recently produced Arup reports undertake detailed visual and landscape studies of these sites. These too highlight the constraints, and acknowledge significant adverse effects from development in these locations.

Our concern is that by leaving a robust determination of Bath's environmental capacity and urban boundary to the Placemaking Plan, the principle of working within a recognised constraint on Bath's development had been sacrificed. Further, the local plan is incomplete without this element and given this we are concerned that there would be a presumption to permit development in these highly sensitive and protected areas. Without third party appeal of planning applications, we believe it is for the LPA to demonstrate the need to protect the national designations in their Local plan and the Strategy as presented fails to do this. This is of great risk to Bath.

Compliance of Core Strategy with planning guidance

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Despite the direct quotation of NPPF paragraph 14 (SPC 150) in the Core Strategy, (see our separate submission on this) it appears the LPA has neither read the footnote to that paragraph spelling out the importance of green belt and AONB designations, nor clearly articulated how their evidence base leads to a conclusion that the public benefit is best served by over-riding tem. By failing to take properly into account the other sections of the NPPF eg NPPF section 9, NPPF 115 and NPPF Section 12 the Strategy fails to be compliant with local policy.

By assuming that Green belt /AONB development is possible in these sites, in advance of the placemaking plan, it appears that the LPA has surrendered its capacity to influence key development control criteria on these sites in advance of the placemaking plan being complete.

Minutes from the UNESCO monitoring mission agreed that the State Party (ie the UK Government) should 'act on the reinforced protection of the landscape surrounding the property (City of Bath) to prevent any further development which could have an adverse and cumulative impact on the OUV of the property and its integrity'.

It is our view that the measures in place under the jurisdiction of the State Party, that is Green Belt and AONB legislation and the NPPF provisions regarding the protection of heritage assets, provide appropriate protection and that the Council is not free to over-ride these protections.

Change to the policy requested:

In order to make the text compliant we believe that land at Odd Down and Weston should be removed from the SHLAA trajectory unless the following conditions have been met: At the very least, in order to be made compliant the Core Strategy needs to incorporate a mechanism to prevent inappropriate development on the Green Belt/AONB sites until

- A specific study to determine the limits of Bath's environmental capacity has been carried out;
- A clear policy statement has been drawn up and agreed with DCMS and UNESCO explaining how the setting of the Bath World Heritage Site is to be protected in future before any amendments are made to the Green Belt boundaries around Bath;
- all brown field sites within Bath have specific consents which will allow them to be built out;
- a detailed review of Green Belt boundaries has taken place in the context of preparing the placemaking plans;
- detailed mitigation measures have been established and agreed with statutory consultees including the Cotswold AONB Board for any development sites proposed within the AONB.

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading

Respondent Organisation: Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Environment Agency supports the wording of point c of Policy B3B in general. This refers to the need for any development to have well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and ensure watercourses running through the site remain open and are incorporated into the developments green infrastructure. However we consider that additional text in relation to flood risk and drainage is required in Policy B3B. As detailed in the concept options report undertaken for the site there are existing surface water flooding problems in Weston, as water flows off the steep slopes towards the high street and centre of the village. The study goes on to highlight that the site will require significant flood risk management measures in relation to drainage, which could result in significant additional cost and land take. This could include for example the need for significant flood storage areas to intercept surface water runoff.

We would recommend the Council liaise with their Lead Local Flood Authority function in relation the site and additional wording that is required for Policy B3B. Recently £1.93m of DEFRA funding was secured by the Lead Local Flood Authority to implement a flood prevention scheme in Weston to address the current flooding problem in the area. It is of key importance that the policy refers to need to take into account existing flooding issues and ensure any development coming forward has an understanding of the implications on the DEFRA funded scheme.

Change to the policy requested:

Additional policy wording should be added requiring that the location, scale and design of development coming forward in

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

the placemaking plan has a sufficient understanding of the existing surface water flood problems in the area. The development will need to demonstrate that there will be no increase in flood risk as a result of the development (either on site or off site). The policy should also refer to the need to understand the implications of the development on the DEFRA funded scheme. BANES Planning Policy should discuss appropriate wording with the Councils Lead Local Flood Authority Function who lead on surface water flooding.

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 20 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Green Belt land is supposed to have statutory protection and although Local Authorities have the ability under the legislation to remove land from Green Belt, it should only be done under exceptional circumstances. This section of the Core Strategy does not identify exceptional circumstances, it merely claims that they are sustainable locations without clarifying exactly what makes them sustainable, or what deficiencies in other land locations outside the Green Belt rule them out. The impression given is that removal of land from Green Belt protection is proposed as a convenience rather than a necessity, and that cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be classed as exceptional circumstances. Whilst the Government may have “wish list” housing targets, the legislation has not been amended and therefore the legislation is more binding on a Local Authority than numerical targets.

It may be that in Bath in order to meet the housing needs (as opposed to arbitrary targets) it is eventually concluded that there is insufficient available land apart from some Green Belt incursions, but these should always be a last resort, not a planned easy option.

The Core Strategy must emphasise that the use of Green Belt land is a last resort.

It should also be noted that the location identified at Weston is visible from the Bath Skyline Walk so development here would conflict with the expectations in SPC92 that the setting of the World Heritage Site would be preserved.

Change to the policy requested:

Land adjoining Weston

The potential for land to be removed from the Green Belt has been recognized but will only be implemented if it eventually proved to be unavoidable when monitoring the Placemaking Plan. The land identified is in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 300 dwellings, small scale local employment opportunities and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary.

Planning assumptions for this location:

a. Residential led mixed use development of around 300 dwellings in the plan period, including 40% affordable housing
...

Add:

n. Assess and protect against the additional risk of downhill flooding due to increased water run-off from developed land compared to the current open land.

Respondent Number: 278 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Cotswolds Conservation Board

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

1. The Cotswolds Conservation Board ('the Board') was established by Parliament in 2004.

The Board has two statutory purposes :

- a) to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and
- b) To increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.

In fulfilling these roles, the Board has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of people living in the AONB.

2. The Board considers the proposed addition to Policy B3B

“Land adjoining Weston

Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 300 dwellings, small scale local employment opportunities and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development

Planning requirements....”

to be unsound.

3. The site at Weston is within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. AONBs are statutorily designated under Section 82 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) in order to conserve and enhance their natural beauty.

4. Section 85 (1) of the CROW Act states:

“In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.”

5. Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states

“Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:

- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.9”

6. Footnote 9 states:

“9 For example, those policies relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives (see paragraph 119) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast or within a National Park (or the Broads Authority); designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.”

7. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states:

“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

8. Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states:

“116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other

way; and

● any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

9. The Board is of the view that in proposing the use of Green Belt land at Weston for development the Council has given insufficient weight to

a) The location of the site within the Cotswolds AONB

b) The statutory purpose of the designation of the AONB

c) Consideration of the restriction of development highlighted by footnote 9 of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

D) The “highest status of protection” given to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB compared to sites outside the AONB rejected by the Council; and

e) The lack of any clear indication as to how the detrimental effect on the environment of the proposed release could be moderated.

10. With respect to point (e) it noted that the Council proposes under paragraph 2.15 of the plan to prepare a “Placemaking Plan” to indicate how development of this site could occur. The Board submits that in the absence of such a Plan it cannot be demonstrated that the detrimental effect on the environment can be moderated.

Subparagraph (e) of the proposed addition is

“e. Identify and assess the landscape character, landscape features and significant view points and the likely effects of development on them. Protect and enhance these aspects and mitigate to avoid or minimise the effects. Significant aspects of landscape include the Cotswold AONB...”

11. With respect to paragraph 10, the Board would wish to draw the Inspector’s attention to paragraph 21 of the Secretary of States letter dated 13th February 2013 with respect to Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (section 78) Appeal by Fay & Son Ltd Highfield Farm, Tetbury, Gloucestershire GL8 8SD (Appeal Reference APP/F1610/A/11/2165778) which states:

“The Secretary of State agrees that the primary concern about the impact on the AONB is the loss of fields to housing development (IR14.53). Despite the visual improvements that would result from the landscaping proposals, and to some extent moderate the impact of the new buildings, he agrees that the loss of open fields must inevitably have a detrimental effect on the landscape and environment.”

12. The Board is therefore of the view that sub paragraph (e) clearly shows that that the means of moderating any detrimental effects on the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB have not been demonstrated.

13. Paragraph 75 of the NPPF states:

“75. Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.”

14. The site is crossed at its southern end by the Cotswold Way National Trail. The Board suggests that any detrimental impact of proposed allocation on the recreational opportunity provided by the National Trail, and its protection and enhancement has not been considered by the Council.

13. The Board therefore suggests that Policy B3B is amended to remove reference to land at Weston to make the plan sound.

Change to the policy requested:

The Board therefore suggests that Policy B3B is amended to remove reference to land at Weston to make the plan sound.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 279 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Rohan Torkildsen **Respondent Organisation:** English Heritage

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Development of the Lower Slopes of Weston

I note the ARUP Development Options Report (April 2013) considers that a limited amount of carefully sited development could provide a coherent extension to Weston minimising the visual impact and preserving a green area which exists as a back drop to the setting of the city. However this report appears not to have determined the relative impact on the WHS Outstanding Universal Value.

Consequently the local authority should produce an assessment to provide a clear and explicit conclusion that demonstrates the objectives for sustainable development in respect of the historic environment have been understood and that objectively assessed development needs of the area will be met in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

This assessment would determine the extent to which this strategic allocation would preserve the WHS OUV, conserve the Bath Conservation Area and other affected heritage assets.

3 NPPF paragraph 87

4 "The increase in built form would notably change the overall balance in detriment to pastoral landscape that currently typifies the setting of Bath. This could result in a change in perception of the setting to the WHS." Weston - ARUP Development Options Report (April 2013) page 19

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 315 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Penny MacKichan **Respondent Organisation:** Charlcombe Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Charlcombe Parish Council has concerns that proposed development on land adjoining Weston will not only involve re-drawing the Green Belt boundary but will also intrude into the Cotswolds AONB. Although the NPPF allows the Green Belt boundary to be redrawn under certain circumstances, the constraints which apply to development in the AONB will remain. B&NES will need to demonstrate that the harm caused by development within the AONB is outweighed by the national need. We would question whether this can be justified.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4435 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Tim Hill**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am a resident of The Weal in Weston Village and am writing to express my sincere concern and disappointment in the clearing of woodland on the road.

The work commenced just over a week ago and what I thought was just a bit of tree maintenance has turned out to be a complete clearing of the area which I fear is intended to be used for development. I have seen no notice for any such work communicated and am hoping you can provide some clarity around any proposed plans?

I would like to make it clear that I would strongly oppose any such plans for development in such a quiet and rural location which was my main reason for choosing to live here. It is extremely sad and frustrating to see well established trees and wildlife habitat destroyed when such environments are already facing such a struggle to survive.

I am also extremely concerned at the proposed building plans on greenbelt land behind Purlewent Drive in Weston and will be joining the countless other Weston villagers in demonstrating against such plans.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4439 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Southern**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

As a resident of Purlewent Drive with two young children I am deeply concerned about a document prepared by Arup for the council.

This document (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/part1/Weston050413.pdf>) suggests on pages 29 and 31 that access could be gained to "Development A" via Purlewent Drive.

This is completely unsuitable route into the settlement and would increase traffic on Purlewent Drive and Lucklands Road to levels which they cannot sustain.

Please clarify how you intend to modify the road layout through Purlewent Drive and Lucklands Road to cope with this extra traffic, as I feel this would detrimentally alter the character of the area.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4441 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Sally Houseman**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

I am registering my deep concern about the above development proposal.

What is an Area of Outstanding Beauty? What is a Green Belt? Answer, the beautiful green slopes of Weston. Why were they designated as such?

For the sanity of town dwellers we need to keep these green areas. People gasp when they view these slopes.

Please consider all other possible sites.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4442 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Lisa Loveridge**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

I understand the need to provide more housing for the residents of B&NES, but this should take place on brownfield, rather than Green Belt Land. The field next to Purlwent Drive is regularly used by local people, many of whom moved there because of the good access to countryside and stunning views. It would be a tragedy to build on this land and to deprive the local community of its use.

Please take my views into consideration and let me know the outcome.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4443 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Paul Smith**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

AONB, Conservation Area and World Heritage Site

1. The proposed Weston development area is designated AONB, a conservation area, lies within the Bath World Heritage Site and forms part of the Cotswold Way national trail. With this level of protection and importance the land should not be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

considered for development

2. The fact that the land is within a conservation area has not be considered
3. The Weston site is categorized as an AONB. National Policy PPS7 states that major development should not take place in AONBs except in exceptional circumstances; I have yet to see sufficient evidence to justify housing on the proposed Weston site and information as to why an AONB should be considered over alternative nonaAONB sites.
4. Any housing scheme on the proposed site would cause direct harm to the AONB; I do not believe this has been given significant weight
5. The land behind Purlewent Drive and part of the proposed access road to the east contains a rare example of an old drovers' road; this was used for generations to take livestock to the Walcot market in central Bath. The proposed housing would mean the total loss of this piece of Baths history.

Permissible footpaths, Cotswold Way and wildlife

6. The permissible rights of way footpaths are extremely well used and loved by the local community; their importance to the health and sense of wellbeing of those who use them has not been considered. Any housing schemes built over parts of these paths will create a significant barrier for access to the countryside and would reduce the quality of the experience of walking along parts of the Cotswold Way national trail
7. The rural/scrub land that forms the Weston development site is an important part of the Bath landscape and habitat for native British wildlife. The proposed development will have a detrimental effect on the environment, which could not be mitigated by a few new trees

Access & increased traffic

8. The proposed use of Weston Park West for access to the eastern end of the Weston development is not appropriate as the road is a private road and is narrow and therefore cannot accommodate an increase in the volume of traffic
9. With the combination of the proposed housing on the eastern side of the development combined with the new Royal High Junior School on Weston Park East, there would be an unreasonable increase in traffic on Weston Park
10. There would be an increase in traffic on Weston Lane due to the proposed housing development. As Weston Lane is an important route for ambulances to the RUH, this could have serious consequences.
11. Overall I feel that access to the site and the implications of increased traffic have not been fully considered

Affordable housing & development costs

12. With 'affordable' housing being based on a percentage of the local market rate (I was informed approximately 70% at the B&NES meeting in Weston), any 'affordable' housing is very unlikely to be financially within reach of first time buyers or key workers due to Weston's existing high property prices. With 40% of the Weston development set aside for 'affordable' housing, the question therefore is whom will these houses be for?
13. The majority of the proposed Weston sites are difficult to develop in terms of access, topography (much of the land is steep) and ground conditions (prone to flooding with numerous springs). As a consequence there will be a high financial cost to the developer, which will be passed on to future homeowners in terms of housing size & cost. It is also likely that a developer, due to the build costs, will negotiate a reduction in the number of affordable units. This element has not been discussed

Consultation

14. The fact that many local residents are still unaware of the proposed housing development indicates that the B&NES has not sufficiently engaged with the local public. Those that are aware have found the available information confusing, difficult to access and intimidating (this comment form included).

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4443 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Paul Smith**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We live in Weston and are very concerned indeed at what is being proposed for the housing on green belt land. The beauty of Bath (as said by people who live all over the city and visit) is the green space that surrounds the city and the quick access to the open countryside for residents. The plans proposed push back green space so that unusable pockets of green space will be left behind. currently the archery field and open field behind it provide a wonderful place to access further green spaces. If the housing is built on the field behind purlewent drive the thoroughfare of green into open countryside is lost. This is something that is very special about Bath and helps it retain its World Heritage Site status. surely this is not something that the council is willing to risk.

Access to this field is also a real issue in terms of traffic but also suitability of size and connection to other roads.

We are extremely opposed to the planning proposals as a whole but in particular to the field designated A in your document (which currently provides open access to the countryside for people all over the city and which will disappear amongst a housing estate under your proposals).

we look forward to your response and trust you will consider the thoughts and fears of local people.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4448 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Heath**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Bath is located in one of the most intensely landslipped areas in Britain (Kellaway & Taylor, 1968) and the proposed site in Weston lies within an area where the geomorphology is consistent with landsliding and where hazard maps show extensive landsliding and cambering have occurred (Hobbs & Jenkins, 2008). There have been a number of landslide related deaths in Bath, most notably from those initiated by the construction of Camden Crescent in the 18th century, leading to three landslides over the next 150 years. This eventually resulted in the demolition of a developed area of the City, now known as Hedgemoor Park. Unlike in the 18th century, we now have the knowledge and tools to assess landslide hazard before development and this should be undertaken.

Planning Policy Guidance 14: Development on Unstable Land provides “the approach that local planning authorities should follow in dealing with land instability issues in their development plans. It may be appropriate, where the relevant information is available, to identify any specific areas where particular consideration of landsliding or the potential for landsliding will be needed” (HM Government, 1996). There is no evidence in the core strategy that this has been done and the term “landslide” or its derivatives are not present in the core strategy document.

Research into landslide hazard and associated costs in the UK has concluded “Planning guidance for geohazards including landslides exists (though its application may be inconsistent)” (as demonstrated with the BathNES core strategy), but that “there are significant weaknesses, possibly resulting from a position of perceived safety that we consider to have

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

potentially serious social and economic implications” (Gibson et al, 2012). This is contrary to the government housing strategy which states that “Successful new homes and neighbourhoods also offer durability – being long-lasting, yet economical to manage and maintain – ensuring good returns on investment.” (HM Government, 2011).

The information provided above demonstrates that the BathNES core strategy is not positively prepared, is not effective and is not consistent with national policy and cannot therefore be considered sound.

References cited:

Gibson, A; Culshaw, M; Dashwood, C & Pennington, C 2012. Landslide management in the UK—the problem of managing hazards in a ‘low-risk’ environment. Landslides, August 2012. DOI 10.1007/s10346-012-0346-4

Hobbs, P.R.N.; Jenkins, G.O. 2008 Bath's 'founded strata' : a re-interpretation. British Geological Survey, 19pp. (OR/08/052)

HM Government, 1996 Planning Policy Guidance 14: Development on Unstable Land - Annex 1: Landslides and Planning, ISBN: 0 11 753259 2

HM Government, 2011, Laying the foundations: a housing strategy for England. A new strategy to unblock the housing market and get the nation building again. ISBN 9781409832348

Kellaway, G. A. & Taylor, J. H. 1968. The influence of landslipping on the development of the City of Bath, England. Proc. 23rd Int. Geol. Conf. 12, 65–76.

Change to the policy requested:

“Planning Policy Guidance 14: Development on Unstable Land” states “Whilst often the most cost-effective strategy, avoidance will not always be possible.” In this particular case, avoidance is possible and should be investigated. This is probably the only realistic option for this location.

Respondent Number: 4456 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** John Fielding

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Thank you for sending the letter to "landowners in the Weston Area" in respect of proposed residential development in the Council's Strategic Housing land Availability Assessment.

I am in favour of this proposal, I deliberately retained this piece of land when I sold Primrose Hill Farm in 2006 because I believed it could be developed. I would be prepared to make my land available for residential development and ultimately to sell it to a housing developer.

Please find the attached plan of my approximately 5 acres of land behind Prospect Place and adjoining Blind Lane.

The council are welcome to undertake an ecological survey on my land.

I understand you will be passing on my comments to the Inspector.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4472 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Richard Cook

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I object to the proposals to build on the field above Purlewent Drive, Weston, on the following grounds:

1. The ground is very steep and soft, and is the source of springs. It is therefore liable to landslip, subsidence etc. The houses in Purlewent Drive, on the same steep slope, already suffer from subsidence cracks.
2. Access shown in the Arup report is by way of Weston Park West, which is very narrow, and has a dangerous corner into Weston Park at the bottom end.
3. Weston Park West is a Private Street, maintained at the cost of the inhabitants, and is not likely to withstand the wear from the anticipated heavy usage from the new housing.
4. The field is crossed by the Cotswold Way and other footpaths. There is also a reservoir which is not even mentioned in the Arup report.
5. The field is an essential part of the Conservation Area, rich in wildlife and of great amenity value for the inhabitants of Bath.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4475 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Annie Beswetherick**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst I am not directly affected by this proposal, I live about half a kilometre away and regularly walk the hillside with my dog, and have a passion for the City of Bath and its unique landscape setting.

The following designations and features have guided my comments on these proposals:

The City of Bath World Heritage Site and approved document

The City of Bath Conservation Area

The Cotswold Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The Green Belt

National Planning Policy Framework

The Cotswold Way (national trail) and other public rights of way

Important local landmarks / viewpoints – Kelston Roundhill and Prospect Stile

Proposed Policy SD1

I am very concerned at the inclusion of new glibly worded policy SD1, in particular the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and the council positively supporting it.

First, for this new policy to be effective, I believe a definition / explanation of what constitutes sustainable development needs to be included. It seems to be in vogue to refer to / promote sustainability, however, it is extremely difficult to define, especially in the context of landscape character. Sustainable development should take account equally of social, economic and environmental aspects, yet all too often the economic aspect takes precedence over the environmental aspect.

In the context of proposed housing in Weston, the social and economic aspects are taking precedence over environmental aspects, given that housing is proposed within an AONB, which is the highest status protection for land of landscape and scenic beauty.

Also, I think some aspects of sustainability are not commensurate with sensitivity to landscape character. For example, at the council's exhibition of Core Strategy amendments, three officers referred to the proposal for HIGH DENSITY development on the Weston slopes. I question the visual appropriateness of high density housing on this hillside in view of the land having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty from being within the Cotswold Hills AONB.

Furthermore, the WHS constitutes the designation of a heritage asset of the highest significance, with a presumption in favour of the conservation of the outstanding universal values of the WHS, of which the landscape setting of the city is one of the main reasons for inscription! I think the council should have explained in the exhibition how new policy SD1 and WHS policies can be reconciled.

There is also the City of Bath Conservation Area protection policies to consider. Surely, there can be no doubt that this level of protection indicates that this hillside is of exceptional value and that unacceptable harm will be caused by the development proposed.

I believe that development at the edge of the city, particularly in such a highly visible location, should be graded, so the transition from the built environment to the adjacent rural area is gradual. At present the built edge is an effective one. It comprises, in the main, an effective edge to the built up area, where there is plenty of space around houses for open space, shrubs and trees to soften the transition from residential to rural use.

The council's consultant's proposals were not displayed at the exhibition, but officers showed some plans on their i-pads (if you asked questions of a more detailed nature). I think these proposals should have been available for all to see at the exhibition, because local people would have been able to gain a clearer understanding of the nature of development that the council had in mind.

The consultants indicated a 'Tide Line' (which I took to mean a proposed extent to development but there was no explanation available). Another plan showed about 4 separate blocks of housing abruptly extending up to the Tide Line. I am genuinely shocked that if the consultants considered views from key cross-valley viewpoints (which they should have), that they would have come up with proposals of this nature. I object in principle to the development as indicated, with blocks of housing striding up the hillside. I believe this would be insensitive in the extreme – appearing very intrusive on the otherwise open hillside and incongruous in important high level views from across the valley – from Kelston View (Haycombe area), and from many viewpoints along the Cotswold Way, a national trail. I believe this would have a serious detrimental impact on more of the exceptional landscape setting to the city, than would a narrow band of housing hugging the existing built edge.

Point 4.9 of a document on the Core Strategy website indicates that a location would only be identified for development with clear development requirements to minimise and mitigate harm, achieve a high standard of development, create positive environments and minimise the impact of neighbouring residents. In my view, development comprising the 'assertive' blocks proposed on this hillside so widely visible would not be able to be acceptably mitigated. I think there are opportunities for a smaller number of houses to 'hug' the present housing development boundary, and in this position the housing would more clearly visually link with existing housing.

In Table 10, Point 16 'protect the hillsides of the upper slopes of Weston'. The development is being referred to being on the lower slopes, which I consider to be a mis-nomer. In my view, it is the lower slopes that are already developed – the proposed development is being proposed on the upper highly visible slopes.

Annex 3 Part 1 – Policy B1, amended includes 'give great weight to conserving landscape and scenic beauty of the Cotswold

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Hills AONB'. Just as development to the west side of Bath was (quite rightly) dropped because of the impact on the AONB and the WHS, the unique relationship between the AONB and Weston and how the landscape boldly frames the built environment needs to be protected too.

Lansdown

Whilst development here would not be contained within the valley sides (as it is in much of the WHS), I believe development here would cause significantly less harm than at Weston. The site is not within the AONB, urbanisation has already significantly spilled along the plateau, and it is visually quite well contained – any views from the rural area would be seen against a backdrop of urban development such as the park and ride site (and all its lighting), sports buildings and associated paraphernalia, some dwellings and the MOD site. Being flat, there is improved scope for landscape mitigation (alongside existing trees) to soften views from the rural area, and good access to the landsdown road with good visibility. Perhaps density could be increased here where harm would clearly be less.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4487 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andrew Hoyes

Respondent Organisation: Government Department

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Proposed change number SPC89 is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); in fact if allowed to become part of the Core Strategy this change will directly oppose and undermine the NPPF and the Core Strategy will be legally unsound. B&NES Council has not provided clear and convincing reasoning to justify their departure from the NPPF specifically in the following areas:

- One of the NPPF 12 Core Land-use Planning Principles (NPPF paragraph 17), which should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking, is being broken by the Core Strategy; the NPPF states that: “planning should: take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it”.

The B&NES core strategy is proposing the destruction of the Green Belt land and the beautiful countryside around Weston and this change is divergent from the NPPF.

- Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states: “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”.

The proposal for another 300 houses on the Green Belt adjoining Weston will increase the urban sprawl in what is already an over developed area of Bath and it completely makes a mockery of the requirement for the Green Belt to be “permanent”. This is another area where change SPC 89 is divergent from the NPPF.

- Paragraph 80 of the NPPF states that “Green Belt serves five purposes:

1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The building of 300 houses in Weston will allow unrestricted urban sprawl; it will diminish the distinction of Weston as a separate village by joining Weston with the Primrose Hill/Sion Hill area of Bath; it will encroach into and destroy a large swathe of the countryside which is classified as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); it will spoil the unique and historic setting of a World Heritage City, which may put that accolade under threat; and will still leave many areas of derelict land and empty, disused buildings' many of which could be converted into flats, within Brownfield sites in and around the city centre in need of recycling. Change SPC89 completely disregards the Government policy on the Green Belt.

Paragraph 87 of the NPPF states: "As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The building of 300 houses on the Green Belt adjoining Weston is inappropriate because it is extremely harmful to the Green Belt to the point that it will destroy a large part of it. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case; particularly when there are other development areas around the City that will not destroy the Green Belt and so change SPC89 should not be approved.

Paragraph 88 of the NPPF states: "When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

There are no special circumstances for building on Green Belt contained in the B&NES Core Strategy; therefore there are no other considerations to be taken into account in this case, and so Green Belt land should not be considered for development in Weston, Bath and SPC89 should not be approved.

Para 94 of the NPPF states "Local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change,¹⁶ taking full account of flood risk"

Over the past few years Weston has flooded many times times ; it is extremely susceptible to flooding during extreme weather conditions involving heavy rainfall; something which has become far more common in recent years. The following examples from the local press are of flooding on Weston Road aand Weston High Street, which are located at the bottom of the slopes below Lansdown, forming the "Front Line" of water running down natural streams and gullies from the hills above.

In October 2008 Council cabinet member for resources Cllr Malcolm Hanney (Con, Chew Valley North) said: "Changes in weather patterns over recent years have led to an increase in extreme weather events such as those experienced in Bath in January this year, when Weston was particularly affected."

Reference: <http://www.thisisbath.co.uk/Flood-roadshow-Weston/story-11331975-detail/story.html#ixzz2S2ttkHxX>

In a statement, it [the council] said: "Such a substantial increase in the volume of surface water and run-off from adjoining land will inevitably result in some parts of the drainage system being overwhelmed. Before the drain can empty properly, even more water enters the system."

Reference: <http://www.thisisbath.co.uk/Council-reopen-flood-hit-road-Bath/story-17094358-detail/story.html#ixzz2S2v0vuhv>

This same area was flooded again in November 2012: "Agency officials issued a red flood warning which says flooding is expected and immediate action should be taken after more than 300mm of rain fell in 12 hours in some parts of the region. Weston Road in Bath was flooded at the Park Lane junction"

Reference: <http://www.thisisbath.co.uk/Families-flood-alert-torrential-overnight-rain/story-17380474-detail/story.html#ixzz2S2z2h4Eu>

In January 2012 the council's plan to cut spending on drain and gully clearing by a quarter was a major concern to the residents of Weston Village. The "This is Bath" article said: "The centre of Weston has experienced serious flooding several times in recent years, and if not enough is done to keep watercourses, drains and gullies cleared then we are certain to see this again. In the past couple of years, we have managed to prevent scenes like the ones we saw a few years back when the whole of Weston High Street was blocked with major flooding. But this has only been achieved by persuading both the

council and Wessex Water to do more to prevent the flooding, increase the capacity of the watercourse, and clear the drains and gullies frequently”

Reference: <http://www.thisisbath.co.uk/Flood-fear-Weston/story-14335098-detail/story.html#ixzz2S7DWCfst>

In February this year nearly 300 homes in Bath were set to get better protection against flooding after the go-ahead was given for work to start on a £2 million project. The Weston Catchment alleviation scheme is expected to help safeguard 285 properties once completed. The scheme involving Bath and North East Somerset Council will involve survey and repair work in the northern part of Weston, where there are a number of old watercourses, sinks and springs.

Reference: <http://www.thisisbath.co.uk/2m-flood-relief-project-ahead-Bath/story-18088562-detail/story.html#ixzz2S4LLJhHE>

Every year, as we experience more extreme weather events, due to climate change, more permanent streams and boggy patches of land appear out of the ground on the lower Weston slopes, adding further complication to a problem that has existed for many years. The council is already struggling to deal with the current problem and the outcome of interference with these natural water courses by development is unknown, but all the evidence that there is already a problem is overwhelming and, if exacerbated by development will increase an already serious flood risk in Weston; SPC 89 does not fully take account of the seriousness of this problem and should not be approved.

Para 109 of the NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- a. protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- b. recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- c. minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;
- d. preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability;
- e. and remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.

If SPC89 is implemented it will actually destroy parts of a landscape, that is so highly valued it has been designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It will destroy a uniquely bio-diverse area and will weaken resilience to current and future risks of flooding. This land also seeps large amounts of Radon gas into the atmosphere; SPC89 does not address the high levels of natural radiation that are present here and their potential for detrimental effects on public health.

- Para 126 of the NPPF states: “Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy”.

The NPPF recognises the need for conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Bath has an outstanding historic environment; its landscape setting in a meandering section of the River Avon on the site of a natural amphitheatre in the Cotswold Hills is a key factor in its designation of World Heritage City. Further eroding this historic landscape by implementing change SPC 89 will directly oppose what the NPPF is trying to achieve and put Bath’s World heritage City status under threat.

- Para 155 of the NPPF states: “Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made”.

Proposed change SPC 89 was only released to the public on 4th March 2013; this does not reflect “early engagement” when the local Weston neighbourhood has only until 8th May to put together a coordinated and representative response. I believe that the council has not met its legal obligation for early engagement and that the local neighbourhood should be given more time to come up with its own neighbourhood plan.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

I request that proposed change SPC 89 is rejected outright because the destruction of Green Belt and part of the Cotswolds AONB, particularly in a UNESCO World Heritage City, is not consistent with National Policy laid down in the NPPF, and as such, is not legally sound.

Respondent Number: 4489 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Anthony Duffy

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Core strategy process has given local residence insufficient time to consider its proposals for increased housing development in the Weston Hills area of bath. The only consultations were notices through the local press and notices on stiles in the fields.

There are many reasons why Weston is the wrong location for further development:

1. We feel that the three brown field sites that have recently become available for new housing in Bath (the old MOD sites), these should be sequenced before green field sites.
 2. The Odd Down site is an area that could accommodate a new school as well as new housing. This could also take all 600 required homes, with the site at Ensleigh for the remaining 120 being in addition to a previously opposed development site.
 3. There are many areas of Keynsham that would also provide affordable homes, and with the new infrastructure in the town centre, Keynsham would be better equipped to meet the needs of any increased population, and not result in damage to a world heritage site..
- Homes in the above areas would be more affordable than in Weston, with fewer building, site, environmental, community, and access complications.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4491 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Barbara White

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

MY FIRST POINT IS THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO REAL CONSULTATION WITH RESIDENTS BEFORE THESE PROPOSED CHANGES. INFORMATION HAS BEEN GARNERED BY WORD OF MOUTH AND THANKS TO A COUPLE OF WESTON INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE TRIED TO KEEP US INFORMED OF DEVELOPMENTS

RESPONDING TO THE CORE STRATEGY DOCUMENT IS IMMENSELY CONVOLUTED AND A GOOD NUMBER OF WESTON RESIDENTS WILL FIND IT TOO DAUNTING TO ATTEMPT. EASIER, MORE PEOPLE FRIENDLY PAPERWORK AND BETTER COMMUNICATION IS ESSENTIAL AS PROPOSALS GO FORWARD.

WESTON SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR A 300 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE IT IS IN A CONSERVATION AREA AND SUPPORTS A HEALTHY WILDLIFE POPULATION INCLUDING BADGERS WHICH ARE A PROTECTED SPECIES. THERE IS A DUTY TO PROTECT GREEN BELTS (AND PROTECTED SPECIES) AND ESPECIALLY AREAS OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY LIKE WESTON. THE IDEA THAT IT IS ACCEPTABLE TO NIBBLE AWAY AT GREEN BELT AND REASSIGN BOUNDARIES IS VANDALISM

BY ANOTHER NAME. ANY HOUSES BUILT ON THE GREEN SLOPES WILL DAMAGE THE VISUAL IMPACT AND WILL DESTROY THE CONSERVATION AREA.

A 300 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WOULD ALSO REQUIRE A NUMBER OF ACCESS ROADS, POSSIBLY SCHOOLS, SURGERIES, SHOPS ETC. THIS BECOMES A HUGE DEVELOPMENT AND WILL HAVE AN UNACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON THE BALANCE IN WESTON

THE CORE STRATEGY HAS ALREADY PROMPTED ENVIRONMENTAL VANDALISM IN THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WOOD BY THE WEAL, IN READINESS IT HAS BEEN SUGGESTED, TO PROFIT FROM THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. THE COUNCIL HAS BEEN POWERLESS TO PRESERVE THE WOODLAND, EVEN THOUGH SOME OF THE TREES WERE PROTECTED – THIS DOES NOT INSPIRE CONFIDENCE FOR WESTON'S GREEN BELT

I UNDERSTAND THERE ARE AT LEAST 26 SPRINGS IN WESTON, THE SLOPES ARE STEEP AND SOME OF THESE ARE FROM MADE-UP GROUND FROM PREVIOUS BUILDING. AS A RESULT, WESTON IS PRONE TO FLOODING AND THIS MAKES THE PROPOSED SITE EVEN LESS SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

ACCESS IS PARTICULARLY PROBLEMATIC – ACCESS OFF THE WEAL, THE PLAYGROUND ON PURLEWENT DRIVE (WHICH IS CONSTRAINED BY A WATER PUMPING STATION) AND THE LAND AT THE EASTERN END OF THE DEVELOPMENT AREA AT WESTON PARK WEST ARE EITHER TOO NARROW OR TOO STEEP AND WOULD PUT UNREASONABLE PRESSURE ON EXISTING ROAD NETWORKS IN EACH AREA.

THIS WILL BE ESPECIALLY TRUE OF THE WESTON PARK WEST AREA WHEN THE ROYAL HIGH JUNIOR SCHOOL OPENS ON WESTON PARK EAST

THERE IS A SEVERE PARKING PROBLEM IN WESTON ALREADY. HOSPITAL WORKERS AND VISITORS PARK IN WESTON TO AVOID CHARGES AND PARKING PROBLEMS WILL BE EXACERBATED WHEN TESCO OPENS A LARGER STORE (MUCH TO THE CONSTERNATION OF LOCAL RESIDENTS) BUT WITHOUT PROVIDING PARKING PROVISION. 300 EXTRA HOUSES COULD PRODUCE ANYTHING UP TO 500-600 CARS – IS THE PLAN TO TAKE UP EVEN MORE GREEN BELT BY PROVIDING CAR PARKING FOR THEM.

WESTON HAS ALREADY HAD ITS FAIR SHARE OF HIGHER DENSITY DEVELOPMENT WITH SOUTHLANDS AND HOLCOMBE GREEN.

THE FIELD BEHIND THE EASTERN END OF PURLEWENT DRIVE (LUCKARDS?) HAS BEEN USED, WITHOUT HINDERANCE, BY LOCAL RESIDENTS AND THE WIDER COMMUNITY FOR OVER FIFTY YEARS FOR SPORTS AND RECREATIONAL PURPOSES. ITS LOSS WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

THERE ARE CONCERNS WHETHER THE LOCAL WASPS SCHOOL COULD ACCOMMODATE THE INTAKE FROM 300 PROPOSED HOUSES. THE SCHOOL IS ALREADY PLANNING TO EXPAND TO A 3 CLASS INTAKE AND FURTHER EXPANSION WOULD MAKE IT THE LARGEST PRIMARY SCHOOL IN BATH. THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT TRANSPORT CONSIDERATIONS TO SUCH A DEVELOPMENT. IT IS UNREASONABLE TO BUILD A NEW SCHOOL SO CLOSE TO AN EXISTING SCHOOL (AND ON GREEN BELT) IN ORDER TO FACILITATE 300 NEW HOUSES. ONE OF THE MOD BROWNFIELD SITES WOULD BE MORE SUITABLE IF NEW SCHOOL WERE REQUIRED.

THE NOTION THAT THE DEVELOPMENT WILL INCLUDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING IS PROBLEMATIC. HOUSES BUILT IN WESTON WILL SOON GAIN WESTON HOUSE PRICES WHICH ARE HIGHER ON AVERAGE THAN IN OTHER PARTS OF BANES SUCH AS ODD DOWN OR KEYNSHAM

WHO ARE THE 300 HOUSES INTENDED FOR? I HAVE ATTENDED TWO MEETINGS IN WESTON, ORGANISED BY THE COUNCIL TO DISCUSS THE CORE STRATEGY IN RELATION TO WESTON AND ON BOTH OCCASIONS, HAVE LISTENED TO ARGUMENTS ABOUT THE NEED FOR MORE HOUSING BECAUSE OF THE BREAKDOWN OF THE NUCLEAR FAMILY, THE NEED TO SUPPLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND BECAUSE OF INCREASED NUMBERS OF JOBS. I AM AT A LOSS TO UNDERSTAND WHERE THE 12,700 JOBS FOR THE AREA ARE COMING FROM.

THE SUGGESTION IS THAT THE HOUSING IS INTENDED FOR SINGLE PARENT FAMILIES OR THE DIVORCED. WILL THEY BE ABLE TO AFFORD HOUSING IN WESTON GIVEN MY POINT ABOVE? THE COUNCIL DID NOT MAKE MENTION OF THE IMPACT ON LOCAL HOUSING ISSUES OF THE FACT THAT BRITAIN HAS OPEN EUROPEAN BORDERS. ISNT THIS A FACTOR IN THE

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

CORE STRATEGY AS IT RELATES TO WESTON? WILL THESE EU RESIDENTS BE ABLE TO AFFORD SUCH HOUSING?

WESTON IS A THRIVING COMMUNITY THAT HAS EVOLVED OVER CENTURIES. RESIDENTS WHO CHOOSE TO LIVE HERE DO SO IN ORDER TO ENJOY THE WELL BEING DERIVED FROM GREEN SPACES AND TO LIVE IN A SEMI RURAL LOCATION. DESTROYING THE GREEN BELT AND BOLTING ON 300 HOUSES, NEW ROADS, A SCHOOL ETC WILL RUIN 'THE VILLAGE'. THIS FACT IS NOT HELPED BY THE KNOWLEDGE THAT ANY DEVELOPMENT WILL BE, IN THE WORDS OF THE FORMER HOUSING MINISTER NICK BOLES, 'PIG UGLY' AND A FURTHER BLIGHT ON THE LANDSCAPE.

Change to the policy requested:

IT IS MY VIEW THAT THE PLAN TO BUILD 300 HOUSES, ROADS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE SHOULD BE ABANDONED. IN ORDER TO REMAIN LEGALLY COMPLIANT OR SOUND, ALL BROWN FIELD SITES IN THE CITY SHOULD BE USED AS A PRIORITY. IN PARTICULAR THE THREE MOD SITES.

THERE SHOULD BE A BETTER MIX OF RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL IN THE CITY CENTRE WHERE SO MANY SPACES ABOVE SHOPS ARE LEFT EMPTY. UNIVERSITIES SHOULD TAKE MORE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT NUMBERS AND HOUSING SO THAT AREAS LIKE OLDFIELD PARK CAN ONCE MORE BE RESIDENTIAL RATHER THAN STUDENT HOUSING.

THERE ARE ALSO A NUMBER OF EMPTY HOUSES IN WESTON ITSELF. I LIVE CLOSE TO AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY HOUSE THAT HAS BEEN LEFT UNINHABITED FOR ABOUT TWENTY YEARS. RESTORING EMPTY HOUSES TO FULL USE THROUGHOUT THE CITY WOULD ALSO MAKE THE CORE STRATEGY LEGALLY COMPLIANT

IN THE CONFLICTING LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE CORE STRATEGY AND GREEN BELT, LEGISLATION TO PROTECT GREEN BELT CANNOT BE JETTISONED WHEN INCONVENIENT. WHITTLING AWAY GREEN BELT MAKES A MOCKERY OF THE LAWS TO PROTECT IT.

Respondent Number: 4499 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mat McNab

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I am against the inclusion of 300 homes in Weston into the Core Development Strategy.

I believe this would cause significant visual intrusion for many residents who have specifically chosen to live in Weston on the edge of the Bath conurbation in order to have views of the countryside. It is already designated as green belt and an area of outstanding natural beauty and should be protected because of this. Any development will devalue the homes in this area.

I also believe that the current road through the centre of Weston village would become unmanageable. There is already significant congestion at times and the addition of another 300 homes would have significant traffic impact.

I would therefore like to register my objection to this development being included in the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4500 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Dunn

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am astounded by the plans for a housing development on the Green Belt at Weston.

Here we have some of the most stunning countryside and views in Bath. The countryside around Bath makes Bath what it is.

It is the crown in which the jewel of Bath is set.

I cannot imagine how any one can contemplate developing any further in this area. It really would be a disaster for the character of one of the most beautiful parts of Bath.

Please don't do this...

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:**

4501

Comment Number:

1

Respondent Name:

Philip and Mandy Osborne

Respondent Organisation:**Agent ID:****Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We understand that more houses are needed in the Banes area, and that most of these will come from brownfield sites already identified. The area in question SPC89 is in an area of ANOB and is part of the seven hills that surround the city of Bath and within sight of the Cotswold Way Footpath. Development on the slopes around Weston would completely overwhelm the village. Traffic is already very congested through the village and Lansdown Lane. The possibility of vastly increased traffic and new entrance and exits onto the existing roads will only make this worse. together with increased safety issues. There have been floods in the village over the years and we understand that many springs have been identified on the hills surrounding Weston. This, together with natural rain water run off can only increase the likely hood of this happening more often. Flash floods, which seem to happen more now, would very likely overwhelm any new drains, built on the Weston slopes, if development happened.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number:

4504

Comment Number:

1

Respondent Name:

Patrick Gleave

Respondent Organisation:**Agent ID:****Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I consider that the proposal to release greenbelt land at Weston is not justified or effective for the following reasons.

- It will urbanise Weston more. Currently, there is a good balance between housing, shops and green spaces. The ability to

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

easily access the green spaces around Weston is important for the well being of its inhabitants. In particular the Weston slopes leading up to and around the Millennium Woods are essential to the setting of those woods and give the area a sense of tranquillity. Brownfield sites should always be used first.

- The Weston slopes are a highly sensitive environment. Development would pose significant flooding risks requiring an expensive and intrusive system. Currently, there is already significant run off down the Weal and development will only increase this. Further, the slopes are home to a variety of plant life. I have walked through the slopes when they have been covered in flowers – I have not experienced this elsewhere in Bath.
- It will increase the amount of cars using Weston. Already, there are difficulties parking vehicles on the high street on roads like the Weal. Development will only increase this problem. Further, there will be increased exposure to pollution and danger for the many children who walk to local schools.
- It has been demonstrated time and time again that it is important for people to have good green spaces readily available. Furthermore, it's critically important for children to have access to these spaces to they can learn to appreciate their environment and learn how to appreciate risk. The western slopes are an ideal place for this. Taking away such spaces reduces the opportunities for children to experience this.

Change to the policy requested:

The removal of Weston slopes from the core strategy and retaining its current status as greenbelt land

Respondent Number: 4505 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sarah Gleave

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I consider that the proposal to release greenbelt land at Weston is not justified or effective for the following reasons.

- The character of Weston is a village in a semi-rural setting. The proposed development would increase urbanisation and change the character of the area.
- The Weston slopes are an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The development would damage or destroy this.
- The Weston slopes experience a significant amount of runoff during periods of prolonged and heavy rain. I have witnessed this several times on the Weal. Development of the slopes would increase this runoff and cause flooding of properties in areas around the High Street.
- It will increase traffic in Weston. Many of the roads including Lansdown Lane, the High Street, Coombe Park and Weston Lane experience high levels of traffic and congestion. Already local children are exposed to air pollution from traffic fumes on their walk to and from school. As the school expands, classrooms will be sited next to the already busy Lansdown Lane.
- The Weston Slopes are a valuable resource to local people, greatly contributing to their wellbeing. They are beautiful and varied, providing opportunities for exercise and recreation in a natural environment. Children use the area, allowing them to experience countryside on their doorstep without having to use a car to access it.
- The development of brownfield sites and the regeneration of existing buildings should always come above greenfield.

Change to the policy requested:

The removal of Weston slopes from the core strategy and retaining its current status as greenbelt land.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4508 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

SPC89 (Weston) A lot of the objections to Odd Down apply to Weston, as defined by NPPF guidance on building on the AONB.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4516 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr David Hayward**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

The land identified in SPC 89 is not suitable for building houses for the following reasons.

1. The land is a green field site and agricultural and located in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding National Beauty. Therefore totally unsuitable to build on land of such quality. On the land there is a Community Woodland which is a valuable and important space for the use of all and enjoyed by all as are the hills which are used a great deal by local people and walkers.
2. The hills on the north side have numerous springs under and on the hills and therefore are unsuitable for building.
3. The village is already crowded and is too small to cope with an extra 300 houses. The schools are full to capacity. There is only 1GP surgery. The roads are already clogged with cars and local residents often find they cannot park anywhere near their homes.
4. The Cotswold Way Walk which traverses the identified site does not seem to feature in the proposals nor is it even mentioned as being important to consider.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4517 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mary Hayward**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

The changes are not sound.

Representation No.:

1. What is the evidence that more houses are needed in Bath? City is already overcrowded and clogged with traffic. If you

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

don't allow traffic then we will lose tourists (main income earner of the city) already they complain about the traffic.

2. Many spaces are already available for accommodation eg vacated MOD sites. There are many empty houses. There are dozens of shops in the city only occupying ground floors. The top floors could be adapted and used for accommodation. Hermann Miller site on the Lower Bristol Rd is available for building -empty for years.

3. The city is a World Heritage site and its status is threatened by new and unsuitable buildings.

Change to the policy requested:

The land identified is not suitable for building.

1. The land is green field and agricultural and located in in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding National Beauty. There is a Community Woodland located just above - the identified area where both flora and fauna have been nurtured to provide a peaceful and important facility for the community. This is important for both physical and mental stability and well being.
2. The village would become overcrowded and is too small to sustain an extra 300 houses. Schools are at full capacity already and have waiting lists. There is only 1GP surgery. The roads in Weston are already clogged with parked cars from the village and commuters leaving their cars on the main and side roads.
3. The Cots'51d Way walk which crosses the land identified does not seem to have been identified in these proposals.
4. The hills on the north side of the village is peppered with springs which makes it unsuitable to build on.

Respondent Number: 4528 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** K G Furber

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This land is of great amenity value to local residents and an integral part of the open landscape that makes the setting of Bath so special. Development here alongside that proposed for MOD Enleigh would create large scale urban development with just "pockets of green".

The land is in an AONB part of and crucial to, the setting of one of only 2 World Heritage sites in the world, part of Baths conservation area and have too much flora and fauna. These factors are too readily dismissed in the core strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

The land should be removed from the list of proposed development areas.

As an absolute minimum it should be placed in a priority order of all land to be developed across BANES.

Respondent Number: 4541 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Stephen and Pam Chamberlain

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I consider this change to be unsound, for the following reasons. I refer in particular to the field to the north-east of Purlewent Drive.

1. In general, Weston is too congested an area, with problematic access, to be suitable for the large-scale development proposed.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

2. The terrain is steep, and on unstable clay. There are many springs in the area, and their locations are dynamic and unpredictable. In particular there is a major spring in the middle of this field which has already been piped but has since re-emerged several metres away, and the surrounding ground appears in danger of slumping. Such changes are very likely to happen again and elsewhere in the area, and could be catastrophic to new houses; such instability also poses a risk to the existing houses in Purlewent Drive and below.

3. There is insufficient suitable access as required by point (j). Access (S) from Purlewent Drive is steep and narrow, partly blocked by a pumping station, and would place unreasonable traffic stress on Purlewent Drive and Lucklands Road. Access (E) from Weston Park West involves a private road which I understand has previously been denied adoption due to access issues at the junction with Weston Park. Such issues will be more severe now. Further, both these routes feed into Weston Road which is already intolerably congested. Access (W) from Lansdown Lane, which is an impractically roundabout route, and would greatly increase traffic along a major external commuting route and close to Weston All Saints Primary School. The fact is that roads in the area barely cope with the traffic even now, and the congestion will be increased by the imminent move of the Royal High Junior School to Weston Park East. The steepness of the terrain also precludes provision of effective cycle routes.

4. The fields are important recreational areas for local people, are included in the Conservation Area, are highly visible from the south and west, and contain important footpaths including the Cotswold Way. I consider point (e) is impossible to implement with the proposed development.

5. The number of houses is insufficient for a new primary school (point (l)), and the existing Weston All Saints School is already too large to be expanded sufficiently.

Change to the policy requested:

This change should be removed.

Respondent Number: 4545 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Lewis Hands

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The plan is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and is therefore not sound. The NPPF states: "73. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required."

And

"74. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss."

The field behind Purlewent Drive has been used by the residents of Bath for over 50 years. It is used as an area for recreation for all ages. It is a high quality open space used for sports and recreation. Activities such as sledging, kite flying,

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

walking jogging, dog-walking, blackberrying, frisbee-ing, taking in the views, nature watching, the playing of children’s games (hide and seek, tag, etc..), drawing, painting, photography and so on all occur in the field.

A formal application to register the field behind Purlewent Drive as a town green was recently submitted to the Council and has been allocated the application number TVG13/1. The application includes completed questionnaires from almost 500 people providing statemetns concerning how they have used and continue to use this field.

I submit that an assessment has not been undertaken by the Council (point 73 NPPF).

Further, I submit that the land should not be built upon as it is not “surplus to requirements”, and will not be replaced by “equivalent or better” (point 74 NPPF).

With regard to the latter point, although the Archery Ground has not, as far as I am aware, been suggested as an alternative which is “equivalent or better”, I submit the following:

The field behind Purlewent Drive has fine views (over a horizontal angle of at least 120 degrees) across Bath to the Mendips, the Archery Ground does not have any, or only very limited views. The ‘upper’ Archery Ground field has a stream running down the middle which creates an impassable quagmire at most times of the year. The field behind Purlewent Drive is natural and “untamed” whereas the Archery Ground is managed. The field behind Purlewent Drive is large. The archery Ground is relatively small. The Archery Ground is surrounded by houses; the field behind Purlewent Drive is not and therefore has a greater sense of openness which allows one to “escape” from the city for a while. The field behind Purlewent Drive is suitable for sledging; the Archery Ground is not. Sledging is an extremely popular sport in winter in Weston; it compensates for living with Weston’s steep hills the rest of the time! In summary, I submit that the Archery Ground is not an equivalent or better replacement than the field behind Purlewent Drive for at least these reasons.

Change to the policy requested:

If the field behind Purlewent Drive is removed from the Plan then it is my opinion that my comments above would not apply and that the Plan would be sound.

Respondent Number: 4545 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Lewis Hands

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Tow n & V illage Green A p p l i c a t i o n f o r t h e l a n d k n o w n a s “T h e f i e l d b e h i n d P u r l e w e n t D r i v e ”

Although this application is being submitted in my own name I am writing on behalf of the many people who are supporting this application.

This land has been used by residents for very many years by local residents of Weston. The earliest date given in the accompanying completed questionnaires is YEAR.

The field has been used for very many recreational activities such as walking, dog walking, sledging in winter, blackberry picking, nature-watching (bats and birds at least), running, playing wide games such as with a Frisbee and so on.

The field is enjoyed by children as much as adults and people have provided information that church youth groups and the local Beavers at least have used it in the past. Children are taught about nature and also get to run around and play games. When there is snow it is not unusual to see dozens of people sledging together. The field is a safe area where parents let their children play unsupervised. This is partly due to the constant number of people using it which, no doubt, acts as “community supervision”. It is also well away from roads and associated traffic. It is welcome to see this when children have diminishing opportunities for outdoor play activities.

Teenagers use the field in the summer evenings for chatting and being with friends away from parents. However, no

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

antisocial behaviour has been observed and it is felt that the field offers a safe and natural location for such activities which is better than loitering around the shops on Weston High Street.

For adults the field provides a welcome break from the stresses of modern life and is enjoyed not least for the fine views from it (the Mendips can be seen on a clear day).

The field is a green lung for the community of Weston and is an important area for physical exercise and mental relaxation. The close proximity of this space for such exercise and relaxation are crucial to a healthy population.

I urge you to register this land as a town green to protect it for the present and future inhabitants of Weston.

I enclose over 400 completed questionnaires attesting to this use. I also attach personal statements from some local inhabitants which further provide detail as to how and why they use the field. Given more time more such statements could have been provided.

I also enclose some Google Earth images which show how paths have been formed over time in many parts of the field, evidencing that not just the rights of way are used. In particular the north east corner has a well used path stretching from the gate on the eastern boundary to that on the northern boundary. Sledging generally takes place in the south western quadrant from Wessex water's access track to the southern boundary although I have seen some people sledging downhill from the northern boundary too. Paths have also developed across the field immediately above Wessex Water's access track.

Finally, I attach a copy of BANES' Delegated Report concerning the application (11/00811/FUL) to erect a telecommunications base station and associated mast by Vodafone. The report substantiates the claims made in the town green application that the field is used by residents; "The site falls within a number of sensitive areas including the Green Belt, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), World Heritage Site and Conservation Area. The position chosen is a prominent location on a hillside south of the Primrose Hill Community Woodland and is situated alongside public rights of way that cross the site and is frequented by walkers and local residents. The location forms an important rural fringe to the city which has unspoilt character and is rich in mature trees and woodland." It also includes comments submitted to the Council which attest to the enclosed statements and questionnaires; for instance "- This field is a rich amenity for large numbers of people on a daily basis. Its beauty, unspoilt state, and much admired views must be retained now and for future generations."

Since the Council already recognises this field as being used by the local inhabitants it is fervently hoped that they will now agree to register it as a Town Green.

My own house backs onto the south east corner of the field and I can truthfully say that at whatever time of day I look out of the window I will invariably see someone using the field.

My own children love this field, as do we all. I urge the council to act in the inhabitants' best interests and protect it for us all by registering it as a Town green.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4545 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Lewis Hands
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Respondent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I write to inform you that a town and village green application was submitted to BANES council on 16 April 2013 for a field behind Purlewent Drive, Weston, Bath. It has been assigned the reference "TVG13/1" by the council.

The field has, and is, used by local inhabitants on a daily basis. It is unusual for it to be empty for more than an hour on any day.

Evidence of use for a period of time of over 20 years from almost 500 people was included with the application.

The council themselves recognise the field's popularity with, and use by, residents. An example is provided in the cover letter (copy attached) included with the application. A further example has recently come to light in that the Findings Report for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (March 2013) states on page 10 "One field (to the rear of Purlewent Drive) is particularly well used [sic] by people living in the area for recreation and forms a link between Weston Park and Primrose Hill Community Woodland."

I am informing you of this since the field in question is included in the core development plan for housing. It is respectfully requested that the field be removed from the plan since it should never have been included and should be safeguarded for the present and future inhabitants of Weston and Bath generally.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4556 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Gooch**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Flood Risk

Last year we experienced "record" levels of rain fall. There are numerous Springs on the Slopes at Weston. When walking last year (which we do frequently around the green field spaces which are proposed development sites within the Core Strategy), we could clearly see that the level of surface water / visible springs / large puddles (rendering roads impassable at times) increased dramatically and thus suggested that existing drainage is "strained".

I can think of two sizeable commercial properties in the Green Park area of Bath that appear to be available / unoccupied / boarded up. Why are these properties not being re-cycled to provide "affordable accommodation"? This has to be a far greater priority than reducing the Green Belt land around Bath.

I note that the Arup report states: "Development within the Lower Slopes at Weston study area is considered to be capable of adversely affecting the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity, authenticity and significance of the Bath World Heritage Site". Has this warning been fully considered?

Change to the policy requested:

Any development proposal would need to incorporate a clear, flexible and long term commitment to ongoing flood management. This is likely to be dynamic based on increased rainfall in future peak years and the unknown effects of global warming etc.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4556 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Gooch**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Accessibility and Vehicular Access

Weston Park West

Referring to the ARUP Report dated April 2013 and pertaining to the Development Options at Lower Weston Slopes, access to Parcel A from the east is described as via "Weston Park Way" [Section 3.2]. Please be advised that "Weston Park Way" does not exist. The map in section 4.2 of the same Arup document is not sufficiently detailed, but appears to suggest the eastern access will be via "Weston Park West". Please be advised that "Weston Park West" is actually a Private Street, and in accordance with the applicable deeds, has been maintained by the residents of "Weston Park West". "Weston Park West" is a quiet street with no pavement. I am quite confident that the residents of "Weston Park West" would, in totality, object to this street serving as an access to an area / development of additional dwellings. "Weston Park West" is in a conservation area.

Traffic Levels

Traffic coming down Lansdown Lane will disperse along Lower Bristol Road, Upper Bristol Road and Weston Lane/Weston Road into central Bath. There are known capacity issues on these routes in peak hours and journey speeds are relatively slow. I know various people who drive into Bath at rush hour. None use the London Road all prefer to drive (from the M4) past Bath Racecourse and enter Bath via Lansdown or Weston. 300 extra dwellings will bring an estimated 450 cars (1.5 per household) to an already congested area.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4562 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Vowles & Son**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

In an area of outstanding natural beauty and on the Cotswold way, a housing estate would destroy the landscape. Building houses close to our property will severely disrupt our farming business. We farm a beef suckler herd (UK 322459) & Sheep.

I'm concerned if houses were built close to our land what measures would be made to stop people trespassing. (All of our land has no right to roam)

Wildlife.

Weston is known for flash flooding, on our land alone water appears out of the ground in numerous places.

Change to the policy requested:

More houses will cause even more traffic congestion in the village.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4567 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Robert Ellard**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

This is not the most appropriate location, the Council could have chosen because:

- It is an open space, which is very well used by the local community for a variety of recreational activities.
- It is on steeply sloping land, which would make any development visible for many miles and spoil the aspect of the hills that surround Bath, one of the city's most notable features.
- It has poor access, only by narrow roads already overburdened by parking and traffic from the nearby Royal United hospital.
- It would entail building on land that has been used for agricultural production in the recent past and could be again – a method of wealth creation that may become increasingly significant if food prices rise in the coming decades.

Change to the policy requested:

Instead of building on agricultural land, countryside and recreational areas, the Council should be building on Brownfield sites, and in particular on the three former Ministry of Defence sites that have recently become available. These three sites are preferable, because:

- They are already developed
- They are highly visible – building houses on them will not diminish Bath's status as World Heritage site.
- They have excellent local infrastructure.

Respondent Number: 4570 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Olivia Whitworth**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The field proposed to be developed is not only Greenbelt as well as Cotswold way.

Where would the access be from?

The field is sloping and has a large volume of water which drains from it. This could cause problems.

The area is used by many local people and also people walking the Cotswolds way, families with children tobogganing, BlackBerrying and dog walking/training.

Change to the policy requested:

Bearing in mind we have recently had development at Holcombe Green and Louthead.

Please can we retain "Village Green" style in the field.

We believe access to such a wonderful open space for sport and recreating contributes significantly to the health and wellbeing of many people in our community.

Respondent Number: 4581 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Heather Allen**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

When I retired in 1987, I had lived away from Britain for 40 years. After living and working in Manhattan, New York, with its hustle, bustle and noise saturating the city continuously, I longed for the peace and quiet of England. My ideal new home was a smallish town (I'd had enough of cities) where I could live among trees and fields with birds singing and animals grazing. But I also wanted urban facilities nearby so I could take a short bus ride (or even walk) to town to the library, bank or cinema.

I found what I was looking for! A wonderful area of Bath called, locally, Weston village. It had once been a village with a stream running through the High Street, until absorbed into Bath in the 1960s. My flat is in a conservation area bordered by the green belt so I was completely confident it could never be spoiled by any kind of development. (I learned about this enlightened land-planning when I lived in New York and was very impressed by the foresight shown by the people responsible. The idea that it was in perpetuity for future generations, made me very proud to be British).

When considering plans for building more houses in Bath, could you first consider all the brown-field sites currently available: those that, until recently, were occupied by the MOD - for example Ensleigh. I think you'd find the land most suitable for housing development, attractive and well supplied with good quality roads and transport,

I am now 89 years old (in early June) and have lived in Weston 26 years - longer than I have lived anywhere. I have been very happy here in this lovely environment. My hope is that Weston can remain this way for future citizens to enjoy.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4588 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Withies Farm Landowners' Group,**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

For reasons set out in the representations made to SPC54, it is considered that, in discharging the policy criteria, the identification of this site as a strategic development location could well be found to be unsound having regard to the priorities of the spatial strategy.

Whilst this location is considered to have some potential for development, it is considered that this is most appropriately considered through the Place-Making Plan.

It is considered that Policy B3B is insufficiently justified and may not be effective.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete Policy B3B from the Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 4595 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Martyn Evans**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I wish to object to the land being allocated in the core strategy for Weston,
Inadequate Consultation

The Amended Core Strategy was voted on and passed by B&NES on the 4th March 2013. I received no information from the council as to the proposed housing development prior to this vote and was only made aware by a neighbour who started to organise a petition against the development. I was informed by the neighbour that the council had arranged a so called 'consultation' with local residents on the 11th April 2013 between 4:30pm and 7:00pm (very difficult to attend if you work and have a family).

Consultations should be made before any decision is taken otherwise it is NOT a consultation.

The Liberal Democrats arranged a meeting on the 3rd May, to discuss the issues. It was clear at the meeting that the vast majority (if not all) of the residents were against the plans and the lack of any consultation was a major grievance.

'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' & Greenbelt

The proposed land in Weston is not just greenbelt but is also within an area designated as an 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' (AONB). Surely within Bath and North East Somerset there are alternatives which do not affect AONB land.

AONB should be looked upon as 'A National Treasure', and should not be left to local council (who are only temporarily in office) to affect as they see fit. One would not cut the corner off a painting by Gainsborough because it was politically expedient, in the same way AONB should not be touched.. We are custodians of this designated land and should preserve AONB for future generations.

The AONB land in Weston on which the council propose to build 300 d houses is viewable from many parts of Bath, The green vista adds enormously to the character of Bath.

Not Sustainable

The site is not sustainable, the local school has been granted the right to expand but that is only to cover existing need it does not include any additional housing in Weston as is proposed in the core strategy. It cannot expand further. Where would the children of the proposed development attend school?

There is only one significant employer in Weston, that is the Royal United Hospital. The NHS is changing rapidly, what services the hospital will offer in the future is uncertain, however, as an employee of the hospital I am aware that there is enormous pressure on the hospital expenditure with the biggest section being the staff wage bill. Hence it is highly unlikely the hospital staff numbers will expand and indeed they are more likely to contract as alternative 'Health Providers' are allowed to offer services. Therefore the residents of any new development would commute from Weston to their place of work, significantly and detrimentally affecting traffic. The increased traffic may also affect ambulances trying to get to the hospital A&E department.

There are currently 2,500 houses in Weston, developing a site with a further 300 houses would be disproportionate.

The 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF) states there are There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. From the definitions given in the NPPF this site in Weston does not meet any of them. With regards the planned 300 houses in Weston, the 'Core Strategy' is not compliant with the NPPF.

NPPF Definitions

- an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;
- a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

Change to the policy requested:

I wish all reference to Weston removed from the 'Core Strategy' and for AONB land to be declared as protected from development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4598 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nick Kuhn **Respondent Organisation:** Nick Kuhn Architect

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I object to the inclusion of PLOT A (as designated in the Arup study) on the Lower Weston Slopes, for the following reasons:

- * This Plot is situated in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is also part of a Conservation Area.
- * The development of this Plot is not justified.
- * The development of this Plot would not be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework

I include the following excerpts from the NPPF to support these points:

“Section 9 : Protecting Green Belt land

80. Green Belt serves five purposes.

- * To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- * To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

81. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to.....retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity....

83. ..Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances.

88. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, or any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Section 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

109. The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...

110. In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to.....allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value.

111. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.”

Plot A sits within a section of particularly beautiful countryside which offers outstanding local views. This “finger” of green space connects directly with Weston Park thereby linking the open countryside to the heart of the built-up area. This relationship is precious and very rare. I feel it should be preserved at all costs.

Change to the policy requested:

I request the removal of Plot A on the Lower Weston Slopes from the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy 2013

Respondent Number: 4601 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Penelope Austin **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The large field immediately behind the north eastern part of Purlewent Drive is not suitable for development for the following reasons:

1. Access not possible via Weston park West as it is a Private Road and is owned and maintained by the residents.
2. The road has suffered flooding in recent months and the local area would not cope with extra pressure on the drainage system of 300 extra dwellings and a Primary School
3. local roads are already very congested, and this development would bring too much traffic along Weston Park, Weston Village (already one-way and always congested), Purlewent Drive.
4. RUH would not cope with extra demands of 300 household in the area ,and the extra traffic would hold up ambulances.
5. Weston has already been developed over the years to include mixed housing . Adding to this in the form of 300 extra houses and a school in an area so close to the city centre is too extreme.. Access would be along roads from the city centre which are narrow and pass significant historic sites which need to be protected
6. Bath is a world heritage city. This and other new proposed developments would alter the image of a city that has cared about the heritage it is responsible for, into one of a city that does not care at all. Tourism would be affected, the jobs available would be fewer, and the reason for the development would no longer exist.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete plan to build in Lower slopes Weston

Respondent Number: 4606 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Sally Winter

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

My comments relate to the proposals to build 300 houses on green belt land to the north and west of Weston, Bath. In particular I would like to comment about your proposal to site houses to the north and to the west of Napier Road. This site is too far from the village centre in Weston for people to walk or cycle to the shops etc, and the land in question is on a fairly steep hill, further reducing the likelihood of new residents using sustainable modes of transport such as cycling or walking. Every house in the area around Napier Road, Leighton Road and Broadmoor Lane is car dependant as evidenced by there being at least one car outside every house. The local bus service is expensive and not regular enough to persuade people to use public transport instead of the car. During the consultation event, a representative of BANES said most of the housing would be 'affordable'. If the plan is to house people of lower incomes the expensive and inadequate bus service must be a consideration. There are also no cycle lanes in the area, the nearest being the tow path. It is also a difficult area to cycle to because of the topography of the hills leading to the outer western edges of Weston.

I should also like to comment that as a general principle it is best to avoid building on undeveloped land. An effect of building is to seal the land so that water cannot penetrate. This is particularly important on the slopes of Weston because it is a very wet area with many springs, which successfully run into local streams and gullies during drier times, but in times of very heavy rain has resulted in flooding through gardens on the hills, and along stretches of Broadmoor Lane, and into the centre of Weston Village. Building on these slopes would increase the amount of water which cannot penetrate the land, increase the volume of water in the streams near houses and possibly increase flooding to these areas and beyond.

I had believed that the green belt is there to avoid urban sprawl and that it is bad policy to build on it. Just over the hill to the west of Weston can be seen the sprawl of Bristol beyond. I believe it is important to preserve these green boundaries between cities.

I would like to suggest that it would be better to densify other areas, for example near the cycle track, in the Brassmill Lane

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

area of Bath, or other areas from which the tow path can be accessed on fairly level ground, thus giving people easy access to the city-centre by bike. There are also many under-used sites within the City upon which it would be better to build, such as by the traffic lights by Windsor Bridge on the Upper Bristol road; in Avon Street Coach Park (owned by BANES?) which is an ugly site and could be better used for housing; in the derelict building in Green Park near the Salvation Army building (also owned by BANES?) to name just a few. Green belt land should not be built upon when such sites are unused, or poorly used.

Bath's UNESCO World Heritage Statement of Significance highlights the importance of the 'surrounding hills and green valley'. While Weston does not have the architectural splendour of the centre of Bath, I would consider views of Kelston Round Hill, across to Landsdown, including Beckford's Tower to be important to the green character of Weston and the Bath as a whole. Building up the slopes around Weston would harm these views and damage the green character of the area.

I hope my comments will be given due consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

As above – I do not support building on green belt land around Weston.

Respondent Number: 4607	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: JC & PA Elliot-Newman and
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Further development in the local area, particularly on the site preferred by the Council, will cause unsustainable overload of all existing infrastructure, with no feasible means of reducing such being evident.

The preferred site is unsuitable for development, due to its topography and the existence of many springs and watercourses and very poor access from public roads.

Weston Park West:

The stated preferred major access, incorrectly named Weston Park Way in the ARUP report, is an unadopted Private Street, constructed for use by private cars and other light weight traffic only, with no pavements.

It is bounded on the west by mainly Grade II listed properties, the listing including the boundary walls and on the east by the ancient bank and hedgerow, beyond which is an always flowing open stream and the protected local Weston Park.

The street has inadequate surface water drainage, is regularly flooded by surface water run off from the land above, including from the path and track forming part of The Cotswold Way national walking route.

The area of Weston Park West is mostly part of the Bath Conservation Area, shown as such on the Core Strategy Update document.

There is very poor sight visibility when attempting to exit Weston Park West.

The existing road system:

This, to the east, south and west of the preferred site, is incapable of being improved to cope with additional traffic. It is heavily congested, with many lengths of parked cars reducing traffic to single lane only, which results in long tail backs and regular hindrance to Public and Emergency Service vehicles.

The preferred site is accessed from the west via the narrow One Way traffic Weston High Street and restricted width Crown Hill, from which Lucklands Road is the major access route to Purlewent Drive, both constructed to a width only suitable for the existing development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

A mixed use development:
No suggestion is made of what is intended.

Education:
The changes include provision of a Primary School, unless an alternative solution can be found and agreed with the Education Authority.

No mention has been made in any supporting documentation of the existing Roman Catholic primary school on Penn Hill Road.

WASPS – Weston All Saints Primary School, is already heavily oversubscribed and has poor vehicular access.

Change to the policy requested:

To be viable and due to the oversubscribed WASPS, a new Primary School would attract pupils from elsewhere in the City, thus increasing traffic movement and so congestion.

The Core Strategy Changes make no reference to Secondary Education, the need for which would also be increased by further housing development in Weston.

Apart from Kingswood and Bath High public schools, the only state Funded Comprehensive in the Western sector of Bath is Oldfield School, which has a good proportion of its existing intake from outlying rural districts.

That school is believed to only take boys at sixth form level.

Thus even more cross city traffic will result, to access the other state funded secondary schools.

NPPF Guidance:
Inadequate consideration has been given to the ramification of developing the preferred site, both physical and cost, to meet the NPPF requirements as set out in SPC163, 164 and 165.

The existing flood avoidance, other surface water and grey water drainage systems are already used to their maximum.

Similarly the Weston Area suffers the result of overload of the electricity and telephone networks.

Respondent Number: 4608 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Simon Malthouse **Respondent Organisation:** RUH NHS

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I believe the strategy for housing in the land adjoining Weston to be unsound for the following reasons
-it is an area of outstanding natural beauty and is inappropriate and might well threaten the World heritage status that Bath currently enjoys
-insufficient attention and consideration has been made to the risk of flooding in the Weston area if this development proceeds.
-a distinctly possible no vote in a European referendum may make the additional housing requirement unnecessary. The decision should be deferred or at least given a timeline of exit clause once the outcome and change of circumstances apparent
-The full impact of the Western Riverside development has not yet been realised in terms of traffic parking and congestion. This makes the predicting accurate outcomes and consequences of this proposal even more difficult
-the roads in and out of Bath on the Western approaches are already seriously congested despite the councils best attempts to promote public transport. More traffic will have further detrimental economic and health consequences

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

-the proposal suggests that building houses on the perimeter will have a lower increase in road traffic. It does not take into account the fact that residents who currently enjoy walks in the green belt will now have to get in their cars to enjoy an evening stroll. The paths from Weston up to Lansdown are very much enjoyed by residents

-there has to be very limited business development potential in Bath because of the restricted planning due the world heritage status. Many of these residents may need to commute to Bristol or a=other adjoining towns with greater development potential

-proposed housing on the land adjoining Weston would have significant access difficulties to the existing road network.

Change to the policy requested:

To make the proposal more sound I suggest that the proposed housing development on land adjoining Weston should be withdrawn

Respondent Number: 4610 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Christopher Gill **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Core Strategy Update makes reference to bats in the area, but does not mention the many badger setts scattered throughout the proposed development site. These setts have been here for many, many years and are currently very much in use.

Although the law allows for them to be re-sited, the traffic travelling on the extra roads that will have to be built (further decimating the AONB & Green Belt) will pose a very real danger to them.

The wild deer that also populate this area will similarly be affected.

Change to the policy requested:

Before eroding the Green Belt/AONB & losing it forever, ensure that every available/disused brownfield site and empty or derelict property is compulsorily purchased (if needed), and re-used effectively. Move students to campus or specialist student accommodation, thus freeing up hundreds of family homes in the Oldfield Park area. Make the best use of the 3 recently vacated MOD sites.

Respondent Number: 4611 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Sheila Sparrow **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: 153 **Agent Name:** ST8 Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

For reasons set out in the representations made to SPC54, the identification of Weston Lower Slopes as having potential for accommodating the City's housing needs is supported.

However, flexibility is required to permit the development of this area to be realised either on a comprehensive basis as a strategic site, or through smaller scale land releases on sites that can make an early contribution towards alleviating the District's shortfall in housing land and backlog from previous plan periods.

Change to the policy requested:

Introduce the clarification and flexibility outlined above.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4612 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** The Elms Weston Bath Management Co**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Further development in the local area, particularly on the site preferred by the Council, will cause unsustainable overload of all existing infrastructure, with no feasible means of reducing such being evident.

The preferred site is unsuitable for development, due to its topography and the existence of many springs and watercourses and very poor access from public roads.

Weston Park West:

The stated preferred major access, incorrectly named Weston Park Way in the ARUP report, is an unadopted Private Street, constructed for use by private cars and other light weight traffic only, with no pavements.

It is bounded on the west by mainly Grade II listed properties, the listing including the boundary walls and on the east by the ancient bank and hedgerow, beyond which is an always flowing open stream and the protected local Weston Park.

The street has inadequate surface water drainage, is regularly flooded by surface water run off from the land above, including from the path and track forming part of The Cotswold Way national walking route.

The area of Weston Park West is mostly part of the Bath Conservation Area, shown as such on the Core Strategy Update document.

There is very poor sight visibility when attempting to exit Weston Park West.

The existing road system:

This, to the east, south and west of the preferred site, is incapable of being improved to cope with additional traffic. It is heavily congested, with many lengths of parked cars reducing traffic to single lane only, which results in long tail backs and regular hindrance to Public and Emergency Service vehicles.

The preferred site is accessed from the west via the narrow One Way traffic Weston High Street and restricted width Crown Hill, from which Lucklands Road is the major access route to Purlewent Drive, both constructed to a width only suitable for the existing development.

A mixed use development:

No suggestion is made of what is intended.

Education:

The changes include provision of a Primary School, unless an alternative solution can be found and agreed with the Education Authority.

No mention has been made in any supporting documentation of the existing Roman Catholic primary school on Penn Hill Road.

WASPS – Weston All Saints Primary School, is already heavily oversubscribed and has poor vehicular access.

Change to the policy requested:

To be viable and due to the oversubscribed WASPS, a new Primary School would attract pupils from elsewhere in the City, thus increasing traffic movement and so congestion.

The Core Strategy Changes make no reference to Secondary Education, the need for which would also be increased by

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

further housing development in Weston.

Apart from Kingswood and Bath High public schools, the only state Funded Comprehensive in the Western sector of Bath is Oldfield School, which has a good proportion of its existing intake from outlying rural districts.

That school is believed to only take boys at sixth form level.

Thus even more cross city traffic will result, to access the other state funded secondary schools.

NPPF Guidance:

Inadequate consideration has been given to the ramification of developing the preferred site, both physical and cost, to meet the NPPF requirements as set out in SPC163, 164 and 165.

The existing flood avoidance, other surface water and grey water drainage systems are already used to their maximum.

Similarly the Weston Area suffers the result of overload of the electricity and telephone networks.

Respondent Number: 4616 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Tina Gill

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

There are approximately 29 springs and streams across the proposed sites, resulting in permanently waterlogged ground in places.

Weston village has been flooded at least 3 times in the last decade, and we in Purlewent Drive (immediately below part of the proposed sites) have experienced water pouring over our back garden, rushing down our steps, and past the side of the house. This, as well as the clay soil that is so prevalent in this area, and the fact that the house is on a steep slope has played no small part in the subsidence of our house and subsequent lengthy insurance claim.

Not only will the new houses more than likely suffer the same problems, it will probably exacerbate the suffering of those of us already affected.

Change to the policy requested:

Before eroding the Green Belt/AONB & losing it forever, ensure that every available/disused brownfield site and empty or derelict property is compulsorily purchased (if needed), and re-used effectively. Move students to campus or specialist student accommodation, thus freeing up hundreds of family homes in the Oldfield Park area. Make the best possible use of the 3 recently vacated MOD sites

Respondent Number: 4619 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Michael Spratt

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

POINTS 2 AND 3 RELATE TO 7b IS THE CORE STRATEGY SOUND ? – IN PARTICULAR JUSTIFIED, WITH RELATION TO SUSTAINABILITY.

(2) From BANES Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2013 Finds Report (March 2013) paragraph 2.18 “One field (to the rear of Purlewent Drive) is particularly well used by people living in the area for recreation and forms a link between

Weston Park and Primrose Hill Community Woodland." So why is this area being removed from the Green Belt and development proposed ? This violates the SUSTAINABILITY requirement. In particular the BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex D has as a Sustainability Objective 2 "Improve the Health and Well-being of ALL communities". Clearly removing a well-used area for recreation violates this sustainability objective.

(3) "Reduce the need and desire to travel by car" is Objective 11 of the BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex D. However, the proposed development at Weston (to the rear of Purlewent Drive) will force many thousands of Bath residents into their cars every time they wish to go for a country walk. A much more sustainable policy is to leave some "fingers" of green countryside close to Bath that are accessible on foot, rather than having to get in the car to go for country walks.

(4) The National Planning Policy Framework (Department of Communities and Local Government) states that "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence."

Thus the Government attaches great importance to preventing urban sprawl. The proposed Weston development is exactly that, urban sprawl.

(5) The National Planning Policy Framework (Department of Communities and Local Government) states that "Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances."

There is clearly a very strong feeling in the community in Weston that the area behind Purlewent Drive is of particular importance, and they should be given the appropriate opportunity to designate it a Local Green Space. By rushing through the plans, BANES are circumventing the government policy of allowing the designation of Local Green Space.

(6) From the BANES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy

"Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed." I have seen no evidence in the BANES documentation of special circumstances applying to the area to the rear of Purlewent Drive in Weston that there are "special circumstances".

(7) The area to the rear of Purlewent Drive in Weston is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is part of a World Heritage Site. It is part of the Cotswold Way (indeed if the proposed development takes place, and Weston becomes an urban sprawl I would doubt that walkers would want to walk from Bath on the Cotswold Way). It is also a Conservation Area. The BANES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy does not take account of any of this.

(9) In the BANES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy and other BANES documentation there does not seem to be any evidence that brownfield sites have been exhaustively explored for development, and government policy is clear that brownfield site development is much preferable to building on the Green Belt.

GENERAL COMMENT

(10) A summary of my comments about the removal of Weston from the Green Belt, and the proposed development is as follows :

One of the principle advantages of living in or visiting Bath is the ability to walk from the city centre to beautiful countryside within 20-30 minutes. The principal walking route on the northern side of Bath is the Cotswold Way, going across the Golf Course, Sion Hill, Summerhill Road and onto Primrose Hill. From there, there is an outstandingly beautiful walk up to Beckford's Tower. This is now under direct threat.

I was appalled at the proposal within the Bath and NE Somerset Council's Core Strategy document to ruin the Primrose Hill area by a large development of 300 houses there. Primrose is an area that has been designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as being a Conservation Area and is part of the Green Belt. This development will drastically detrimentally affect the quality of life people living in Weston, as well as those in the north and centre (e.g. Lower Weston, Julian Road area etc.) wishing to directly walk into the countryside close to Bath.

My belief is that Bath should now be marketing itself as a walking and cycling hub to complement the historical attractions within the city. This is especially the case now that the Two Tunnels Greenway cycle paths to Midford have been

completed. Competitor tourist cities such as York have a nondescript urban sprawl outside of their historic centres, and can in no way compete with the natural setting Bath enjoys.

It is important to consider the medium term - it seems inevitable that over the next few years the price of fuel will continue to rise steeply, and more and more people will find that car journeys are expensive. Indeed, environmentalists are encouraging us to consider voluntarily relinquishing our cars. Therefore fewer and fewer people will be able to just jump into the car to go for a country walk. It is therefore vital for the people of Bath as well as for tourism that we do not destroy the beautiful walks from the city to the countryside that everyone can enjoy - the "fingers" of green countryside quickly accessible from Bath centre. Walkability from the city centre should be a key criterion for assessing the value of areas of outstanding natural beauty.

Weston is already about to experience a huge increase in population as the Western Riverside Development with several thousand new homes being planned. This will be bound to make Victoria Park much busier, and preserving Primrose Hill takes on much more importance. Dog walkers make considerable use of Primrose Hill, and should it no longer be conserved as a pleasant environment many will inevitably use Victoria Park instead, with an inevitable increase in the already noticeable dog mess.

Even London, in spite of its urban sprawl, has maintained areas of natural beauty (such as Hampstead Heath and Richmond Park) that are relatively accessible to those living in central areas of London. It is madness if Bath does not attempt to also maintain the natural beauty of centrally accessible areas such as Primrose Hill.

Even by BANES council's own Sustainability Appraisal Report for its Core Strategy Development Plan, the development of Primrose Hill should not be allowed. The document states that BANES should (1) protect and provide access to appropriate levels of open space (2) improve people's health (and reduce health inequalities), (3) reduce the need to travel. Clearly the highest quality open space is being replaced by urban sprawl. The steep incline to Beckford's Tower makes the walk excellent exercise, and so replacing it with housing worsens rather than improves people's health, and forcing people who want to go for a country walk to go by car increases rather than reduces the need to travel.

The council has clearly not thought through the issues, and has overlooked the fact that areas of open country accessible from the heart of the city such as Primrose Hill is and will increasingly be of great importance. Primrose Hill needs to be conserved for ourselves, for walkers and tourists and for future generations.

Change to the policy requested:

POINTS 2 AND 3 RELATE TO 7b IS THE CORE STRATEGY SOUND ? – IN PARTICULAR JUSTIFIED, WITH RELATION TO SUSTAINABILITY.

(2) From BANES Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2013 Finds Report (March 2013) paragraph 2.18 "One field (to the rear of Purlewent Drive) is particularly well used by people living in the area for recreation and forms a link between Weston Park and Primrose Hill Community Woodland." So why is this area being removed from the Green Belt and development proposed ? This violates the SUSTAINABILITY requirement. In particular the BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex D has as a Sustainability Objective 2 "Improve the Health and Well-being of ALL communities". Clearly removing a well-used area for recreation violates this sustainability objective.

(3) "Reduce the need and desire to travel by car" is Objective 11 of the BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex D. However, the proposed development at Weston (to the rear of Purlewent Drive) will force many thousands of Bath residents into their cars every time they wish to go for a country walk. A much more sustainable policy is to leave some "fingers" of green countryside close to Bath that are accessible on foot, rather than having to get in the car to go for country walks.

(4) The National Planning Policy Framework (Department of Communities and Local Government) states that "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence."

Thus the Government attaches great importance to preventing urban sprawl. The proposed Weston development is exactly that, urban sprawl.

(5) The National Planning Policy Framework (Department of Communities and Local Government) states that "Local

communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.”

There is clearly a very strong feeling in the community in Weston that the area behind Purlewent Drive is of particular importance, and they should be given the appropriate opportunity to designate it a Local Green Space. By rushing through the plans, BANES are circumventing the government policy of allowing the designation of Local Green Space.

(6) From the BANES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy

“Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for the detailed boundary to be changed.” I have seen no evidence in the BANES documentation of special circumstances applying to the area to the rear of Purlewent Drive in Weston that there are “special circumstances”.

(7) The area to the rear of Purlewent Drive in Weston is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is part of a World Heritage Site. It is part of the Cotswold Way (indeed if the proposed development takes place, and Weston becomes an urban sprawl I would doubt that walkers would want to walk from Bath on the Cotswold Way). It is also a Conservation Area. The BANES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy does not take account of any of this.

(9) In the BANES Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy and other BANES documentation there does not seem to be any evidence that brownfield sites have been exhaustively explored for development, and government policy is clear that brownfield site development is much preferable to building on the Green Belt.

GENERAL COMMENT

(10) A summary of my comments about the removal of Weston from the Green Belt, and the proposed development is as follows :

One of the principle advantages of living in or visiting Bath is the ability to walk from the city centre to beautiful countryside within 20-30 minutes. The principal walking route on the northern side of Bath is the Cotswold Way, going across the Golf Course, Sion Hill, Summerhill Road and onto Primrose Hill. From there, there is an outstandingly beautiful walk up to Beckford’s Tower. This is now under direct threat.

I was appalled at the proposal within the Bath and NE Somerset Council’s Core Strategy document to ruin the Primrose Hill area by a large development of 300 houses there. Primrose is an area that has been designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as being a Conservation Area and is part of the Green Belt. This development will drastically detrimentally affect the quality of life people living in Weston, as well as those in the north and centre (e.g. Lower Weston, Julian Road area etc.) wishing to directly walk into the countryside close to Bath.

My belief is that Bath should now be marketing itself as a walking and cycling hub to complement the historical attractions within the city. This is especially the case now that the Two Tunnels Greenway cycle paths to Midford have been completed. Competitor tourist cities such as York have a nondescript urban sprawl outside of their historic centres, and can in no way compete with the natural setting Bath enjoys.

It is important to consider the medium term - it seems inevitable that over the next few years the price of fuel will continue to rise steeply, and more and more people will find that car journeys are expensive. Indeed, environmentalists are encouraging us to consider voluntarily relinquishing our cars. Therefore fewer and fewer people will be able to just jump into the car to go for a country walk. It is therefore vital for the people of Bath as well as for tourism that we do not destroy the beautiful walks from the city to the countryside that everyone can enjoy - the “fingers” of green countryside quickly accessible from Bath centre. Walkability from the city centre should be a key criterion for assessing the value of areas of outstanding natural beauty.

Weston is already about to experience a huge increase in population as the Western Riverside Development with several thousand new homes being planned. This will be bound to make Victoria Park much busier, and preserving Primrose Hill takes on much more importance. Dog walkers make considerable use of Primrose Hill, and should it no longer be conserved as a pleasant environment many will inevitably use Victoria Park instead, with an inevitable increase in the already noticeable dog mess.

Even London, in spite of its urban sprawl, has maintained areas of natural beauty (such as Hampstead Heath and Richmond Park) that are relatively accessible to those living in central areas of London. It is madness if Bath does not attempt to also

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

maintain the natural beauty of centrally accessible areas such as Primrose Hill.

Even by BANES council's own Sustainability Appraisal Report for its Core Strategy Development Plan, the development of Primrose Hill should not be allowed. The document states that BANES should (1) protect and provide access to appropriate levels of open space (2) improve people's health (and reduce health inequalities), (3) reduce the need to travel. Clearly the highest quality open space is being replaced by urban sprawl. The steep incline to Beckford's Tower makes the walk excellent exercise, and so replacing it with housing worsens rather than improves people's health, and forcing people who want to go for a country walk to go by car increases rather than reduces the need to travel.

The council has clearly not thought through the issues, and has overlooked the fact that areas of open country accessible from the heart of the city such as Primrose Hill is and will increasingly be of great importance. Primrose Hill needs to be conserved for ourselves, for walkers and tourists and for future generations.

Respondent Number: 4620	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name: Thomas Constantine	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The proposal for a development of 300 homes in Weston is in my view has been rushed, not thought through properly, and therefore does not fully take into account the dramatic effect on the Weston community such a development would have.

There are physical, environmental and social reasons for Weston not being suitable for the proposed development

1. The hills proposed for development are in the Cotswolds AONB, the green belt, in a Conservation Area, and part of the World Heritage city site – such land is extraordinarily rare and can never be regained once lost. Development at sites like this when considered on a national scale, beggar belief, and are a major risk to our national heritage.
2. These beautiful hills form a much valued green area for the residents of Weston who overlook them, and for those many users who walk, hike, run, picnic, play and in other ways use the hills, they frame the historic city of Bath.
3. The environmental effects will not be insignificant. There are natural springs throughout the hills, and the green areas are a haven for many forms of wildlife and flora/fauna. The community woodland Primrose Hill whilst not included within the development, will be severely affected by the encroaching building work.
4. Weston High St has flooded in recent years, with its location in a steep sided valley putting it naturally at risk. The land proposed for development has numerous springs, and does not lend itself to being converted into housing and sealed roads. The increased flood risk to Weston High St and properties between should be a significant blocker to the development.
5. The local primary school, WASPS, is already severely strained and is being developed to a point where access will be a problem. A further 300 homes will only add to the problems, and will not be sufficient numbers to justify a new primary school.
6. Access to the proposed site is very poor to all but the far Western end of the proposed development. Other than directly off Lansdown Lane, access for 300 homes is not feasible within the infrastructure of Weston. Weston High St at the bottom of Lansdown Lane already is a being trafficked far beyond its capability by commuters travelling to/from Bath. The road is congested and at times dangerous, a situation which will be exacerbated by further housing development. At the eastern end, access is not feasible, with Weston Park East and Purlewent Drive being minor roads without the capacity for the additional traffic likely.

Change to the policy requested:

I support the deletion of this proposed change. I dispute that the quantity of houses quoted are required in Bath, but if this is fixed, the 300 house from Weston would be far better placed at the Odd Down site which BANES themselves say can support 600 homes, yet is only being proposed for 300. The Odd Down site with 600 homes, would be far better placed to build a new community and justify a new primary school on its own terms.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4622 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Alexandra Burrage**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

It is my belief the change proposed in B3B makes the Submitted Core Strategy is NOT SOUND as the loss of green space for the local community would be at odds with points 73, 74 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (as follows):

“73. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.”

In response to point 73 of the NPPF above: The field behind Purlewent Drive is used by a significant proportion of the local community, as well as many who come to enjoy the views across Bath and the Cotswold Way national trail. Local residents have been using this field for sport and recreation for over 50 years. I was personally involved in collecting over 500 questionnaires to support a town village green application for the field behind Purlewent Drive. This process clearly proved that many people use the field for the following pursuits: Walking, running, football, frisbee, photography, drawing, blackberry picking and sledging. I personally use the field up to 3 times per week and to play games with the children and sledged there as a family during the recent snow fall along side many other families enjoying some of the best sledging in Bath.

"74. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.”

In response to point 74 above: I do not believe the council has undertaken an adequate assessment which has proved the open space to be ‘surplus to requirements’. The field behind Purlewent Drive is in contact use by the local community. My house backs on to this field, and whenever I look out of my window, I see people using this space for recreation. It has unique characteristics, in particular the views across the city, which is not replicated in other near by green spaces, such as Weston Park East aka The Archery Ground. The spectacular views across the city are a strong draw for local residents, as is the abundant wildlife. The field behind Purlewent has benefits over other nearby view points (such as the Cotswold Way leading up from Penn Hill Rd to Dean Hill Lane) in that it does not involve a prohibitively steep hike. This field is accessible to all, due to its much more gentle incline, which you see enjoyed by a broad range of people, including much older and frailer. It is an ideal space to take kids to burn off with easy access points at either end. There are also fields above the one behind Purlewent that are used by walkers, runners and dog walkers but the users begin to thin out considerably one you move above the field in question as the incline increases dramatically and is suitable only for fitter walkers and not ideal for small children. Therefore the field behind Purlewent Drive has some unique characteristics that make it a most attractive and practical spot for locals seeking views and exercise, and that some residents who reap obvious health benefits from the field may not be inclined to use other nearby spaces without the benefits of the views, ease of access, the gentle non-prohibitive slope and beautiful surroundings that an AONB has to offer which brings me to the next point. The field in question is part of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Therefore it makes an important contribution to the health and well-being of the local community.

“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

In response to point 115 of the NPPF above, I believe the proposed change B3B is again at odds with the NPPF in that it would result in the loss of part of this AONB. Part of Bath’s charm is that the city is nested within a green bowl of hills and it is therefore important to restrict the sprawl of housing so that this characteristic is preserved. The line should most definitely be drawn at the base of the Cotswold AONB so that none of this beautiful land is lost to housing, especially the field behind Purlewent that is used and loved by many local residents.

Paragraph 75 of the NPPF also states:

“75. Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.”

Change to the policy requested:

If you remove the field behind Purlewent Drive from the plan (point B3B) I would regard the submitted core strategy as sound.

Respondent Number: 4631 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Chris Sandison

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy and the documents published in its support define a number of targets for the developments proposed at Weston. That the proposed developments as described in the supporting documents fail on many counts to meet these very targets demonstrates that the proposed changes are not sound. They threaten to create a situation whereby either development proceeds anyway, to the detriment of current and future residents and the wider community, or an area earmarked for development cannot feasibly be developed as proposed, meaning that the 300 homes are not built and the shortfall in available housing persists.

The process of participating in this consultation has been made much more difficult than need be by the amount of contradictory information published and the apparent lack of any cohesive overview of the various publications, the extent to which they are binding or merely advisory and their relation to one another. Consequently I apologise if I have commented on material that is no longer valid.

Point b. states that the new developments are to be “well integrated with neighbouring areas.”

The most recent Development Concept Options Report from consultants Arup proposes three separate blocks of development in Weston separated by areas (in actual fact wet valley bottoms) left as open space. These three blocks will thus be tacked on in isolation, making proper integration very difficult.

Some versions of the supporting documents show Homestead Park playground being included in the proposed development area. Local children’s playgrounds are a very important meeting point for young families in the neighbourhood and there appears to be no stipulation in the plans currently available that any new parks and playgrounds to be developed would have to become available before Homestead Park could be closed. A gap of, for example, three years between the closure of Homestead Park and the opening of a newly developed park nearby may be insignificant in the eyes of developers, but for young children growing up and making friends prior to starting school, this is a crucial period. There are no other playground facilities anywhere near Homestead Park, hence this is likely to hinder integration with neighbouring areas.

Point c. states “Key requirements include provision of habitat connectivity through the retention and enhancement of the

existing high valued habitat; ... provision of cycle and pedestrian links through the site connecting to the existing network particularly towards Bath city centre and Weston local centre... All watercourses running through the area should remain open.”

Some versions of the information made available by the council include the field immediately above the Archery Field (Northern extension of Weston Park) in the proposed area for development, indeed one of the Arup reports earmarks this area for the highest housing density of the entire development. This would permanently sever the wildlife corridor that extends from the Weston slopes through Weston Park and the extensive mature grounds of surrounding properties in the Audley Park/Sion Hill area all the way to Locksbrook Cemetery, Victoria Park and the River Avon corridor. The Council has indirectly recognised the importance of this very corridor recently with its habitat work on the Archery Field and proposals to change mowing practice in Weston Park to enhance its wildlife value.

The areas earmarked for development are by definition well up on the hillside. Reaching Purlewent Drive by bike or with a pushchair is a considerable physical effort and it is simply unrealistic to expect residents in the proposed new development areas, which are located even further – and up even steeper slopes – from amenities and bus stops, to travel on foot or by bike unless they are very fit and never have anything to push/carry.

There is no “existing network” for cycling in the Weston area. Arup suggest making use of the Cotswold Way as a shared pedestrian/cycling route. It is nonsensical to suggest cycling on this extremely steep and at times very narrow path, especially as it includes a flight of steps.

The least dangerous cycling route (i.e. avoiding Combe Park and the Upper Bristol Road) is along Weston Park road. Weston Park road is already effectively single-lane in several areas due to on-street parking and would become much more difficult to navigate as a result of the proposed development due to a) the fact that the main access route (Weston Park West road) from the most densely populated zone joins it at an awkward corner with poor visibility and b) that if, as stated by Arup, the new developments are to be located close to a good bus service, the size and frequency of buses along this road will have to increase very significantly.

The statement that “All watercourses running through the area should remain open” is simply unrealistic. Watercourses appear and disappear all the time on the Weston slopes in response to recent rainfall. It would be impossible to build on the site without containing at least most of the known watercourses and this naturally would accelerate runoff into residential areas lower down the slope (where flooding of properties and erosion damage to roads have both recently occurred) and remove some of the vital water supply to whatever of the area’s trees, hedges and grassland were to be retained.

The defined “key requirements” cannot be met by the plans as defined so far.

Point d. concerns “Appropriate site assessment and ecological surveys to be undertaken to inform site master planning with particular attention to potential impacts to protected sites, priority species, and Bradford-upon-Avon SAC.”

It is not clear that any such assessment has been carried out other than the Bat Habitat Assessment (carried out at a time of year when bats are not active), which states “There have been no field surveys (either radio-tracking or static bat-call activity surveys) to assess the actual use by either foraging or commuting horseshoe bats of these two sites.” Typically, meadowlands with wetland areas, small fields and plenty of mature hedgerow and trees would be considered very good wildlife habitat and the Weston slopes do appear to support a wide variety of wildflowers, amphibians, invertebrates and resident and migratory birds. If and when proper assessments are carried out, it would be most surprising if they did not discover priority species whose presence could well prevent or at least further complicate the proposed developments.

Point e. speaks of protecting and enhancing landscape features “including ancient woodland, tree belts, hedges and field patterns”.

I cannot see how access, either for residents or construction vehicles, can be provided to the proposed sites in Weston by the proposed routes without significant loss of tree belts and hedges leading to the destruction, to all intents and purposes, of field patterns. It should be noted that the extent of groundworks required to resolve the hydrological issues and construct foundations on a steep slope formed by continuous slow landslip will require very heavy plant. Either new access routes need to be described – and it is far from obvious where they might be – or it should be acknowledged that these requirements cannot be met.

Point g. states “The degree of harm to or loss of non-designated heritage assets will be balanced against the positive contribution made by the development and the extent to which harm/loss can be mitigated.”

The Schedule acknowledges Summerfield School grounds as non-designated heritage assets but fails to mention the fields immediately off Blind Lane, The Weal and Purlewent Drive, at least some of which appear to have been in use as community assets for leisure, foraging and natural history for many decades. While it may be implicit in the earmarking of this land for development that its loss is considered to be justified by the positive contribution of new homes, no attempt appears to have been made to mitigate this loss. This is detrimental not only to current residents of Weston, walkers on the Cotswold Way and other people who use this land, but also to those who might live in the new developments.

Point i. states “Ensure good public transport provision.”

The area earmarked for the highest density housing (the field behind Purlewent Drive/Weston Park West) is also the area furthest from existing frequent bus services. Arup recommends connecting the new development to existing bus stops in Purlewent Drive, but in fact there are no existing bus stops in Purlewent Drive. The Weal, Purlewent Drive, Lucklands and Trafalgar Rd are effectively single lane for most of their length due to parked cars, a situation that cannot easily be rectified as a large proportion of homes on these roads have no off-street parking space and no possibility of creating any. The proposal to provide an access route to the new development up the extremely steep single-track roads running past the water pumping station behind Purlewent Drive and up Blind Lane is likely to make traffic flow in this area even more difficult, reducing the likelihood of even small buses (the difficulties regularly encountered by larger delivery vehicles suggest full-size buses could not use these routes safely even as they are) being able to serve new routes in this area. As a regular bus user I can say that the distance to be walked, the steepness of the slope and its exposure on wet and windy days make it unlikely many people with children, any infirmity or even just a heavy bag will choose to use the existing public transport offerings from the new developments. The constricted nature of the proposed access routes to the new developments and their relative isolation makes it unlikely that bus services will be brought to them.

It should be noted also that more than a third of the proposed homes are to be affordable housing. Providing good public transport means making it affordable as well as accessible and reliable. Few people will use the bus if it is cheaper and more convenient to go by car and that is the current position in Weston. I am not aware of any official proposals to make public transport in Bath “good” in the sense of more affordable.

Point j. states “Vehicular access to the east, west and south of the location should be provided.”

All of the roads approaching the proposed development area are already very busy at times as acknowledged by Arup and most are effectively single-lane due to the lack of off-street parking. Vehicular access to local amenities in Weston High Street is already very limited and will shortly become even more difficult as Tesco doubles in size and loses most of its car park at the same time as six to twelve new households are created in the immediate area.

Traffic issues are further complicated in the Weston area by the three schools, several nurseries/preschools and the Royal United Hospital and the fact that there is no obvious way to widen roads or provide off-street parking without demolishing existing homes. Lansdown Lane is very steep and narrow in places, lies on the route to and from school for hundreds of children and has a difficult exit onto the main road at its North end. Combe Park and Weston Park roads are already constricted and often heavily congested. This is particularly problematic for Combe Park, as it provides access to A&E. Arup suggests mitigation measures extending as far as Windsor Bridge, but it seems unlikely, given the importance of this route for emergency vehicles, that there are feasible measures that have yet to be implemented or that the addition of 300 homes in Weston would make previously infeasible measures feasible. All improvements to the road network also have to be measured against the inevitable increase in traffic associated with the planned expansion of Weston All Saints Primary School, the transfer of additional NHS units (previously at the Riverside Centre and RNHRD) to the RUH site and the opening of the new Royal High Junior School site on Weston Park East.

It should be noted also that the 300 homes as proposed will come with no meaningful new employment opportunities in Weston, so new residents will have no option but to commute.

Point l. states “Educational needs generated by the development must be met; a primary school is to be provided on site, unless an alternative solution can be found and agreed with the Education Authority.”

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

It appears no indication has been given as to which of the three parcels of land for development in Weston would accommodate a primary school or how making room for a school site would affect the density of housing on the remainder of the site. None of the sites is large and it is hard to see how any could combine a school site with sufficient housing to create any kind of immediate community. Placing a primary school in any of these three isolated hillside sites would significantly increase traffic to that site, especially as there is apparently no provision for direct links – making it easier to walk – between the three new developments. It is not clear that any of the proposed access routes is prepared for this additional volume of traffic.

It is not clear that there is any land in the proposed areas flat enough to allow any school to have proper sports facilities. Weston already has an outstanding school in WASPS and a new school that failed to match its quality of teaching and facilities could well lead to enormous division and resentment in the Weston community as parents compete for places at the better school. Any new school for Weston could only compete by offering something different but equally attractive and it is hard to see how it could do this without a well-chosen site in terms of both position relative to the community (i.e. not an afterthought stuck out on a limb in an isolated development up the hillside) and the suitability of the site for facilities (playing fields, pool, vegetable plots, etc.) to match those at WASPS and other Bath schools.

WASPS is already expanding to 600 pupils and cannot be expected to grow any further, so it is difficult to imagine an “alternative solution” that did not further exacerbate traffic congestion and undermine the sense of community in Weston.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC89 needs to be revised so that it is actually deliverable within the constraints defined. If it cannot be delivered within the constraints defined, it needs to be struck out.

Respondent Number: 4635 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Richard Hadley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This section appears to contradict National Planning Policy in that no long term view of greenbelt land is to be made. There appears to be an acceptance that there will be substantial environmental impacts and nothing can be done about these, so no safeguards will be put in place.

This area has significant wildlife. For example Field Fares & Redwings whose habitat is fields live there. Buzzards are also frequently seen overhead. As are woodpeckers. The proposals would have a serious detrimental impact on the wildlife and I can't see how it would continue to be suitable for the majority of this wildlife.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove the Weston Green Belt from the proposed areas for development

Respondent Number: 4635 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Richard Hadley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposal is not Justified or Effective.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The core strategy does not state how sustainability will be achieved.

The Weston area will have significant detrimental impact on the environment. Building 300 houses in the area would make it unsuitable for Redwings & Buzzards

Additionally, I fail to see how the infrastructure requirements will be met. I can not see how access will be achieved other than by using existing residential roads. These are narrow and unsuitable for the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposal.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove the Weston Green Belt from the proposed areas for development

Respondent Number: 4635 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Richard Hadley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This proposal is not justified.

There will be no retention & enhancement of existing habitat. This area has significant wildlife. For example Field Fares & Redwings whose habitat is fields live there. Buzzards are also frequently seen overhead. As are woodpeckers. The proposals would have a serious detrimental impact on the wildlife and I can't see how it would continue to be suitable for the majority of this wildlife.

The proposals would affect the existing Cotswold Way. The area is extensively used by visiting hikers and the local community.

The area offers extensive views over western Bath and towards the Mendips. These would be adversely impacted by the proposed developments.

The Lansdown Lane and Upper Weston areas benefit from an open rural character. This would be ruined by the proposals.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove the Weston Green Belt from the proposed areas for development

Respondent Number: 4636 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ann Wilton

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Weston 'Village' currently struggles to live up to its name. Busy times sees the roads trying to cope with the quantity of traffic. Its saving grace are the beautiful hills which surround it (those that haven't already been built on), horses on the fields at the end of Broadmoor Lane, playing fields behind Purlewent drive – reasons to live in Weston.

Walking up to Kelston Round Hill and looking back on Weston Village shows clearly why Weston should not expand any more.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove reference to build on land adjoining Weston in SPC 15 and SPC 24

Respondent Number: 4652 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** John Wetherill **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

11. Much of the area is undesirable for development due to the steepness of the slopes, the fact that some is made-up ground and there are springs in many places;

12. The field behind the eastern end of Purlewent Drive has been used by the local community (and indeed people come from all over Bath to use it) for over 50 years and its loss would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) which states:

“73. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.”

And

“74. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.”

Neither of these provisions appear to have been considered by BANES.

13. Development of a substantial number of new houses in Weston would require the local primary school (WASPS) to be made even larger than the present plans which are already expanding it to a 3-class in-take. This would make the school significantly larger than any other primary school in Bath. It would exasperate an already difficult transport situation at the school at the start and end of the school days. Consequently, it could be argued that another area in Bath which could accommodate a new school as well as new housing would be more sensible. The Odd Down site is one such area;

14. Houses built in Weston will gain Weston house prices which are higher on average than other areas in BANES such as Odd Down, PSJ, and Keynsham. Such new houses would therefore not be attractive to first-time buyers;

15. Three brownfield sites have recently become available for new housing in Bath (the old MOD sites). These should be sequenced before Greenfield sites;

16. The available land in Weston is fragmented. This will make adding infrastructure and community resources in a coherent way difficult. Locating a school for example on the doorstep of the existing school because that is the only available location would be nonsensical. This contrasts with the single coherent site at Odd Down which could take all 600 required houses, with the site at Ensleigh for the remaining 120 being an addition to a previously proposed development site, so similarly avoiding such problems.

17. A recent study by the University of Exeter found that parks, gardens and green space in urban areas can improve the wellbeing and quality of life of people living there. Green spaces boosts wellbeing of urban dwellers – study

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-22214070

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4657 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Lisa Vernalls

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Greenbelt

I object to the lack of clarity as to where the green belt boundary will be defined. The Weston area fields being proposed are a random hotchpotch. I also object to greenbelt land being defined as suitable for development when there are brownfield sites not yet developed. Most developers would prefer to use greenbelt and as there can't be any distinction between the order in which sites are developed then green belt should not be included in the plan.

Schooling

Last year there were closures of secondary schools in Bath proposed and yet this year there is a need to build additional primary school places. How can we be confident that the actual requirements proposed here have been addressed correctly? A classic example of the lack of joined up thinking was the proposal that in Weston a single class intake nursery and primary school is required to accommodate the new development's needs, and yet a double class intake is required for the preschool age group. Are these extra preschool children going to magically appear for those two years and then suddenly disappear? How can we be confident that the other sums have been done correctly for the number of houses & facilities needed? Not to mention that fact that there will be a disproportionate number of primary classes in the Weston area to the rest of the city if this goes ahead.

Employment

I am also uncomfortable with the indication that these additional houses are required for the new jobs that will be created and yet there seems to be no reference to the existing unemployed who could fill these jobs. I would therefore question the figures being determined for the required number of households.

Summary

In summary...

- The process followed had a number of flaws
- There is no clear definition of the greenbelt boundary
- I have no confidence that number of households required is correct and seems excessive
- There will be excessive knock on effects on the local community especially schooling

I have also not enjoyed trying to find the relevant information concerning this proposal. As an ordinary member of the public I don't often have cause to delve into the specifics of local politics and have been quite intimidated by this experience.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like to see a review of the number of households actually required. This would ideally result in the additional seven hundred houses in Weston & Odd Down being removed. If this is not possible then a single site solution in Odd Down should be considered for these additional houses, so that the appropriate facilities can be put in place and the schooling system on the Weston side of Bath isn't overloaded.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4659 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Beverley Harris**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The land indicated for development in Weston is within a conservation area and is an area of outstanding natural beauty. A significant proportion of it is extensively used by the local community for leisure and recreational activities, and by people travelling from further afield. Its loss would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (Mar 2012), which supports the requirement for local communities to have access to high quality recreational spaces. I understand that there is also a legal requirement for any development in conservation areas to enhance or preserve the area, and this does not seem likely if it is used for housing. The greenbelt around Bath is a huge asset for our city and should be protected, not only for this generation but for those generations who will be living here in the future. The extent of the 'new' greenbelt has not been clearly defined.

Access to the area defined is limited and very steep in places; the existing access roads are narrow and already congested with vehicles brought into the area by those visiting the hospital site. Bringing further traffic into the area would exacerbate an existing problem.

The hillside above Weston contains many springs, which already cause a significant flooding issue within the village. It would seem very likely that further hard landscaping on this area would exacerbate the risk to existing residential and commercial properties.

There has been very limited consultation with local residents about these proposals, and the time given to respond has been short.

Change to the policy requested:

It is essential that brown field sites should be prioritised for new housing and that ALL existing housing stock is made available before ANY new housing developments are considered in and around Bath. These two principles should be the clear policy of local government, who have a duty to preserve our greenbelt. The land in Weston should not be included in the Core Strategy for the reasons outlined above.

Respondent Number: 4662 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Liz Vowles**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I oppose the proposal to build 300 homes in Weston for a number of reasons

- Access to the proposed sites and the extra traffic on the already busy narrow roads in and around Weston village
- The impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty included in the green field sites proposed & the legality of changing the boundaries/area of AoONB at a whim, shouldn't this be protected
- The great number of springs within the slopes of Weston & the drainage problems/cost that go hand in hand with developing this area
- The close proximity to my farm and the negative impact on the everyday running of it with the noise and smells and problems with dog walkers/ramblers thinking they have the right to roam over our land climbing fences and boundary hedges leaving the danger of my livestock escaping
- The inhabitants of these homes will all use the local services, the schools are already over subscribed
- Affordability of these houses in what is a very popular suburb of Bath most probably out of the majority of local families

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

budgets with the developer wanting to capitalize on this

- The overall infrastructure of Bath with so many homes being built within the city, Western Riverside & the three MOD sites, surely the spread within the BANES council region should be more even

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4667 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Beverly Stark **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I oppose the proposed building of 300 new houses Conservation/green belt land in Weston, for the following reasons:-

There has been no proper consultation with the residents of Weston before these plans were drawn up.

There has been no thought given to the social and environmental impact of the proposal on the residents of Weston, who already deal with the additional traffic and parking issues brought about by the numbers of people visiting and working in the RUH (main hospital for Bath and surrounding areas) and by the existence of a large secondary school in the area (Oldfield).

Weston has already had new development in the Holcombe Green and Southland areas , where higher density housing has been built. Some of the new buildings have had an impact on the village and surrounding countryside because of their height and position.

300 new houses will bring at least that many cars onto the local roads, which are already struggling to cope during rush hour. There is already a shortage of parking at the local shops – and there is also the issue of the increased noise and pollution.

Other local services will struggle to cope with the increase in population in Weston. For example, the local school WASPS, has already expanded to a 3 class in-take, which makes it the largest primary school in Bath. Traffic and parking issues at school run time are already significant. Other primary schools in the wider area are already over-subscribed. Surely it would make more sense for new housing to be built in an area where a new school can also be built?

The field behind the Eastern end of Purlewent Drive has been used by the local community – and by people from other areas of Bath and even beyond – for over 50 years for walking and other recreational pastimes. Its loss would be hugely damaging to the community – and would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) which states in section 73 that ‘Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities.’

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4667 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Beverly Stark **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

In principal, I am in favour of the council putting forward a core strategy for Bath, to ensure that any development proceeds in a careful and coherent manner. I am in favour of the BANES plan to build new housing on brown field sites, such as the former MOD sites. The city does not need more retail space or supermarkets – so brown field sites like the former Bath Press site should also be used for housing.

However, the proposed building of 300 new houses Conservation/green belt land in Weston should not be allowed to proceed. This is not a site which should be built on. The benefits of providing 300 new homes are outweighed by the negative impact on the existing community of Weston and the environmental damage to an area of outstanding natural beauty.

Contrary to the 2004 act, there has been no community involvement or proper consultation in the BANES core strategy as it relates to Weston. It appears that BANES have been asked to provide a greater number of houses in the city of Bath than they considered were necessary or beneficial, and have therefore had to rush to find additional building space in order to submit their Core Strategy on time. As a result, the BANES Core Strategy as it relates to Weston does not properly address the full impact of the environmental and social repercussions of building on this area of land. This cannot be claimed as 'sustainable development.'

I have outlined the issues as follows:-

The land is not suitable for development:

This land is part of the green belt and is an area of outstanding natural beauty which should be preserved for future generations. The land, much of it organically farmed, is an important habitat for wildlife and is an integral part of popular walks (including the Cotswold Way and the 'Horseshoe' Walk) - enjoyed by people from all over Bath as well as visitors and tourists. This is a very special and prominent piece of landscape, visible for great distances.

The loss of this land to development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) which states in section 73 that 'Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities.'

Section 74 states that "Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless-

an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or

the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location;

or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss."

BANES proposal to change the use of this land (by developing it) runs contrary to section 74 of this Policy. This land is not surplus to requirements as it is in daily, frequent use by the community for recreational purposes (as well as by farmers) and there is no other similarly rural land nearby in a suitable location which can 'replace' it.

The land is very steep in places and is the source of at least twenty four springs. Any development would increase the risk of flooding to the housing below it and the centre of Weston itself which has a history of being flooded. Areas of Bath by the river will also be under increased flood risk, if the water, currently absorbed by the fields, ends up in the city drains/river. Given recent weather patterns and the increased risk of flooding in general, this is a major concern which has not been convincingly addressed.

This land lies within a Conservation area – and the law says that any development must enhance or preserve it. The land has a rural character with fields and woodland, and is an important wildlife habitat, creating an attractive, green rim above Weston. Any development, however 'sensitive' or 'sustainable' it is claimed to be, is going to cause major damage and change its character forever.

Bath, as a city built within a bowl of hills, would be an oppressive place to live if all the hillsides were covered in buildings. What makes it distinctive, as a city, is the way in which fields still feature within the city boundary, creating semi-wild spaces of green. Bath has already come close to losing its World Heritage Status because of bad development decisions, which is very detrimental as its economy relies heavily on tourism.

Town Green:

In addition, the council-owned field behind the Eastern end of Purlewent Drive has been used daily by the local community and visitors for over 50 years for a range of recreational pastimes. This field continues to be a precious resource for people

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

of all ages and can be accessed by local people without the need for a car. It is used, in effect, as a 'town green' and a recent study by the University of Exeter found that green spaces improve the wellbeing of people living in urban areas <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-22214070>

Unsuitable access points to the proposed development site:

The access point from Purlewent Drive is currently only used by walkers and by a few residents who have access to garages from it. It is, in effect, like a small, private road running between two houses and their gardens. It is very steep, narrow and the upper end is further constrained by a water pumping station and children's playground.

The access indicated off The Weal is narrow and steep – and additional traffic would burden the congested network of small roads in that area.

Access points will also be needed for the areas of land adjoining Lansdown Lane. Putting more traffic on this road, as well as creating additional junctions, would make this long, steep and busy road more dangerous than it already is. In addition, the junction at the top of the hill (by the racecourse) is already a notorious accident black spot. The BANES Core Strategy will already have created additional traffic along this road because of the planned development of the MOD site nearby. The access to the land at the Eastern end is along Western Park West, currently a private road. To bring more cars down it would add to the already significant traffic issues in this area, particularly in rush hour, as the roads are narrow in places where vehicles are parked.

Moreover, the extra traffic will impact one of the key commuter routes into the centre of Bath from Weston (along Weston Park or Weston Lane and feeding into Weston Park East and along Weston Road). This route is already at capacity - in particular Weston Road where delays and traffic jams are common. The two existing junctions leading into Weston Park East have been the scene of traffic accidents and near misses and it should be noted that there are cars trying to access Snapdragons Nursery and King Edwards Junior School right up close to one of these junctions.

The other major commuter route into the centre of Bath from Newbridge is already extremely congested so is not an option for those travelling in to the city via Weston and Upper Weston.

The impact of additional traffic on Weston:

300 new houses are likely to mean at least 300 – 500 new cars are added to the local road network in and around Weston, which is already struggling to cope with existing levels of traffic.

Significant traffic and parking issues occur in Weston because of the numbers of people visiting or working in the RUH, the main hospital for Bath and north Somerset, and this problem will get worse because of the plans to expand the RUH significantly by closing the Mineral Hospital in central Bath – and the NHS Drop-in clinic by Green Park – and to relocate all those services to the RUH site.

Additional traffic is generated by the large secondary school in the area (Oldfield) – and by the significant expansion of the main primary school (WASPS).

A great deal of traffic travels through Weston to access the A46 and M4 – or the A4 to Bristol. This has a major environmental impact (noise and pollution) on residential streets as well as impacting journey times for local road users.

Shortage of parking:

There is already very little parking area in the centre of Weston where the local shops are located. Increasing the number of cars in Weston will make the shortage of available even worse.

Other impacts on Weston:

Weston has suffered from poor development in the past – and has taken more than its fair share of additional housing. The area has seen recent development in the Holcombe Green and Southland areas, where some higher density housing has been built.

Local services will struggle to cope with the increase in population. For example, the primary school WASPS is already expanding to a 3 class in-take to cope with a higher birth rate. Other primary schools in the area are over-subscribed and do not have the space to expand (eg St Marys).

Housing in Weston

House prices in Weston are generally higher than other areas of BANES such as Odd Down, Keynsham and Peasedown St John. Whatever the prospective developers might

Change to the policy requested:

I am requesting that the land on the slopes of Weston is ruled as unsuitable for development, so that it is protected as part of the green belt for the city and as a designated area of outstanding natural beauty.

The Core Strategy does not need to be rejected as a whole but should be amended accordingly to protect such environmentally sensitive area for the benefit of future generations as well as our own.

If BANES are allowed to build the number of houses they felt were necessary, rather than having a larger total imposed on them, this would immediately remove the need for the development of the slopes above Weston.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4668 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Celia Downie**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am writing to object to the proposals of Bath and NE Somerset Council to alter the boundary of the Bath Green Belt at Weston, and by implication, the boundary of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in the same area. I would be willing to speak in person at an Enquiry if so required.

This proposal is inappropriate, on grounds of both principle and practicality. The Core Strategy has to ensure that housing development in the Authority area is guided to places where it is appropriate, be it brown or green field sites. New housing is accompanied by increased needs for transportation facilities, health and education. Weston's primary school is already full, with little land left to develop on its existing site. Weston has some public transport in the form of buses, no railway station or railway lines within several miles, no tram system and very few cycle lanes. Placing housing without a transport infrastructure or adjacent transport nodes, is merely increasing car-dependency and inappropriate.

A more appropriate place within the Authority area would be where there is a railway line, and preferably room to enlarge or build a new station, so people can commute into Bath or Bristol – or London, as many people do from Bath Spa. Room for car parking or park and ride is essential, so the corridor east of Keynsham towards Saltford, and Newton Park, where the Bath Spa University attracts a lot of car-borne traffic, would be more appropriate. That is just one example of looking at transport on an integrated basis. Building more houses in Weston will just mean more cars on the roads into Bath and Bristol, and more pollution.

The Council has only consulted on its proposals for Weston for a few weeks. I know personally people who live in properties adjacent to the green fields now proposed for housing, who have had no leaflets through their doors explaining where exactly the housing is planned for, and no opportunity for a Council-led public meeting to air their views. At the very least these proposals should go back out into public consultation and more effort be made to inform people what is happening, and the long term implications of the proposals be clarified and considered over a reasonable period of time.

The principal objection against the Council's proposals is, of course, that of the significance of the Bath Green Belt and the Cotswold AONB, the need to protect open spaces for future generations, and the setting of the Bath City World Heritage site.

You will be aware that the green slopes above Weston village were designated as AONB because they are, by definition, "a precious landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard them." (NAAONB website). The 38 AONBs in England and Wales represent some 18 per cent of the Finest Countryside we have. "Their care has been entrusted to local authorities, organisations, community groups and the individuals who live and work within them or who value them. (NAAONB website.) Primary legislation in 1940s entrusted the Cotswold AONB to local councils, so why is Bath and NE Somerset Council is now seeking to diminish the AONB instead of protecting it for future generations? The designation calls attention to the high quality of Weston's scenic views as well as flora, fauna, historical and cultural associations, and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act of 2000 added further regulation and protection to the Cotswold AONB as a national resource. It has additional significance as part of the setting of the City of Bath, one of only two City World Heritage Sites in Europe, the other being Venice. To compromise such an important AONB by siting housing immediately adjacent seems in conflict with the care entrusted by the original and subsequent primary legislation.

The National Planning Policy Framework is relevant. In Chapter 8, Promoting Healthy Communities, paragraph 72 says "The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities." Weston's primary school is already full, with little land left to develop on its existing site. With additional housing being planned for Lansdown, it would seem reasonable to conclude a new school between the two new proposed areas of housing will be needed, together with a large gp surgery. The Council appears to be silent

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

on these issues, although it does mention the need for shops. “Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.” (Chapter 8, Paragraphs 73 – 75 of the National Planning Policy Framework.) Open space and recreation is one of the most important functions of the Cotswold AONB, with community woodland and public rights of way open to all. Any additional building will diminish the area available for open space and recreation, and be contrary to the paragraphs named above in the National Planning Framework which says that the Core Strategy “should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.” (Chapter 8, Paragraph 75).

Regarding the Bath Green Belt, the National Planning Policy Framework makes the general point in Chapter 8, paragraph 76, that “Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular important to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Bath and NE Somerset Council should be working alongside the community in Weston so to do, and protect the existing AONB, Bath Green Belt and the setting of the Bath City World Heritage Site.

Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework deals with Green Belt land. Paragraph 79 states, “The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.” It is therefore all the more surprising, in the light of Government guidance, that there is a proposal to alter and downgrade the Bath Green Belt boundary on the green slopes of Weston AONB, to accommodate housing and all the additional types of development this proposal implies, which can simply be described as inappropriate infill.

Paragraph 82 continues, “The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established.” Paragraph 83 states, “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances . . . “ Paragraph 87 states “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.” Paragraph 88 says “‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”

Paragraph 89 states “A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt.” One exception cited is “provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.” In Weston, the Green Belt serves to open up and keep open, land between Weston and Lansdown, and to provide outdoor recreation for residents. This openness will be compromised completely if green fields are taken into housing developments. The Green Belt boundary should not be altered to suit the numbers of houses the Core Strategy requires; the test is appropriateness, and on a number of significant tests, the green slopes of Weston fail this test – because they are inappropriate for housing.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4670 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Anne Francis

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Weston has already had new housing developments at Southlands and Holcombe Green recently, with higher housing density than previously. The land is not good for building as it is steep and riddled with many springs (a natural resource that Weston has been using for centuries) and any developer would be deterred by the need to make provision for this. My own house apparently has no foundations and sits at the bottom of the fields beneath the proposed development, which

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

does not bode well if any displaced springs were directed that way. The fields behind Purlewent Drive have been used by the local community for many years and their loss would contravene the National Policy Planning Framework (March 2012). Houses in Weston will attract Weston prices (higher than other areas under consideration in this plan), making potentially rich pickings for developers, but not creating affordable social housing (at a time of national housing shortages and crippling rents). The Cotswold Way runs through the area and it is an Area of Natural Beauty, part of a World Heritage site – the people of Bath are the guardians of this beautiful setting and should be form the first line of defence in keeping it safe. Greenbelt land is protected by law and should not be earmarked as ‘land available for housing’; furthermore, it should be protected beyond the next ‘cut-off’ date of 2029, not have to be contested all over again at that point. Once poor decision-making has eroded the scope and beauty of this land, it is gone forever and we are all the poorer for it. Weston is already struggling with its infrastructure, with not enough (and costly) parking at the RUH, thus spilling out into the surrounding areas. Pressure on through routes and residential areas will only increase as the new Royal Junior High School opens and Weston All Saints Primary School expands – and this is all before any proposed developments occur. The local economy will struggle to provide jobs for this influx of people. It is council policy to use brown field sites first before greenbelt land: there are sites in the centre of Bath where quite attractive office blocks stand empty and could be turned into homes; sites on the river could also be used for floating homes. The three MOD sites should be utilised fully before considering any other development. The whole process of consultation has been short and insufficiently publicised in relation to its importance for the future of the area and the city. In addition, the process of becoming involved in consultation, of adding comments and the whole decision-making process and structure seem immensely cumbersome and hard to understand/penetrate – unnecessarily so and to the detriment of clarity, participation and indeed, democracy. You need to be quite determined (and literate) to submit the required response and many people will be deterred by this process and thus be unrepresented. Being told that the Core Strategy needs to be in place in some form (possibly mitigated by the Placemaking Planning process, as a sop to community involvement), to prevent the ‘greater evil’ of unrestricted development without it, doesn’t feel like a great recommendation, when the whole premise of building more houses in Bath feels wrong – and in particular, on the green slopes above Weston.

Change to the policy requested:

Build the houses in a more appropriate place, where greenbelt land and areas of outstanding natural beauty are not unnecessarily compromised – such as around Radstock/Midsomer Norton, where house prices will be more affordable. Identify and use brownfield sites in the area, as per council policy.

Respondent Number: 4672 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Richard Stark

Respondent Organisation: Virgin Media

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I support the BANES plan to build new housing on brown field sites, such as the former MOD sites and other brown field sites like the former Bath Press site should also be used for housing.

However, I oppose the proposed building of 300 new houses in Conservation/green belt land in Weston You cannot build 300 homes on such a sensitive site without irreparable damage to the environment and landscape. This cannot be claimed to be sustainable development.

There has been no proper consultation in the BANES core strategy as it relates to Weston. Building on green belt and an area of outstanding natural beauty cannot be claimed as ‘sustainable development.’

The land is unsuitable:

It hosts many popular walks – used by locals and visitors alike – such as the Cotswold Way and other rights of way.

This land is visible for great distances. Building on it would spoil the landscape for miles.

The proposed development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) which states in

section 73 that 'Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities.'

Section 74 states that "Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless-

an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or

the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location;

or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss."

BANES proposal to change the use of this land (by developing it) runs contrary to section 74 of this Policy. This land is not surplus to requirements and there is no other similarly rural land nearby in a suitable location which can 'replace' it.

The land is very steep and there are many springs in this area. The risk of flooding from covering over such high-lying fields with concrete is very real as the water will have to drain into drains and the river. Weston and the lower-lying areas of Bath already have problems with flooding.

This land lies within a Conservation area – I believe the law states that any development must enhance or preserve it. A rural landscape of trees, fields and ancient hedgerows cannot be preserved by being turned into a housing estate.

The landscape of Bath is enhanced by the fields alongside and within the edge of the city. This green border to Weston is very much in keeping with this.

In addition, the field behind the Eastern end of Purlewent Drive has been used daily for over 50 years for a range of recreational pastimes. This is, in effect, a town green used by people of all ages, both local and from across the city

Unsuitable access:

The access points from Purlewent Drive and off The Weal are narrow and steep – and additional traffic would put too much strain on the small roads in that area.

Access points for the land adjoining Lansdown Lane will make this already busy road (route up to the A46 and M4) more dangerous to drive on. The junction at the top of the hill is already very dangerous (if turning right) – and there will be more traffic passing it if the MOD site is developed for housing as planned. It is important not to add to the traffic volumes coming up from Weston as well.

The access to the land at the Eastern end is along Weston Park West, a private road. Traffic is already congested in this area as the roads are narrow where cars are parked and the route is busy.

Any extra traffic generated from the proposed development (300 – 500 cars say) will impact the routes into the city which are already congested and slow, particularly the road approaching Victoria Park from Weston as the estate traffic would join it at Weston Park.

Too much traffic:

300 new homes could mean 300 – 500 new cars are added to the local roads which are already struggling to cope with existing levels of traffic because Weston is home to the RUH hospital, which is set to increase still further in size when the Mineral Hospital and NHS walk-in clinic are closed and their services relocated to the RUH in Weston. Traffic and parking issues – as a result of the volume of staff and visitors to the RUH – are a major problem in Weston – and have never been satisfactorily resolved, even at current levels.

Weston also copes with traffic to the large secondary school (Oldfield) – and what will soon be the largest primary school in Bath (WASPS). The traffic for WASPS will also impact Lansdown Lane (please see point about unsuitable access points for the proposed new development).

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Weston is also used by volumes of cars, vans etc to access the A46 and M4 – or the A4. The residents of Weston already deal with significant traffic noise and pollution as well as a shortage of parking spaces and congested roads – we dont want a significant increase of traffic which a new estate would generate.

House Prices

The spectacular views from this area of land will mean that house prices on this proposed new development will be too expensive for most local people or first time buyers. Rental income will also reflect the location, even if capped. This proposed development will not improve the housing shortage or have a significant impact – whilst at the same time it will rob local people of one of their most treasured green spaces. The benefits of such development do not outweigh the negative consequences for my community – and as such are deeply unpopular. Local people have lost faith in local democracy as a result this proposal – so if it can be amended, this will help to restore trust in the planning and consultation process.

Change to the policy requested:

The land on the slopes of Weston is unsuitable for development.

The Core Strategy but should be amended accordingly to protect this area of outstanding natural beauty for the benefit of the wider community and visitors from further afield.

If BANES are not forced to build 12,000 plus new houses, there would be no pressure to build on green belt land. This total should be reduced to a more sustainable and sensible level.

Respondent Number: 4674 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ben Kirchner

Respondent Organisation: Freelance + Bath Spa University

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I believe the change proposed in B3B makes the Submitted Core Strategy UNSOUND as it is at odds with paragraphs 73, 74, 79, 80, 100 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework. I will quote each relevant paragraph followed by my reasons for why I believe the inclusion of Purlewent Drive contradicts the NPPF in each instance.

“p 73. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.”

In response to paragraph 73 of the NPPF above: The field behind Purlewent Drive is a high quality open space due to the spectacular views, its natural, relatively unmanaged, beauty and the wildlife it contains. It’s used by many local residents for sport and recreation and has been for over 50 years (I recently spoke with a local in his seventies who has enjoyed the field his entire life). I was involved in collecting close to 500 questionnaires recently that clearly proved that many people use the field for the following pursuits: Walking, running, football, frisbee, birdspotting, photography, drawing, blackberry picking and sledging. I personally use the field to run 3 - 5 times per week and to play games with the children and we sledged there as a family during the recent snow fall. It was clear from the numbers present that this was one of the premium sledging locations of the city.

"p 74. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of

quantity and quality in a suitable location; or

● the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.”
In response to paragraph 74 above: I do not believe the council has undertaken an adequate assessment which has shown the open space to be ‘surplus to requirements’. The field behind Purlewent Drive has unique characteristics such as its views that are not replicated in its nearest equivalent green space – Weston Park East aka The Archery Ground. The spectacular views across the city are a strong draw for local residents. The field behind Purlewent has benefits over other nearby view points (such as the Cotswold Way leading up from Penn Hill Rd to Dean Hill Lane) for it does not involve a prohibitively steep hike, attractive only to more hardcore walkers and runners. Indeed I see a relatively frail old couple who walk on the field almost daily to appreciate the views and many other elderly users who find the gentle slope perfect for a quick walk. It is also an ideal space to take kids to burn off steam with easy access points at either end. There are admittedly beautiful fields with views above the one behind Purlewent although the users of these higher slopes begin to thin out considerably as the incline is much steeper and is suitable only for fitter walkers and not ideal for small children. Therefore the field behind Purlewent Drive has some unique characteristics that make it a most attractive and practical spot for locals seeking views and quick exercise. I fear that some residents who reap obvious health benefits from the field may not be inclined to use other nearby spaces without the draw of the views, ease of access, the gentle non-prohibitive slope and beautiful surroundings that an AONB has to offer. The loss of this green space with obvious health benefits for the community will not be replaced “by equivalent or better provision” in my opinion. Neither is the development for “alternative sports and recreational provision”.

“100. Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.”

In response to paragraph 100 of the NPPF above: The field behind Purlewent Drive does contain many natural springs and I have heard complaints from residents on Purlewent Drive directly beneath the field that during periods of heavy rainfall these springs overflow down the field and onto their land. One resident described water pouring down her front drive from the springs. There are genuine concerns about the impact this development may have on the flow of water and that there may be a risk to some of our properties if the springs are not properly assessed and managed. To the best of my knowledge no such assessment has occurred so far.

“P 79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

P 80. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”

In response to paragraphs 79 & 80 of the NPPF above: The field behind Purlewent Drive is greenbelt land. Part of Bath’s charm is that the city is nested within a green bowl of hills and it is therefore important to restrict the sprawl of housing so that the “special character of (the historic town of Bath) is preserved” as per paragraph 80 of the NPPF above.

“p 115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

In response to paragraph 115 of the NPPF above: The field in question is part of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – one of only 29 in England. The field behind Purlewent Drive is included in the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty because it is beautiful in itself, has beautiful views over the city and contains a wealth of wildlife. Therefore its value to the local community is self evident. In response to paragraph 115 of the NPPF above, I believe the proposed

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

change B3B is again at odds with the NPPF in that it would result in the loss of part of this AONB.

Change to the policy requested:

If you remove the field behind Purlewent Drive from the plan (point B3B) I would regard the submitted core strategy as sound.

Respondent Number: 4681 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Linda Stone

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I understand both the need for a core strategy clearly outlining housing plans and the need for increased housing numbers in the BANES area. There is a definite need for affordable housing so that both people born in the area and those who relocate for work are able to live in the area.

I am in favour of utilising all available brown field sites and addressing the need to construct suitable student housing. However, the proposed building of 300 new houses Conservation/green belt land in Weston should not be allowed to proceed. This is not a site which should be built on. The benefits of providing 300 new homes will be outweighed by the loss to the community to an area of outstanding natural beauty.

I have outlined the issues as follows:-

The land is not suitable for development:

This land is part of the green belt and is an area of outstanding natural beauty which should be preserved for future generations. It is utilised by locals and tourists alike as it forms part of the Cotswold Way a popular walking route. It forms part of the unique Bath skyline offering many beautiful views. Part of its charm is to be able to view the bowl of hills around the city not slopes covered in houses.

This land is in daily, frequent use by the community for recreational purposes (as well as by farmers) and there is no other similarly rural land nearby in a suitable location which can 'replace' it.

The land is very steep in places and is the source of at least twenty four springs. Any development would increase the risk of flooding to the housing below it and the centre of Weston itself which has a history of being flooded. My own home lies on the slopes and we ourselves have problems with springs, aggravated by the recent rainfall patterns. With the possibility that our weather patterns are changing this removal of a natural soak away for the water would have an impact on all housing below.

We need to continue to protect our world heritage status, which attracts many tourists who bolster our economy.

Unsuitable access points to the proposed development site:

The access point from Purlewent Drive is currently only used by walkers and by a few residents who have access to garages from it. It is, in effect, like a small, private road running between two houses and their gardens. It is very steep, narrow and the upper end is further constrained by a water pumping station and children's playground.

The access indicated off The Weal is narrow and steep – and additional traffic would burden the congested network of small roads in that area.

Access points will also be needed for the areas of land adjoining Lansdown Lane. Putting more traffic on this road, as well as creating additional junctions, would make this long, steep and busy road more dangerous than it already is. In addition, the junction at the top of the hill (by the racecourse) is already a notorious accident black spot. The BANES Core Strategy will already have created additional traffic along this road because of the planned development of the MOD site nearby.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The access to the land at the Eastern end is along Western Park West, currently a private road. To bring more cars down it would add to the already significant traffic issues in this area, particularly in rush hour, as the roads are narrow in places where vehicles are parked.

Moreover, the extra traffic will impact one of the key commuter routes into the centre of Bath from Weston (along Weston Park or Weston Lane and feeding into Weston Park East and along Weston Road). This route is already at capacity - in particular Weston Road where delays and traffic jams are common. The two existing junctions leading into Weston Park East have been the scene of traffic accidents and near misses and it should be noted that there are cars trying to access Snapdragons Nursery and King Edwards Junior School right up close to one of these junctions.

The impact on Weston

300 new houses are likely to mean at least 300 – 500 new cars are added to the local road network in and around Weston, which is already struggling to cope with existing levels of traffic.

With two primary schools, a secondary school the main RUH hospital and several nurseries the village already suffers significant congestion. There is already a shortage of parking

House prices in Weston are generally higher than other areas of BANES such as Odd Down, Keynsham and Peasedown St John. Whatever the prospective developers might offer in terms of ‘starter homes’ or ‘reasonably priced’ rented housing, the prices of any homes that come onto the open market will be beyond the reach of many local people or first time buyers. This will be a very desirable site in term of it position with developers able to charge a premium price.

Change to the policy requested:

I am requesting that the land on the slopes of Weston is ruled as unsuitable for development, so that it is protected as part of the green belt for the city and as a designated area of outstanding natural beauty.

The Core Strategy does not need to be rejected as a whole but should be amended accordingly to protect such environmentally sensitive area for the benefit of future generations as well as our own. All existing brown field sites need to be utilised as outlined on the policy and the number of homes needed reduced to eliminate the need for the area in Weston

Respondent Number: 4684 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sharon Gray

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I would like to complain about core strategy happening in the Weston are of Bath. I live on Eastfied Avenue and the road you are planning on building onto the new estate will be directly next to our house. I do not believe this is the best place to build the road or the new estate as the road outside of our house is already a race track with many cars driving high speed along the road to which we already have an on going complaint with the council about as we would like speed humps put in, this is being dealt with by Malcolm Lees. We also have no parking on Eastfield Avenue with some houses having 4 or 5 cars to a household it is already a nightmare to park and with more people living in the area it would be even worse. We have parking both sides of the road which makes it very tight for traffic to flow threw easierly sometimes the bus cannot even get past.

The schools are full and there are no jobs available in the Weston so unless you are planning on building a new school and creating new jobs then I cannot see how or why you are going to build new houses in an area which is already overflowing.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4685 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Gaynor Williams**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The change submitted is not legally compliant because:-

community involvement : The local community of Weston were not involved in the preparation and revision of the core strategy changes.

1. There was very limited coverage of the changes or how to contribute to such a debate in the local paper.
2. The consultation evening on April 11th was the first time that most people had heard of the core strategy let alone the changes. This meeting itself was very poorly advertised and was held at a time that many people found very difficult to attend. At this meeting there were not enough Core Strategy Update papers to go around. Some of the planning officers I spoke were not able to answer my specific questions since they had not even accessed the site in question in Weston.
3. Many residents who do not have internet access would have found it difficult to find out about the changes as information in libraries was not available to take away to read.

On the contrary the significant number of people who responded to the Town Village Green application for the field behind the eastern end of Purlewent Drive indicates high levels of community support against the proposals. This would have been discovered if the community had been more closely consulted in initial stages of the revision of the core strategy.

Sustainability Appraisal Report

There are a number of social, environmental and economic factors in Weston that have not been considered fully before arriving at the core strategy changes.

1. Environmental – all brown fields sites in the local area of Bath should have been considered first. More suitable old MOD sites are now available. This area in Weston is in the Cotswold area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and so one would naturally conclude that it would be one of the last places to decide to build on. The risk of flooding in this area is well known. To build where there are natural underground springs which require substantial funds to counteract this seems unwise.
2. Social – Primary school provision has not been taken into account. WASPS the local primary schools will be full despite a second major expansion. Children living in the local area would have to travel across Bath. Public transport links, and the lack of them, have not been fully examined. Access to the proposed area of development via Weston Park East has not been fully assessed and would be likely to cause further environmental damage.

The change submitted is not sound because:-

It has not been positively prepared

The addition of the change in SpC89 to the core strategy was rushed as a response to the Inspector and did not take into account objectively assessed infrastructure requirements such as schooling, local transport and size and use of existing highways.

Change to the policy requested:

To include the local community:=-

A new time scale for proper consultation

More published information available from more locations regarding consultation sessions

Access to all of the Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Core Strategy Update

A fuller and more comprehensive assessment of the infrastructure requirements and environmental impact of the proposed changes.

Respondent Number: 4694 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Geoff Pinch**Respondent Organisation:** InMomentum Ltd**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The late inclusion of the Green Belt at Weston in to the Core Strategy appears to be ill considered and there are many aspects of the infrastructure which are completely inappropriate for more houses in this area.

Moreover there has been no opportunity for open discussion with the Community on its inclusion and why it would be appropriate. This is particularly surprising given that the now superceded Regional Spacial Strategy (which demanded even more homes in BANES) doesn't appear to have needed to include this part of the AONB. Our erstwhile Council representatives blithely state in SPC14:

However, in order to make provision for housing and employment needs and to fulfil the objectives of the Core Strategy, some greenfield land is also required. In some instances this entails the release of land from the Green Belt because these are the most sustainable locations. The identification of land for development has sought to minimise the impact on the environment and the Green Belt and take account of infrastructure requirements. The Council has therefore sought to make provision for level of development likely to be needed.

If this is true and we as the residents have not had the facts presented or the opportunity to discuss and understand that it is necessary, making the leap in SPC15:

In order to meet development needs, land also needs to be released from the Green Belt. The Council has undertaken a careful assessment of the options and has identified locations which cause the least harm to the City's highly sensitive environment and has sought to minimise scale of the impact. Land will therefore be released from the Green Belt at Weston and Odd Down and identified for development.

This suggests that there is a clear and logical process that has been undertaken to systematically consider all the options and these are the best available. No evidence has been provided that this is the case. It is being done to us (the residents) for our own good, and it is being done on our behalf by those we pay for and supported by those we elected to represent us. It is either a shocking abuse of position or a complete abdication of responsibility. Whichever it leaves me astounded that when confronted with questions, those involved in the process offer us assurances that all brown field sites will be developed first and Green Belt will always be the lowest development priority, but to get past 'The Inspector' we need this site included or risk 'The Inspector' rejecting the whole Core Strategy. Are we to supposed to believe that Developers will abide by these rules? Does anyone really believe that if this land is included in the Core Strategy it will stay undeveloped? It's probably the prime site in the Core Strategy and through compromise and other offers for Social Housing on other sites in Bath and because of the poor infrastructure, we'll end up with fewer, larger, higher cost homes in what was a beautiful AONB. The only people to benefit will be the landowners who have already started restricting access to what has been open countryside for years.

Change to the policy requested:

I would like to see the Green Belt at Weston removed from the Core Strategy once and for all. It is an AONB that we have in keeping for generations to come. There are better alternatives that position people closer to jobs and put less strain on infrastructure. Floating homes have been a consideration and would indeed improve the drainage ditch that used to be the River Avon. Using new materials such as prefabricated basalt panels would allow building of additional floors on existing commercial premises, meaning people can live close to work, in highly insulated, fire resistant homes. We need more innovation not more Green Belt destroyed. I would expect to see the Council engage the community and use the massive pool of experience, goodwill and imagination that's available.

Respondent Number: 4696 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Alison Rees**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposed area of development is an area of outstanding natural beauty, which serves both a local and wider population as a place to walk, run and enjoy other leisure pursuits. The lower field has a number of regularly used footpaths (see attached) some of which have in recent weeks become mysteriously refenced and blocked, presumably by interested parties. The land leads up to a network of fantastic footpaths in the Millenium Wood, up to and around Beckford Tower. The area has already been eroded/spoilt by the development at the bottom of the slopes.

The area is a huge asset for the population of Weston and beyond. The views from the upper slopes are beautiful and the slopes are visible from a great distance across Bath. The council have stated that this land would be built on as a last resort after all brown field sites have been developed, and have tried to offer reassurance that nobody wants to build on an AONB, but it remains in my opinion a risk that is wholly unacceptable. The only acceptable solution would be to remove Weston from the Core Strategy.

This land should be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations.

Change to the policy requested:

SCP89 should be removed and the land at Weston excluded from the Core Strategy. It is too great a risk to have it in there and would be too great a loss to future generations. The community has never been properly consulted and we are being patronised by the Council in terms of its inclusion. They do not represent the majority view and are acting in a wholly reprehensible manner in respect of this open space. It is clearly not suitable for house construction, transportation and roads are clearly inadequate and the risk of flooding below is a massive concern. The latter point is being hugely underplayed by those involved. They need to have their focus on doing the job properly rather than in the timescales and hoping we won't notice.

Respondent Number: 4706 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Becky Gallagher

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The parking is currently unacceptable in Weston. I live on Weston Park with no parking space. If I go out in my car anytime in the daytime I cannot park closer usually than at the top of Lucklands Rd – a good 5 mins walk. With two small children this has been an absolute nightmare, as they cannot walk that far either down from the car to home or back up to the car again. The reason for this parking problem seems to be the RUH parking situation as well as houses on Lucklands Rd using the road as parking for their extra cars. Whilst I understand that the RUH workers need somewhere to park, it is unreasonable that local residents, and people wishing to use Weston shops cannot easily park because RUH workers have taken all the parking spaces.

If there are new homes built above Lucklands Rd there is the obvious problem of more cars which will not be contained within the house/parking space allocated to each house (multiple cars per household), therefore they will continue to park down the hill into Lucklands Rd, exacerbating the problem.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4716 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Phelim McAdam

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I understand that BANES Council need to identify more land for housing, however I object to their proposal to amend the Green Belt on Weston Slopes. It is not clear what area will be taken out of the Green Belt at this stage. It seems in appropriate to leave the re-alignment of the Green Belt to the Placemaking Plan.

I object to the removal of land from the Green Belt in this location. These are the only remaining undeveloped slopes in Bath and as such form an essential feature of the setting of Bath as a World Heritage site. Although it is understood that Bath might in principal be a good location for new housing, the majority of people living in these new houses will need to travel outside of Bath for work. The resulting impact on the roads will be unacceptable, particularly given that the roads within, in/out of Bath are already highly congested.

Although land has been identified for 300 homes, land will also be needed for infrastructure and services such as a school, retail and employment. The school in Weston was expanded 2 years ago to meet the growing population, then just as the development had finished, the Council sought to expand the school again. This second expansion will not cater for new pupils coming from this proposed new housing area in Weston. There is not sufficient land on the Weston slopes to provide a school, retail, jobs as well as 300 houses without having a severe impact on the setting of the World Heritage Site, important views from the Cotswold Way, the setting of Beckfords Tower and other heritage assets.

A new school is due to be built on Landsdown, but this would require a road to be carved into the hillside, seriously damaging the landscape and this has to be considered. The proposals in this respect are not consistent and don't show good forward planning.

We are invited to consider the "rejected locations", but this information is buried in Council reports and is not sufficiently accessible to most people to represent meaningful consultation. It is not clear what the alternatives were and why other locations were rejected. It seems unbelievable that, given the multiple sensitivities of the Weston Slopes, a more sustainable location could not be found. The balance between a location which is close to existing services/jobs has outweighed all other considerations, but in my view this is not a sustainable balance or solution for Bath.

The proposed development at Weston will have a negative impact on the World Heritage site, in terms of its setting; it will spoil an important area of the Cotswold AONB, will damage the character of the Bath Conservation area, and finally, will exacerbate an already unmanageable level of flooding in this area of Weston.

The background documentation implies that development could take place on a few fields in Weston without unacceptable damage to the WH site, Conservation Area, heritage assets, CAONB etc, but I disagree. I find it hard to believe that a more suitable location for housing and development could not be found in BANES. The area of search on the Weston Slopes is huge and if this area was taken out of the Green Belt it would cause unsustainable damage to Bath, its surroundings and the important landscape in which it sits.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4717 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Helen Curran

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

It is my belief the change proposed in B3B makes the Submitted Core Strategy is NOT SOUND as the loss of green space for the local community would be at odds with points 73, 74 and 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (as follows):

"73. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.”

In response to point 73 of the NPPF above: The field behind Purlewent Drive is used by a significant proportion of the local community, as well as many who come to enjoy the views across Bath and the Cotswold Way national trail. Local residents have been using this field for sport and recreation for over 50 years. I use the field in regularly in conjunction with my neighbours.

“74. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.”

In response to point 74 above: I do not believe the council has undertaken an adequate assessment which has proved the open space to be ‘surplus to requirements’. The field behind Purlewent Drive is in contact use by the local community. It has unique characteristics, in particular the views across the city, which is not replicated in other near by green spaces, such as Weston Park East aka The Archery Ground. The spectacular views across the city are a strong draw for local residents, as is the abundant wildlife. The field behind Purlewent has benefits over other nearby view points (such as the Cotswold Way leading up from Penn Hill Rd to Dean Hill Lane) in that it does not involve a prohibitively steep hike. This field is accessible to all, due to its much more gentle incline, which you see enjoyed by a broad range of people, this providing equality of access. It is an ideal space to take children. There are also fields above the one behind Purlewent that are used by walkers, runners and dog walkers but the users begin to thin out considerably one you move above the field in question as the incline increases dramatically and is suitable only for fitter walkers and not ideal for small children or people with limited mobility. Therefore the field behind Purlewent Drive has some unique characteristics that make it a most attractive and practical spot for locals seeking views and exercise, and that some residents who reap obvious health benefits from the field may not be inclined to use other nearby spaces without the benefits of the views, ease of access, the gentle non-prohibitve slope and beautiful surroundings that an AONB has to offer which brings me to the next point. The field in question is part of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Therefore it makes an important contribution to the health and well-being of the local community.

“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.”

In response to point 115 of the NPPF above, I believe the proposed change B3B is again at odds with the NPPF in that it would result in the loss of part of this AONB. Part of Bath’s charm is that the city is nested within a green bowl of hills and it is therefore important to restrict the sprawl of housing so that this characteristic is preserved. The line should most definitely be drawn at the base of the Cotswold AONB so that none of this beautiful land is lost to housing, especially the field behind Purlewent that is used and loved by many local residents.

Paragraph 75 of the NPPF also states:

“75. Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.

Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.

Change to the policy requested:

If you remove the field behind Purlewent Drive from the plan (point B3B) I would regard the submitted core strategy as sound.

Respondent Number: 4721 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support: **1.11 Landscape and Visual Study****1.11.1 ARUP's Landscape and Visual Study Lower Slopes of Weston (LVS) dated 4th April 2013**

(<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes-LVS.pdf>) notes that it is not intended to be a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that would draw conclusions about the magnitude of the impact or the significance of the effect of development in the area. The LVS is simply to anticipate if development proposals are likely to be adverse or beneficial (see 1. Introduction) and, in common with other evidence base reports, it is noted at section 4 that statutory consultees were not consulted about the report or its conclusions.

1.11.2 Section 6.1 of the LVS usefully describes the study area:

"The area is distinctly rural in character and defines the edge of urban development. It provides immediate access into the countryside from the town centre. There are several footpaths which cross the area including the Cotswolds Way and it appears well used. The topography is very undulating and steep in some places. Due to the nature of the existing topography it is visible from an extensive area, in and around Bath."

1.11.3 Section 7 of the LVS notes that the Lower Slopes at Weston lie within the "Escarpment Bath to Breach Farm" character area and the concludes that the "sensitivity" of the area is "high" and that "any change within this area is likely to be adverse." It also notes that "The undeveloped hillsides provide an important backdrop to this residential area. Key characteristic features of the rolling hills and hedgerows would be permanently impacted on by development within the study area."

1.11.4 Section 8 of the LVS considers the impact of development in the area from 6 different viewpoints and concludes that the sensitivity from all such points is "high" and that any change within the area is likely to have an "adverse" effect. Indeed, the photograph on the cover of the Green Belt Review – Stage 1 Report (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/Environment/gbr_stage1_report.pdf) helpfully illustrates the prominence of the "lower slopes" in a view from Bath City Farm to the south.

1.11.5 Although section 9 of the LVS sets out "design and mitigation recommendations", these should not be taken out of context (such as where they have been in the ARUP Development Concept Options Report for the area and in the Landscape and Mitigation section on page 11 of Appendix 1b to the SHLAA). The recommendations should be read in the context of the LVS conclusions that development of the land adjoining Weston would be in an area:

- that has a "high sensitivity";
- where "any change is likely to be adverse"; and
- where the sensitivity from viewpoints is "high" and "any change is likely to have an adverse effect".

1.11.6 We share the conclusions of the LVS and must also conclude that the SHLAA analysis of the area is not based on the Council's own evidence.

1.11.7 The SHLAA Findings Report suggests in 2.18 that the land adjoining Weston could be suitable for about 500 new homes, although Appendix 1b (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) only suggests that the area is suitable for 300 homes! It does however acknowledge that:

"... further assessment is need in respect of the achievement of highways access and the impact of development on PROW. One field (to the rear of Purlewent Drive) is particularly well uses by people living in the area for recreation and forms a link between Weston Park and Primrose Hill Community Woodland."

1.11.8 However, the SHLAA fails to properly consider the "constraints on the delivery" of the sites, including the land

adjoining Weston and includes no recommendations as to how the “constraints could be overcome and when”. It does not therefore meet the requirements for the Core Outputs in Figure 1 in the SHLAA Practice Guidance (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/11500/3992_67.pdf). The ARUP

1.11.9 Our own view is that the land adjoining Weston is not suitable for development on account of, inter alia, its:

- Conservation Area designation to which the Council has not paid “special attention”;
- AONB designation;
- World Heritage site designation;
- contribution to the setting of the World Heritage Site;
- recreational value in terms of the use of the south eastern part of the area by local people for dog walking, walking and other activities;
- importance in providing long distance views for users of the Cotswold Way national trail that passes through the area;
- green belt designation;
- topography; and
- restrictions on access (particularly to the land in the south eastern area where access is really only possible via Weston Park West (a private road that would need to be improved to accommodate the development)).

1.11.10 The poor access to the land in the south east of the area of land adjoining Weston in particular is not identified as a constraint in the SHLAA and no suggestions are put forward as to how it may be overcome. The same is the case with other constraints, including the Conservation Area designation across much of the area and the lack of proper consideration as to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

1.11.11 The document and its conclusions therefore remain an unreliable piece of evidence to support the proposals for green field developments around Bath, particularly the proposals for 300 homes on land adjoining Weston.

1.11.12 The Council has also just declared in 4.1 of BNES/40 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/bnes40.pdf>) that it intends to publish an updated SHLAA Findings Report in May 2013. We reserve the right to make further comment on that Report.

1.11.13 CONSERVATION AREA

1.11.14 The Planning and Listed Buildings Act confirms the duty on the local planning authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas and the need to preserve the setting of listed buildings.

1.11.15 English Heritage has published advice about the duty imposed by the Act (see: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/hpg/decisionmaking/legalrequirements/>) and notes that, when considering any decision that affects a conservation area, a local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The advice confirms that the duty applies to the exercise by the local authority of all its functions under the planning acts, including the preparation of Local Plans and other Development Plan Documents.

1.11.16 We understand that English Heritage has not yet commented on the proposals (see Appendix 1) and, presumably, have not been engaged in the process of including the land adjoining Weston for development.

1.11.17 The Council’s evidence base documents refer to the Conservation Area designation, but there is no evidence that “special attention” has been paid to the impact of the proposed allocation of land adjoining Weston for development on that area, or its setting. Indeed, the Council’s SHLAA casually comments on page 11 of Appendix 1b (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) that:

“The Bath Conservation Area and Listed Buildings could be protected by careful planning at Primrose Hill, with any development not extending too far up the valley slope above Upper Weston.”

1.11.18 This analysis is not evidence based and the lack of stakeholder engagement in the preparation of the SHLAA is

particularly telling in the reading of such statements.

1.11.19 This is a fundamental flaw in the Council's Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy that means that they are not legally compliant or sound. If the Council had properly paid special attention to the character and appearance of the Bath Conservation Area, it would have acknowledged that the extensive open fields are an important part of the character of the area, helping to bring the countryside into the City as happens in other areas (e.g. at Bathwick and Widcombe). Their development, with any substantial areas of new housing, would inevitably harm the character and appearance of the area.

1.11.20 Indeed the Council's own SHLAA (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) notes on page 10 that:

"Even though the area assessed is directly above urban development which occupies the lower slopes of the valley, it remains highly rural in character and contributes to the fine landscape setting to the city, this being an important characteristic of Bath."

1.11.21 We fail to understand how, in that context, the SHLAA continues:

"Development on the lower slopes would only have a medium impact as it would retain a significant rural landscape and the rural skyline on the upper slopes to frame the city."

1.11.22 Finally, the Sustainability Appraisal notes on page 114 of Annex D (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_d.pdf) the proposals for the development of land adjoining Weston "could have a negative impact on the heritage of Bath which would be difficult to fully mitigate." However there is no evidence available to assess the impact of development in this area on the Bath Conservation Area and nothing to support the response in the SA that:

"Limiting development to the lower parts of the slope closely connected to existing development would reduce the effect on these aspects providing development is contained by a strong hedgerow/ tree belt."

1.11.23 The part of the area within the Bath Conservation Area (that is also within the World Heritage Site, AONB and green belt) contributes positively to the "fine landscape setting to the City". Its development would harm the Bath Conservation Area's character and appearance.

1.11.24 BATH CITYWIDE CHARACTER APPRAISAL

1.11.25 Although the Bath Citywide Character Appraisal (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/SPDs/bath_city-wide_character_appraisal_spd.pdf) is not specifically intended as an analysis of the Bath Conservation Area, it does include an analysis of the land adjoining Weston, it was intended to identify key elements of the City's character and was prepared with some consultation and engagement of the public and other stakeholders. It provides an analysis of Bath and what makes it "distinctive by considering its character and significance."

1.11.26 The Appraisal notes at 6.1.3 that "fingers of green", such as the land within the Bath Conservation Area that adjoins and is part of Weston, "extend well into the city softening and contrasting with the built form." This is an essential part of the valued character and appearance of the Bath Conservation Area where such areas extend into the City along the River Avon corridor, through Widcombe and Bathwick. The development of the part of the Bath Conservation Area on the slopes above Weston would harm this important character. Indeed, the Appraisal notes in the analysis of the developed parts of Weston (Area 1) that "there are many fine views to undeveloped hillsides ..." (see para 7.1.30).

1.12 LISTED BUILDINGS AND THEIR SETTINGS

1.12.1 In a similar manner to Conservation Areas, the Council's evidence base makes little reference to the setting of listed buildings in the Weston area. The LVS notes that one of the key issues to consider is the impact of development in the Weston area on "the setting of Beckford's Tower Historic Park and Garden and Lansdown Cemetery and associated listed buildings and structures". Viewpoint 4 considers the impact of development in views from Beckford's Tower, but not the

impact of development on its setting.

1.12.2 The Council will be aware of the recent case in respect of proposals for a wind farm in East Northamptonshire where the Inspector in considering a planning appeal failed to give “proper effect” to the statutory duty in the Planning and Listed Buildings Act to have special regard for the setting of listed buildings (http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/general/news/stories/2013/mar13/140313/14032013_5).

1.12.3 It appears that, in bringing forward the proposals in the Core Strategy, the Council has failed to take account of the legislative requirements in the Planning and Listed Buildings Act in undertaking its planning functions.

1.13 TRANSPORT

1.13.1 The ARUP Lower Slopes at Weston Development Concept Options Report of April 2013 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>) states in 3.1 on page 22 about access in the area that: The study area has few options for primary access. This constraint dictates that primary access should be provided east and west from Lansdown Lane, northwards from the existing Weston settlement from a number of existing openings and gaps in the built form, and from Summerhill Park to the east.

1.13.2 The Report continues in 3.2 on page 24 and states:

Primary new access points are possible from Lansdown Lane to the west, giving access to parcels either side of the existing road corridor and from Weston Park Way to the east. Additional opportunities for access to the study area are via existing minor access points (in the east from Weston Park Way, along the existing edge of settlement from The Weal and Blind Lane, and the existing route across the study area connecting to Lansdown Lane: Weston Farm Lane). Good opportunities exist to promote pedestrian and cycling connections and create a well- connected and car-independent development. Potentially, there are good pedestrian links to Weston centre and onwards towards Bath city centre by bus. The parcel at the south east provides particularly good access to the city centre via a series of attractive and well established open spaces. There is also potential for a pedestrian/cycle route between Weston and the Ensleigh study area.

1.13.3 This analysis appears to ignore the earlier analysis of the area’s topography in the Report. In particular, the development of a pedestrian/cycle route between Weston and the Ensleigh study area seems particularly unlikely given the area’s topography. It is very unlikely that the development of the land adjoining Weston will result in a “car independent development” and that development in this area would instead be car dependent.

1.13.4 It should also be noted that Weston Park West is a private road and substantial works would be required to develop it to a standard capable of accommodating the anticipated amount of development. Any such works are likely to result in significant harm to the character and appearance of this part of the Bath Conservation Area.

1.13.5 The draft policy B3B sets out a requirement for “good public transport provision”, but this is not well defined. Given that it appears that the Council’s proposals are to spread new homes across a number of different land parcels in the land adjoining Weston, and that public transport providers are unlikely to be willing to divert existing bus services to accommodate the planned growth of about 300 new homes into each of these land parcels, any assessment of each site’s accessibility must be based on the existing public transport provision in the area. Indeed, Appendix A the Council’s own Transport Study (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence- Base/Transport/CS%20Transport%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20Appendix%20A.pdf>) confirms that: Weston ranks fairly low amongst Bath wards for use of public transport and improvement to bus services could encourage modal shift, providing relief on routes to/from the city centre. The quantum of development is unlikely to support commercial diversion of services so any masterplan should prioritise pedestrian links to existing stops on Lansdown Lane, Purlewent Drive or Eastfield Avenue. Pedestrian and bus infrastructure improvements should be considered.

1.13.6 In addition, the Transport studies (see: http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core- Strategy/ProposedChanges/scspc_background_evidence.pdf) do not evaluate the transport impacts of other potential locations for new development and it is therefore difficult to conclude whether the proposals for the development of land adjoining Weston are the most sustainable.

1.13.7 The transport evidence focuses on the “performance” of the existing homes in the area.

Little weight is given to the performance of the land adjoining Weston and whether future residents in new homes on the land adjoining the existing development might walk and cycle in similar proportions to existing residents. The land adjoining Weston is steeply sloping and new residents may be less inclined to walk and cycle, particularly on the more peripheral parts of the area. The Transport study notes that bus routes are unlikely to change and new homes would be further from these established routes.

1.13.8 Finally, the Accession Plans (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/Transport/CS%20Transport%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20Appendix%20K.pdf>) appear to only analyse the accessibility of one point within the area of land adjoining Weston and do not examine the accessibility of the wide range of land parcels within that area. These Plans should not therefore be relied on as evidence that development of land adjoining Weston would result in a similar modal split for new residents as existing residents.

1.14 ARUP LOWER SLOPES AT WESTON DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT OPTIONS REPORT APRIL 2013

1.14.1 Status of Report

1.14.2 The ARUP Lower Slopes at Weston Development Concept Options Report of April 2013

(<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>) is one of a series of studies commissioned by the Council to:

“investigate development concept options for ten locations to inform the consideration of additional housing led development”

with four of the studies examining locations adjacent to Bath, including the land adjoining Weston. The studies are described:

“as assessments used to help the consideration of these locations for development”

and it is rather unhelpfully stated that the studies have: “no planning status”.

1.14.3 The ARUP Report is not referenced in the list of Background Papers to the Council’s Report of 4th March 2013 (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ProposedChanges/130304_background_papers.pdf) although it appears that earlier versions of this and the other Development Concept Options Reports are referenced in the SHLAA Findings Report (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf).

1.14.4 Furthermore, the Council’s latest response in BNES/40 includes a schedule that lists the Reports and states that they:

“have been produced to underpin the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy.”

1.14.5 The status of these Reports and the extent to which they have informed the Council’s decision making process is entirely unclear and must be clarified by the Council as a matter of urgency.

1.14.6 If it is now the case that the Council has relied on them to prepare its Proposed Changes, the delay in their publication until 3rd April (with revised versions issued on 16th April) is entirely unacceptable and brings into question the validity of the 6 week consultation period that expires on 8th May 2013.

1.14.7 In the context of these reports, that suggest much higher levels of development than are being put forward in the Proposed Changes (454 dwellings even in Option 2 for the land adjoining Weston that sets out a “more restricted” development), and the lack of consultation undertaken to inform the SHLAA, it is difficult to see how the Council has arrived at the housing numbers (300) for the land adjoining Weston.

1.14.8 Conservation Area

1.14.9 Page 14 of the Lower Slopes at Weston Development Concept Options Report refers to the Bath Conservation Area and suggests that its character is considered in the Bath Citywide Character Appraisal (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning->

Policy/SPDs/bath_city-wide_character_appraisal_spd.pdf). However, that document is NOT an analysis of the Bath Conservation Area and should not be relied upon to assess the impact of the development of the land adjoining Weston on that Area.

1.14.10 The reference to the Conservation Area is cursory and does not “pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of the Area.

1.14.11 Landscape and Visual Impact Study

1.14.12 The Report draws on the Landscape and Visual Study Lower Slopes at Weston dated 4th April 2013 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes-LVS.pdf>). It appears that this study was undertaken from February 2013 onwards on the basis that the photos in the study date from 21st February 2013 (less than 2 weeks from the 4th March Council meeting).

1.14.13 The Report notes at 2.7 on page 19 that:

“Development on the Lower Slopes at Weston would reduce views from the city to undeveloped and treed slopes around the edge of the city. It is considered to be difficult to mitigate the development in this location due to the topography which offers long distance views from the surrounding city.”

1.14.14 However, it is difficult to see how development of the land adjoining Weston is appropriate and included in the Proposed Changes given that conclusion. Furthermore, this conflicts with the evidence in the Council’s SA.

1.15 EDUCATION

1.15.1 The Council’s Cabinet report notes about the proposals for development on land adjoining Weston that: On its own development on this scale does not generate sufficient housing to support a new primary school on site. However, the need for primary school places arising from this development combined with the residential development of other sites in the Weston area identified in SHLAA would need to be met through provision of a new primary school.

1.15.2 A new primary school would require at least 210 pupils (assuming a reception year and years 1 to 6 inclusive). However, on the basis of the Council’s own Planning Obligations SPD (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/SPDs/PlanningObligationsSPD.pdf>), the proposal for 300 homes on the land adjoining Weston would only generate about 93 pupils (31 places per 100 dwellings of 2 bedrooms or more (see para 2.2.14 on page 26 of the SPD)). This ratio of pupil places per 100 dwellings is used at 5.2 in the ARUP Report about development on land adjoining Weston (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>). The suggestion in that report that primary school provision is required on site appears to be on the basis of its higher housing numbers that do not reflect the proposals for 300 homes in the Proposed Changes.

1.15.3 Although the evidence refers to the need to accommodate pupils from other developments in the Weston area, the SHLAA and Proposed Changes do not propose further developments of about 400 dwellings of 2 or more bedrooms in the Weston area and the need for such a school on the land adjoining Weston is not justified on the basis of the evidence.

1.15.4 In addition, we note that Appendix C of the Council’s Western Riverside SPD (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/SPDs/BWRSPD-AppendixCDeveloperContributions.pdf>) identifies a site for a new primary school within that development in Zone 2 (West). This would be in a more accessible, level location and could serve the needs of pupils from a wider area. The Council has also recently agreed to fund the expansion of Weston All Saints Primary School from a 480 place to a 630 place primary school (see the Cabinet report of the 10th April 2013 at: <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s25116/E2548%20Determine%20Staturory%20Expansions.pdf>).

1.15.5 If there is a need for another primary school in Bath to accommodate the planned growth, the Council’s Core Strategy ought to identify the best site for such a facility on the basis of a more robust analysis of primary school need. Any such school should be developed in an accessible location where there is an opportunity to provide a sports pitch.

1.15.6 Given:

- that the Council's evidence does not support the need for a new primary school in Weston;
- the sloping nature of the land adjoining Weston and difficulty of developing large scale buildings and an outdoor sports pitch on such sites (see the Arup Report (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>) that states at 3.1 on page 22 that: "Topography is the most defining constraint for the land" adjoining Weston);
- the proposal to develop a new primary school at Bath Western Riverside; and
- the proposal to expand Weston All Saints Primary School; land at Weston is not required to accommodate a primary school.

1.16 ECOLOGY

1.16.1 The Habitat assessment of the potential impacts of possible development locations on the Box, Cheddar, Mells and Bath & Bradford on Avon, and Wye Valley & the Forest of Dean SACs (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/bat_habitat_assessment_report_-_ensleigh_draft_2013.pdf) was only undertaken in February 2013.

1.16.2 The Appendix 1b to the SHLAA (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence- Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) acknowledges that it would not be possible to mitigate the loss of land within the SNA and SNCI and the priority habitats. Any such areas must therefore be excluded from future development.

1.17 GREEN BELT

1.17.1 In the context of the Council's Proposed Changes to the overall level of planned growth in the area and the preference to focus new development in Bath, a Green Belt review (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/Environment/gbr_stage1_report.pdf) was commissioned in December 2012.

1.17.2 The final draft of the review was only issued to the Council in February 2013 (see Introduction to the Review), the same month that the report to the Council's Special Meeting of the 4th March would have been drafted, thereby giving very little time for an analysis of its conclusions.

1.17.3 In common with other evidence base documents, there has been no stakeholder engagement in undertaking the Stage 1 review, with only a workshop being held with B&NES Officers to allow for a critical discussion of the results.

1.17.4 The report that is currently available is dated April 2013 and emphasises in section 7 that it does not seek to balance Green Belt purposes with sustainability objectives and therefore reach conclusions on whether there should be amendments to the Green Belt boundaries. It is simply a discursive document that outlines the extent to which different areas serve the purposes of the green belt.

1.17.5 Furthermore, the report notes that the Green Belt Review comprises a two stage process. The Stage 1 report is only a "high level, district wide Green Belt review to ascertain the extent to which different parcels of land serve national Green Belt purposes, with reference also to the local reasons for the Bristol and Bath Green Belt designation."

1.17.6 It goes on to note:

Should the Council determine that alterations to the Green Belt boundary are necessary, a second stage of more detailed area based studies would be undertaken. This would inform detailed boundary changes that may be consulted upon through the preparation of a Site Allocations Plan document (Placemaking Plan).

1.17.7 We think that, if the release of any green belt land is required to accommodate the planned growth within the Council's area, the Core Strategy should include detailed proposals for any such amendments. This task should not be relegated to a Placemaking Plan.

1.17.8 The NPPF states that:

“Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.”

1.17.9 The land adjoining Weston is in Land Parcel: North West Bath and an analysis of this area is on pages 42 and 43 of the Green Belt Review – Stage 1. The report notes that:

“The Green Belt in the south eastern portion of the land parcel is therefore of particular importance for preventing urban sprawl.”

1.18 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

1.18.1 The Inspector at 5.1 of Annex A to ID/28 (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/id-28_preliminary_conclusions_final_21_june_2012.pdf) notes that one of the tasks of the SA is to:

“...explain the reasons for the selection of the chosen strategy/policies from the reasonable alternatives considered.”

1.18.2 Although the Stage 1 report makes a case for focusing development in Bath, the subsequent stages fail to demonstrate why the sites identified for greenfield development around Bath have been identified in preference to other sites around the City and why different scales of development on those sites has been rejected in favour of the distribution now set out in the Proposed Changes.

1.18.3 The SA and other evidence referenced in the background papers to the Council’s decision of the 4th March 2013 does not provide any analysis or justification for the development of the scale proposed in Table 7 of the Cabinet report at: <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s24562/Core%20Strategy%20Annex%201.pdf>

1.18.4 The report sets out proposals for the development of 300 homes on land adjoining Weston in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.6 but there is no evidence to suggest how the Council arrived at this figure (or indeed how the Council arrived at the figures for the other Greenfield sites put forward in the Proposed Changes).

1.18.5 The SHLAA identifies the land adjoining Weston as Area 3i (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_plans.pdf). The Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Strategic Land Availability Assessment Report of Findings (March 2013) - Appendix 1b: Bath Green Belt (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) notes that the housing potential “of the lower slopes (A3i) is set out in the Arup Study of Feb 2013 as being about.....”

1.18.6 The ARUP report (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>) was not however published until after the start of the Proposed Changes consultation and is dated April 2013 (a version was published on the 3rd April and replaced by a revised version on the 16th April). Similar studies were undertaken for the other three areas identified for the development of new homes in the Proposed Changes.

1.18.7 The SA of the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy report (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_report.pdf) was published in March 2013, after the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy were assessed in February/March 2013. The results are set out in Annexes D (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_d.pdf) and L (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_l.pdf)

Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_l.pdf).

1.18.8 Annex D

1.18.9 The SA (in Appendix D) suggests that the impact on some of the District Strategy to focus much growth in and around Bath on some of the objectives:

“will be uncertain and will mainly depend on the changes proposed to the Green Belt”

1.18.10 The Council’s response is that, in mitigation:

“The Placemaking Plan will establish the new detailed Green Belt boundaries. It is important that issues of heritage are considered as part of this process.”

1.18.11 However, as noted elsewhere in our representations, we believe that the detailed changes to the green belt should (given that in the Weston area, in particular, the green belt serves the purposes set out in the Green Belt Review: Stage 1

(http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/Environment/gbr_stage1_report.pdf) be brought forward in the Core Strategy and not relegated to the Placemaking Plan.

1.18.12 The proposed changes to the green belt are fundamental to the delivery and implementation of the Core Strategy, particularly as a number of the sites are included in the Council’s five year housing land supply (see Appendix 2: Housing Trajectory at: <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/evidence-base/strategic-housing-land#two>). Furthermore, the programme for bringing forward the Placemaking Plan appears to have slipped since the Council agreed to suspend the Core Strategy examination at the Cabinet meeting on the 12th September 2012 (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22312/E2464%20Core%20Strategy.pdf>), itself nearly 3 months after the Inspector suspended the Core Strategy in June 2012.

1.18.13 The Council’s Report to the Planning, Transport & Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel of the 7th May 2013 (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s25512/PlacemakingPlan.pdf>) about the Placemaking Plan notes: The programme for producing the Placemaking Plan is to be finalised, but it will target adoption by the end of the 2014. This is acknowledged as a very ambitious programme that will require a concentration of corporate resources if it is to be achieved.

1.18.14 The Council’s website separately suggests that adoption will not be until “early summer 2015” (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/placemaking-plan/what-placemaking-plan>).

1.18.15 Annex L

1.18.16 The SA Annex L (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_l.pdf) sets out in stage 2 the Bath Environs Assessments. However, it appears that the Assessment draws on the flawed evidence in the SHLAA and does not properly assess the impact of development in the green belt on the land adjoining Weston (identified as area 3i within Cell A (Weston Slopes (North))).

1.18.17 The Assessment also fails entirely to include any analysis of the impact of the proposals on the Bath Conservation Area and simply notes in respect of objective 13:

Area 3i (SHLAA)

Development on the lower slopes immediately adjacent to the urban edge would have a high localised impact but would have a lesser impact on the character of the World Heritage Site and its setting if: a strong urban edge were maintained; a substantial area of the upper slopes were left with its rural character providing the green setting and skyline for the city; and the development were of a scale and design that integrates it into the local character.

1.18.18 This conclusion is not supported by the Council’s evidence.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1.18.19 Furthermore, the SA main report and Annexes (including the Stage 2 Bath Environs Assessment) do not include an analysis and explanation as to why the Council has selected the specific sites within the green belt to accommodate new development, including the land adjoining Weston. It therefore remains unclear as to how the Council selected the land adjoining Weston over and above other sites. In the absence of a clear rationale as to the selection of the green belt sites for development around Bath (based on sound evidence), the Core Strategy is not sound.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete policy B3B

The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Respondent Number: 4723	Comment Number: 4	Respondent Name: Jacquie Murray & Robert Black	Respondent Organisation:
--------------------------------	--------------------------	---	---------------------------------

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.11 Landscape and Visual Study

1.11.1 ARUP's Landscape and Visual Study Lower Slopes of Weston (LVS) dated 4th April 2013

(<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes- LVS.pdf>) notes that it is not intended to be a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that would draw conclusions about the magnitude of the impact or the significance of the effect of development in the area. The LVS is simply to anticipate if development proposals are likely to be adverse or beneficial (see 1. Introduction) and, in common with other evidence base reports, it is noted at section 4 that statutory consultees were not consulted about the report or its conclusions.

1.11.2 Section 6.1 of the LVS usefully describes the study area:

"The area is distinctly rural in character and defines the edge of urban development. It provides immediate access into the countryside from the town centre. There are several footpaths which cross the area including the Cotswolds Way and it appears well used. The topography is very undulating and steep in some places. Due to the nature of the existing topography it is visible from an extensive area, in and around Bath."

1.11.3 Section 7 of the LVS notes that the Lower Slopes at Weston lie within the "Escarpment Bath to Breach Farm" character area and concludes that the "sensitivity" of the area is "high" and that "any change within this area is likely to be adverse." It also notes that "The undeveloped hillsides provide an important backdrop to this residential area. Key characteristic features of the rolling hills and hedgerows would be permanently impacted on by development within the study area."

1.11.4 Section 8 of the LVS considers the impact of development in the area from 6 different viewpoints and concludes that the sensitivity from all such points is "high" and that any change within the area is likely to have an "adverse" effect. Indeed, the photograph on the cover of the Green Belt Review – Stage 1 Report (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/Environment/gbr_stage1_report.pdf) helpfully illustrates the prominence of the "lower slopes" in a view from Bath City Farm to the south.

1.11.5 Although section 9 of the LVS sets out "design and mitigation recommendations", these should not be taken out of context (such as where they have been in the ARUP Development Concept Options Report for the area and in the Landscape and Mitigation section on page 11 of Appendix 1b to the SHLAA). The recommendations should be read in the context of the LVS conclusions that development of the land adjoining Weston would be in an area:

- that has a "high sensitivity";

- where “any change is likely to be adverse”; and
- where the sensitivity from viewpoints is “high” and “any change is likely to have an adverse effect”.

1.11.6 We share the conclusions of the LVS and must also conclude that the SHLAA analysis of the area is not based on the Council’s own evidence.

1.11.7 The SHLAA Findings Report suggests in 2.18 that the land adjoining Weston could be suitable for about 500 new homes, although Appendix 1b (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) only suggests that the area is suitable for 300 homes! It does however acknowledge that:

“... further assessment is need in respect of the achievement of highways access and the impact of development on PROW. One field (to the rear of Purlawent Drive) is particularly well used by people living in the area for recreation and forms a link between Weston Park and Primrose Hill Community Woodland.”

1.11.8 However, the SHLAA fails to properly consider the “constraints on the delivery” of the sites, including the land adjoining Weston and includes no recommendations as to how the “constraints could be overcome and when”. It does not therefore meet the requirements for the Core Outputs in Figure 1 in the SHLAA Practice Guidance (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/11500/3992_67.pdf). The ARUP

1.11.9 Our own view is that the land adjoining Weston is not suitable for development on account of, inter alia, its:

- Conservation Area designation to which the Council has not paid “special attention”;
- AONB designation;
- World Heritage site designation;
- contribution to the setting of the World Heritage Site;
- recreational value in terms of the use of the south eastern part of the area by local people for dog walking, walking and other activities;
- importance in providing long distance views for users of the Cotswold Way national trail that passes through the area;
- green belt designation;
- topography; and
- restrictions on access (particularly to the land in the south eastern area where access is really only possible via Weston Park West (a private road that would need to be improved to accommodate the development)).

1.11.10 The poor access to the land in the south east of the area of land adjoining Weston in particular is not identified as a constraint in the SHLAA and no suggestions are put forward as to how it may be overcome. The same is the case with other constraints, including the Conservation Area designation across much of the area and the lack of proper consideration as to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

1.11.11 The document and its conclusions therefore remain an unreliable piece of evidence to support the proposals for green field developments around Bath, particularly the proposals for 300 homes on land adjoining Weston.

1.11.12 The Council has also just declared in 4.1 of BNES/40 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/bnes40.pdf>) that it intends to publish an updated SHLAA Findings Report in May 2013. We reserve the right to make further comment on that Report.

1.11.13 CONSERVATION AREA

1.11.14 The Planning and Listed Buildings Act confirms the duty on the local planning authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas and the need to preserve the setting of listed buildings.

1.11.15 English Heritage has published advice about the duty imposed by the Act (see: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/hpg/decisionmaking/legalrequirements/>) and notes that, when considering any decision that affects a conservation area, a local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The advice confirms that the duty applies to the exercise by the local authority of all its functions under the planning acts, including the preparation of Local Plans and other Development Plan Documents.

1.11.16 We understand that English Heritage has not yet commented on the proposals (see Appendix 1) and, presumably, have not been engaged in the process of including the land adjoining Weston for development.

1.11.17 The Council's evidence base documents refer to the Conservation Area designation, but there is no evidence that "special attention" has been paid to the impact of the proposed allocation of land adjoining Weston for development on that area, or its setting. Indeed, the Council's SHLAA casually comments on page 11 of Appendix 1b (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) that:

"The Bath Conservation Area and Listed Buildings could be protected by careful planning at Primrose Hill, with any development not extending too far up the valley slope above Upper Weston."

1.11.18 This analysis is not evidence based and the lack of stakeholder engagement in the preparation of the SHLAA is particularly telling in the reading of such statements.

1.11.19 This is a fundamental flaw in the Council's Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy that means that they are not legally compliant or sound. If the Council had properly paid special attention to the character and appearance of the Bath Conservation Area, it would have acknowledged that the extensive open fields are an important part of the character of the area, helping to bring the countryside into the City as happens in other areas (e.g. at Bathwick and Widcombe). Their development, with any substantial areas of new housing, would inevitably harm the character and appearance of the area.

1.11.20 Indeed the Council's own SHLAA (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence- Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) notes on page 10 that:

"Even though the area assessed is directly above urban development which occupies the lower slopes of the valley, it remains highly rural in character and contributes to the fine landscape setting to the city, this being an important characteristic of Bath."

1.11.21 We fail to understand how, in that context, the SHLAA continues:

"Development on the lower slopes would only have a medium impact as it would retain a significant rural landscape and the rural skyline on the upper slopes to frame the city."

1.11.22 Finally, the Sustainability Appraisal notes on page 114 of Annex D (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_d.pdf) the proposals for the development of land adjoining Weston "could have a negative impact on the heritage of Bath which would be difficult to fully mitigate." However there is no evidence available to assess the impact of development in this area on the Bath Conservation Area and nothing to support the response in the SA that:

"Limiting development to the lower parts of the slope closely connected to existing development would reduce the effect on these aspects providing development is contained by a strong hedgerow/ tree belt."

1.11.23 The part of the area within the Bath Conservation Area (that is also within the World Heritage Site, AONB and green belt) contributes positively to the “fine landscape setting to the City”. Its development would harm the Bath Conservation Area’s character and appearance.

1.11.24 BATH CITYWIDE CHARACTER APPRAISAL

1.11.25 Although the Bath Citywide Character Appraisal (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/SPDs/bath_city-wide_character_appraisal_spd.pdf) is not specifically intended as an analysis of the Bath Conservation Area, it does include an analysis of the land adjoining Weston, it was intended to identify key elements of the City’s character and was prepared with some consultation and engagement of the public and other stakeholders. It provides an analysis of Bath and what makes it “distinctive by considering its character and significance.”

1.11.26 The Appraisal notes at 6.1.3 that “fingers of green”, such as the land within the Bath Conservation Area that adjoins and is part of Weston, “extend well into the city softening and contrasting with the built form.” This is an essential part of the valued character and appearance of the Bath Conservation Area where such areas extend into the City along the River Avon corridor, through Widcombe and Bathwick. The development of the part of the Bath Conservation Area on the slopes above Weston would harm this important character. Indeed, the Appraisal notes in the analysis of the developed parts of Weston (Area 1) that “there are many fine views to undeveloped hillsides ...” (see para 7.1.30).

1.12 LISTED BUILDINGS AND THEIR SETTINGS

1.12.1 In a similar manner to Conservation Areas, the Council’s evidence base makes little reference to the setting of listed buildings in the Weston area. The LVS notes that one of the key issues to consider is the impact of development in the Weston area on “the setting of Beckford’s Tower Historic Park and Garden and Lansdown Cemetery and associated listed buildings and structures”. Viewpoint 4 considers the impact of development in views from Beckfords Tower, but not the impact of development on its setting.

1.12.2 The Council will be aware of the recent case in respect of proposals for a wind farm in East Northamptonshire where the Inspector in considering a planning appeal failed to give “proper effect” to the statutory duty in the Planning and Listed Buildings Act to have special regard for the setting of listed buildings (http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/general/news/stories/2013/mar13/140313/14032013_5).

1.12.3 It appears that, in bringing forward the proposals in the Core Strategy, the Council has failed to take account of the legislative requirements in the Planning and Listed Buildings Act in undertaking its planning functions.

1.13 TRANSPORT

1.13.1 The ARUP Lower Slopes at Weston Development Concept Options Report of April 2013 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>) states in 3.1 on page 22 about access in the area that:

The study area has few options for primary access. This constraint dictates that primary access should be provided east and west from Lansdown Lane, northwards from the existing Weston settlement from a number of existing openings and gaps in the built form, and from Summerhill Park to the east.

1.13.2 The Report continues in 3.2 on page 24 and states:

Primary new access points are possible from Lansdown Lane to the west, giving access to parcels either side of the existing road corridor and from Weston Park Way to the east.

Additional opportunities for access to the study area are via existing minor access points (in the east from Weston Park Way, along the existing edge of settlement from The Weal and Blind Lane, and the existing route across the study area connecting to Lansdown Lane: Weston Farm Lane).

Good opportunities exist to promote pedestrian and cycling connections and create a well- connected and car-independent development. Potentially, there are good pedestrian links to Weston centre and onwards towards Bath city centre by bus.

The parcel at the south east provides particularly good access to the city centre via a series of attractive and well established open spaces. There is also potential for a pedestrian/cycle route between Weston and the Ensleigh study area.

1.13.3 This analysis appears to ignore the earlier analysis of the area's topography in the Report.

In particular, the development of a pedestrian/cycle route between Weston and the Ensleigh study area seems particularly unlikely given the area's topography. It is very unlikely that the development of the land adjoining Weston will result in a "car independent development" and that development in this area would instead be car dependent.

1.13.4 It should also be noted that Weston Park West is a private road and substantial works would be required to develop it to a standard capable of accommodating the anticipated amount of development. Any such works are likely to result in significant harm to the character and appearance of this part of the Bath Conservation Area.

1.13.5 The draft policy B3B sets out a requirement for "good public transport provision", but this is not well defined. Given that it appears that the Council's proposals are to spread new homes across a number of different land parcels in the land adjoining Weston, and that public transport providers are unlikely to be willing to divert existing bus services to accommodate the planned growth of about 300 new homes into each of these land parcels, any assessment of each site's accessibility must be based on the existing public transport provision in the area. Indeed, Appendix A the Council's own Transport Study (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence- Base/Transport/CS%20Transport%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20Appendix%20A.pdf>) confirms that:

Weston ranks fairly low amongst Bath wards for use of public transport and improvement to bus services could encourage modal shift, providing relief on routes to/from the city centre. The quantum of development is unlikely to support commercial diversion of services so any masterplan should prioritise pedestrian links to existing stops on Lansdown Lane, Purlewent Drive or Eastfield Avenue. Pedestrian and bus infrastructure improvements should be considered.

1.13.6 In addition, the Transport studies (see: http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core- Strategy/ProposedChanges/scspc_background_evidence.pdf) do not evaluate the transport impacts of other potential locations for new development and it is therefore difficult to conclude whether the proposals for the development of land adjoining Weston are the most sustainable.

1.13.7 The transport evidence focuses on the "performance" of the existing homes in the area.

Little weight is given to the performance of the land adjoining Weston and whether future residents in new homes on the land adjoining the existing development might walk and cycle in similar proportions to existing residents. The land adjoining Weston is steeply sloping and new residents may be less inclined to walk and cycle, particularly on the more peripheral parts of the area. The Transport study notes that bus routes are unlikely to change and new homes would be further from these established routes.

1.13.8 Finally, the Accession Plans (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence- Base/Transport/CS%20Transport%20Evaluation%20Report%20-%20Appendix%20K.pdf>) appear to only analyse the accessibility of one point within the area of land adjoining Weston and do not examine the accessibility of the wide range of land parcels within that area. These Plans should not therefore be relied on as evidence that development of land adjoining Weston would result in a similar modal split for new residents as existing residents.

1.14 ARUP LOWER SLOPES AT WESTON DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT OPTIONS REPORT APRIL 2013

1.14.1 Status of Report

1.14.2 The ARUP Lower Slopes at Weston Development Concept Options Report of April 2013 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core- Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>) is one of a series of studies commissioned by the Council to:

"investigate development concept options for ten locations to inform the consideration of additional housing led development"

with four of the studies examining locations adjacent to Bath, including the land adjoining Weston. The studies are

described:

“as assessments used to help the consideration of these locations for development”

and it is rather unhelpfully stated that the studies have: “no planning status”.

1.14.3 The ARUP Report is not referenced in the list of Background Papers to the Council’s Report of 4th March 2013 (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ProposedChanges/130304_background_papers.pdf) although it appears that earlier versions of this and the other Development Concept Options Reports are referenced in the SHLAA Findings Report (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf).

1.14.4 Furthermore, the Council’s latest response in BNES/40 includes a schedule that lists the Reports and states that they:

“have been produced to underpin the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy.”

1.14.5 The status of these Reports and the extent to which they have informed the Council’s decision making process is entirely unclear and must be clarified by the Council as a matter of urgency.

1.14.6 If it is now the case that the Council has relied on them to prepare its Proposed Changes, the delay in their publication until 3rd April (with revised versions issued on 16th April) is entirely unacceptable and brings into question the validity of the 6 week consultation period that expires on 8th May 2013.

1.14.7 In the context of these reports, that suggest much higher levels of development than are being put forward in the Proposed Changes (454 dwellings even in Option 2 for the land adjoining Weston that sets out a “more restricted” development), and the lack of consultation undertaken to inform the SHLAA, it is difficult to see how the Council has arrived at the housing numbers (300) for the land adjoining Weston.

1.14.8 Conservation Area

1.14.9 Page 14 of the Lower Slopes at Weston Development Concept Options Report refers to the Bath Conservation Area and suggests that its character is considered in the Bath Citywide Character Appraisal (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning- and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/SPDs/bath_city-wide_character_appraisal_spd.pdf). However, that document is NOT an analysis of the Bath Conservation Area and should not be relied upon to assess the impact of the development of the land adjoining Weston on that Area.

1.14.10 The reference to the Conservation Area is cursory and does not “pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of the Area.

1.14.11 Landscape and Visual Impact Study

1.14.12 The Report draws on the Landscape and Visual Study Lower Slopes at Weston dated 4th April 2013 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning- and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower- Slopes-LVS.pdf>). It appears that this study was undertaken from February 2013 onwards on the basis that the photos in the study date from 21st February 2013 (less than 2 weeks from the 4th March Council meeting).

1.14.13 The Report notes at 2.7 on page 19 that:

“Development on the Lower Slopes at Weston would reduce views from the city to undeveloped and treed slopes around the edge of the city. It is considered to be difficult to mitigate the development in this location due to the topography which offers long distance views from the surrounding city.”

1.14.14 However, it is difficult to see how development of the land adjoining Westin is appropriate and included in the Proposed Changes given that conclusion. Furthermore, this conflicts with the evidence in the Council’s SA.

1.15 EDUCATION

1.15.1 The Council's Cabinet report notes about the proposals for development on land adjoining Weston that:

On its own development on this scale does not generate sufficient housing to support a new primary school on site. However, the need for primary school places arising from this development combined with the residential development of other sites in the Weston area identified in SHLAA would need to be met through provision of a new primary school.

1.15.2 A new primary school would require at least 210 pupils (assuming a reception year and years 1 to 6 inclusive). However, on the basis of the Council's own Planning Obligations SPD (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/SPDs/PlanningObligationsSPD.pdf>), the proposal for 300 homes on the land adjoining Weston would only generate about 93 pupils (31 places per 100 dwellings of 2 bedrooms or more (see para 2.2.14 on page 26 of the SPD)). This ratio of pupil places per 100 dwellings is used at 5.2 in the ARUP Report about development on land adjoining Weston (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>). The suggestion in that report that primary school provision is required on site appears to be on the basis of its higher housing numbers that do not reflect the proposals for 300 homes in the Proposed Changes.

1.15.3 Although the evidence refers to the need to accommodate pupils from other developments in the Weston area, the SHLAA and Proposed Changes do not propose further developments of about 400 dwellings of 2 or more bedrooms in the Weston area and the need for such a school on the land adjoining Weston is not justified on the basis of the evidence.

1.15.4 In addition, we note that Appendix C of the Council's Western Riverside SPD (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/SPDs/BWRSPD-AppendixCDeveloperContributions.pdf>) identifies a site for a new primary school within that development in Zone 2 (West). This would be in a more accessible, level location and could serve the needs of pupils from a wider area. The Council has also recently agreed to fund the expansion of Weston All Saints Primary School from a 480 place to a 630 place primary school (see the Cabinet report of the 10th April 2013 at: <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s25116/E2548%20Determine%20Staturory%20Expansions.pdf>).

1.15.5 If there is a need for another primary school in Bath to accommodate the planned growth, the Council's Core Strategy ought to identify the best site for such a facility on the basis of a more robust analysis of primary school need. Any such school should be developed in an accessible location where there is an opportunity to provide a sports pitch.

1.15.6 Given:

- that the Council's evidence does not support the need for a new primary school in Weston;
- the sloping nature of the land adjoining Weston and difficulty of developing large scale buildings and an outdoor sports pitch on such sites (see the Arup Report (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower-Slopes.pdf>) that states at 3.1 on page 22 that: "Topography is the most defining constraint for the land" adjoining Weston);
- the proposal to develop a new primary school at Bath Western Riverside; and
- the proposal to expand Weston All Saints Primary School; land at Weston is not required to accommodate a primary school.

1.16 ECOLOGY

1.16.1 The Habitat assessment of the potential impacts of possible development locations on the Box, Cheddar, Mells and Bath & Bradford on Avon, and Wye Valley & the Forest of Dean SACs (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/bat_habitat_assessment_report_-_ensleigh_draft_2013.pdf) was only undertaken in February 2013.

1.16.2 The Appendix 1b to the SHLAA (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and->

Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence- Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) acknowledges that it would not be possible to mitigate the loss of land within the SNA and SNCI and the priority habitats. Any such areas must therefore be excluded from future development.

1.17 GREEN BELT

1.17.1 In the context of the Council's Proposed Changes to the overall level of planned growth in the area and the preference to focus new development in Bath, a Green Belt review (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/Environment/gbr_stage1_report.pdf) was commissioned in December 2012.

1.17.2 The final draft of the review was only issued to the Council in February 2013 (see Introduction to the Review), the same month that the report to the Council's Special Meeting of the 4th March would have been drafted, thereby giving very little time for an analysis of its conclusions.

1.17.3 In common with other evidence base documents, there has been no stakeholder engagement in undertaking the Stage 1 review, with only a workshop being held with B&NES Officers to allow for a critical discussion of the results.

1.17.4 The report that is currently available is dated April 2013 and emphasises in section 7 that it does not seek to balance Green Belt purposes with sustainability objectives and therefore reach conclusions on whether there should be amendments to the Green Belt boundaries. It is simply a discursive document that outlines the extent to which different areas serve the purposes of the green belt.

1.17.5 Furthermore, the report notes that the Green Belt Review comprises a two stage process.

The Stage 1 report is only a "high level, district wide Green Belt review to ascertain the extent to which different parcels of land serve national Green Belt purposes, with reference also to the local reasons for the Bristol and Bath Green Belt designation."

1.17.6 It goes on to note:

Should the Council determine that alterations to the Green Belt boundary are necessary, a second stage of more detailed area based studies would be undertaken. This would inform detailed boundary changes that may be consulted upon through the preparation of a Site Allocations Plan document (Placemaking Plan).

1.17.7 We think that, if the release of any green belt land is required to accommodate the planned growth within the Council's area, the Core Strategy should include detailed proposals for any such amendments. This task should not be relegated to a Placemaking Plan.

1.17.8 The NPPF states that:

"Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period."

1.17.9 The land adjoining Weston is in Land Parcel: North West Bath and an analysis of this area is on pages 42 and 43 of the Green Belt Review – Stage 1. The report notes that:

"The Green Belt in the south eastern portion of the land parcel is therefore of particular importance for preventing urban sprawl."

1.18 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

1.18.1 The Inspector at 5.1 of Annex A to ID/28 (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/Examination/id->

28_preliminary_conclusions_final_21_june_2012.pdf) notes that one of the tasks of the SA is to:

“...explain the reasons for the selection of the chosen strategy/policies from the reasonable alternatives considered.”

1.18.2 Although the Stage 1 report makes a case for focusing development in Bath, the subsequent stages fail to demonstrate why the sites identified for greenfield development around Bath have been identified in preference to other sites around the City and why different scales of development on those sites has been rejected in favour of the distribution now set out in the Proposed Changes.

1.18.3 The SA and other evidence referenced in the background papers to the Council’s decision of the 4th March 2013 does not provide any analysis or justification for the development of the scale proposed in Table 7 of the Cabinet report at: <http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s24562/Core%20Strategy%20Annex%201.pdf>

1.18.4 The report sets out proposals for the development of 300 homes on land adjoining Weston in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.6 but there is no evidence to suggest how the Council arrived at this figure (or indeed how the Council arrived at the figures for the other Greenfield sites put forward in the Proposed Changes).

1.18.5 The SHLAA identifies the land adjoining Weston as Area 3i (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_plans.pdf). The Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Strategic Land Availability Assessment Report of Findings (March 2013) - Appendix 1b: Bath Green Belt (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/SHLAA/shlaa_2013_bath_green_belt_site_assessments.pdf) notes that the housing potential “of the lower slopes (A3i) is set out in the Arup Study of Feb 2013 as being about.....”

1.18.6 The ARUP report (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning- and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/ConceptOptions/COR-Weston-Lower- Slopes.pdf>) was not however published until after the start of the Proposed Changes consultation and is dated April 2013 (a version was published on the 3rd April and replaced by a revised version on the 16th April). Similar studies were undertaken for the other three areas identified for the development of new homes in the Proposed Changes.

1.18.7 The SA of the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy report (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_report.pdf) was published in March 2013, after the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy were assessed in February/March 2013. The results are set out in Annexes D (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_d.pdf) and L (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_l.pdf).

1.18.8 Annex D

1.18.9 The SA (in Appendix D) suggests that the impact on some of the District Strategy to focus much growth in and around Bath on some of the objectives:

“will be uncertain and will mainly depend on the changes proposed to the Green Belt”

1.18.10 The Council’s response is that, in mitigation:

“The Placemaking Plan will establish the new detailed Green Belt boundaries. It is important that issues of heritage are considered as part of this process.”

1.18.11 However, as noted elsewhere in our representations, we believe that the detailed changes to the green belt should (given that in the Weston area, in particular, the green belt serves the purposes set out in the Green Belt Review: Stage 1

(http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building- Control/Planning-Policy/Evidence-Base/Environment/gbr_stage1_report.pdf)) be brought forward in the Core Strategy and not relegated to the Placemaking

Plan.

1.18.12 The proposed changes to the green belt are fundamental to the delivery and implementation of the Core Strategy, particularly as a number of the sites are included in the Council’s five year housing land supply (see Appendix 2: Housing Trajectory at: <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/evidence-base/strategic-housing-land#two>). Furthermore, the programme for bringing forward the Placemaking Plan appears to have slipped since the Council agreed to suspend the Core Strategy examination at the Cabinet meeting on the 12th September 2012 (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s22312/E2464%20Core%20Strategy.pdf>), itself nearly 3 months after the Inspector suspended the Core Strategy in June 2012.

1.18.13 The Council’s Report to the Planning, Transport & Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel of the 7th May 2013 (<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s25512/PlacemakingPlan.pdf>) about the Placemaking Plan notes:

The programme for producing the Placemaking Plan is to be finalised, but it will target adoption by the end of the 2014. This is acknowledged as a very ambitious programme that will require a concentration of corporate resources if it is to be achieved.

1.18.14 The Council’s website separately suggests that adoption will not be until “early summer 2015” (<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/placemaking-plan/what-placemaking-plan>).

1.18.15 Annex L

1.18.16 The SA Annex L (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core-Strategy/InfoPapersandAppraisals/scspc_sa_annex_l.pdf) sets out in stage 2 the Bath Environs Assessments. However, it appears that the Assessment draws on the flawed evidence in the SHLAA and does not properly assess the impact of development in the green belt on the land adjoining Weston (identified as area 3i within Cell A (Weston Slopes (North))).

1.18.17 The Assessment also fails entirely to include any analysis of the impact of the proposals on the Bath Conservation Area and simply notes in respect of objective 13:

Area 3i (SHLAA)

Development on the lower slopes immediately adjacent to the urban edge would have a high localised impact but would have a lesser impact on the character of the World Heritage Site and its setting if: a strong urban edge were maintained; a substantial area of the upper slopes were left with its rural character providing the green setting and skyline for the city; and the development were of a scale and design that integrates it into the local character.

1.18.18 This conclusion is not supported by the Council’s evidence.

1.18.19 Furthermore, the SA main report and Annexes (including the Stage 2 Bath Environs Assessment) do not include an analysis and explanation as to why the Council has selected the specific sites within the green belt to accommodate new development, including the land adjoining Weston. It therefore remains unclear as to how the Council selected the land adjoining Weston over and above other sites. In the absence of a clear rationale as to the selection of the green belt sites for development around Bath (based on sound evidence), the Core Strategy is not sound.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete policy B3B

The proposals to develop land in the green belt at Weston are unsound.

Respondent Number: 4738 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Steven Faux

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Brownfield site development must come first, not Greenbelt
- 24 springs on Weston slopes combined with local clay soil - see past changes through diversion of springs and impact on conservation area, for example Champion Trees have died. Floods are an enduring problem in Weston – dealing with run off from new housing will cause problems
- Weston Park West proposed as access for development and to future housing. This is a private road not adopted in past because of poor sight lines turning into Weston Park. It is impossible to widen it to allow heavy plant, fire engines etc., because of private property on one side and the Archery Field and stream on the other. Archery Field belongs to Weston Park residents - see 1990s ruling against further development.
- AONB gives Bath its unique character as an early type of ‘garden city’ concept
- This is a valued ‘lung’ and recreational area for all the city, forming part of the Cotswold Way
- Weston has already taken a disproportionate share of local expansion. And greenbelt AONB belongs to the nation
- Weston Slopes are especially visible, being the first Greenbelt land to the North West of the City Centre.
- Modern housing will in all probability contrast poorly with unique ‘World Heritage’ older housing along Weston Park and in Weston village.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4740 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Hilary Bickford**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am utterly appalled that the council/planning department are even considering development on the slopes behind Weston village- this is a significant conservation area recognised internationally and nationally as being part of a World Heritage site, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and greenbelt which has been enjoyed by many people from in and around Bath (not forgetting the wildlife!) and I consider it would be completely reckless to ruin this outstandingly beautiful area and to rob us all, including future generations, of the enjoyment of this landscape (and its flora and fauna) which also forms part of the Cotswold Way. The law dictates that any development must enhance or preserve conservation areas and yet I cannot see how this is possible with the proposed development. I understand there are other brown field sites available for development e.g. the old MOD sites and Odd Down and these should be given careful consideration before destroying the green field sites in Weston.

In addition, you appear to assume access at the eastern end of the development via Weston Park Way (which I assume is Weston Park West) and there is no mention of the fact that this is a private street maintained at the expense of residents of Weston Park West and is quite unsuitable for any additional traffic .

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4742 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sandra Bellows**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Any development will greatly impair the community's resources to an amazing cluster of fields, and lets not omit how the wildlife will be affected.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4763 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Terrence Hiskens

Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC 6 (Core Strategy- Broad Locations)

Object to the allocation of land at Weston for the following reasons which are expanded under SPC 89. Development on the Weston site is contrary to the five principles of Green Belt Policy.

The proposal is contrary to guidance for the allocation of development land within the Cotswold AONB as contained within the NPPF Policy guidance.

The site is contrary to guidance for developments within and the setting of the World Heritage Site due to it's visibility from numerous locations within the city.

The additional housing requirement can be accommodated by increasing the density on brownfield sites within the City without the need to encroach on to Greenfield sites thus making development more sustainable.

The original sites considered as part of the Core Strategy should be revisited and considered under the provisions of the NPPF.

The Core Strategy spatial options consultation 2009 studied the Haycombe/Englishcombe/Rush Hill Area which was excluded from further analysis due to:

The steepness of the slopes have meant that access/building is difficult. Visual and landscape impact. Ecological impact. Geological instability. Potential site access difficulties.

All these reasons also apply to the Weston site which has the added protection of AONB status.

The Council has only looked at sites on the edge of the City. Many of the internal hillsides formally protected under Policy NE 3 of the adopted plan are not covered by National Policies e.g. AONB etc and should be evaluated as they have less policy protection than the Weston site and being within the City are more sustainable.

Change to the policy requested:

Delete reference to Weston

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4763 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Terrence Hiskens**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC 89 (Policy B3B Land adjoining Weston)

The allocation of land at Weston has been put before the Inspector without due consultation by the Local Authority with bodies such as The Cotswold Conservation Board, Local amenity groups etc and the local population. The other sites included within the Core Strategy have been determined by the Council following full consultation with all bodies and changes duly made.

For this site to be included with regard to the NPPF it should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and protect the environment. The site is within several national policy boundaries. The document Annex 1 Changes to Policies on housing requirement and housing supply recognises the environmental sensitiveness of this area. At paragraph 5.4 it states that the Council has recently been awarded a substantial grant to address the existing flooding issues in this area. It also states that the impact on the World Heritage Site and the AONB can be minimised if development is restrained in scale and restricted to the lower slopes. This statement therefore accepts that any development will impact on the landscape. With regard to the flooding aspect it appears that the grant to the local authority is to solve existing problems of which there are other areas with greater needs. The grant is not to assist in the funding of new development.

The text in SPC 89 also includes a list of planning requirements.

a) The description refers to residential led mixed use development. This requires further explanation, what amount of mixed use and the scale of built development and it's impact on the environment.

c) Existing development allows for habitat connectivity e.g. bat feeding and roosting within and beyond the built environment. Any proposed development will destroy existing habitats.

The provision of sustainable drainage systems cannot be guaranteed In this area. The hillside has a history of springs arising in different areas, water running continuously in roads around the site and gardens having to pipe water into the drainage system. Many of the garden walls fronting the highway have collapsed due to soil creep and land slippage. Much of the hillside above the existing development is steep and unstable and no amount of drainage will solve this problem.

d) The protection of bat species is paramount in the Council's policies. The area around Weston is a feeding zone and probably includes roosting sites in the surrounding woodland. These areas must be safeguarded.

e) The landscape character of this area has been assessed many times especially leading to its allocation as an extension to the Cotswold's AONB. This boundary should be protected not changed. The site is within the World Heritage Site, Green Belt, Bath Conservation Area and its setting and can be viewed from many significant viewpoints. Mitigation of development is not the answer, the site should not be developed.

l) The Council in its supporting documents- Ove Arup (Core Strategy Evaluation) at Para 1.4.5 Potential for Mitigation refers to existing bus stops in Purlewent Drive. This service has not operated for a considerable amount of time due to lack of use and the existing road network being incapable of taking large vehicles because of the road width. This is a problem of the road network in the area and any increase in car usage from new development would exacerbate the problem and not promote sustainable development.

l) This requirement appears muddled. It states a primary school is to be provided on site unless an alternative arrangement can be agreed. Of the two nearest schools WASPS has been developed to its capacity whilst Newbridge could not be considered as it would require development on an existing playing field. Its distance from the proposed development could not be considered as promoting sustainable development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Delete this Policy.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 281 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy**Respondent Organisation:** Natural England**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

We have considered the main modifications to the Bath and North East Somerset Submitted Core Strategy alongside the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of these proposed changes. We are generally satisfied the assessments provide an adequate review of potentially significant effects on the natural environment that are likely to arise from the proposed modifications; however we consider that further evidence based information is needed to determine the importance of the land at Weston lower slopes for bat species associated with the Bat SAC and whether proposed mitigation is likely to be effective. For this reason we are unable to advise that the Plan would not result in a likely significant effect on the Bat SAC at this time.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 3152 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Development on Greenfield land is not required to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy, indeed it is harmful to national and local policy objectives.

The NPPF directs development towards land of lower ecological value – generally previously developed land. The Core Strategy has (until now) adopted a brownfield first approach. Development on brownfield land is beneficial as it improves the amenity of that area. It is beneficial to the occupants of such buildings as they are closer to services. It is beneficial to the economy as it concentrates development and regenerates derelict areas of settlements. It is beneficial to the environment as it allows sustainable transport. Brownfield development also allows the preservation of Greenfield land for nature or agriculture. This has environmental, amenity and food supply benefits, in line with the Green Belt Act. It is not necessary to allocate Greenfield land for development as so much brownfield is available. The densities proposed for individual brownfield sites do not develop them to their sustainable capacity, which is why Greenfield has been required. Were the brownfield sites developed fully it would not be necessary to allocate Greenfield land.

Change to the policy requested:

Reserve the change

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4437 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Richard Vowles**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

I consider Bath, Weston inappropriate for any further housing development including SPC89 and SPC14.

Change to the policy requested:

I think Keynsham and Whitchurch would be ideal for the extra housing.

Respondent Number: 4437 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Richard Vowles**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

My family and I are completely against the above proposal.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4641 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** David Vernalls**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC89**Plan Reference:** Policy B3B**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Of the greenbelt proposals, there is some sense in squaring off the plot at Ensleigh, and if the numbers are justified (see comments on SPC87) then the site at Odd Down might offer a coherent development which allows for proper infrastructure (schools in sensible places, expansion of the bus terminal at the Park and Ride to improve sustainable transport etc). However the sites chosen in Weston present considerable problems to the point that as a realistic prospect of delivering a viable sustainable development it must be discarded.

The topography of the northern fringes of Weston mean that a single coherent site accommodating all 300 proposed houses is not possible. To achieve that number some combination of the sites indicated in the ARUP study will need to be used, resulting in piecemeal development to avoid the steeper sloped valleys within the study area. This makes a coherent addition to the existing community in Weston impossible.

Access to many of the sites is problematic. Site A shown in the ARUP report which borders Purlwent Drive can only be accessed either via a private street (Weston Park West) or via the footpath access in the middle of Purlwent Drive. Weston Park West would need to be adopted at considerable cost, and the issues of visibility at its junction with Weston Park. It was apparently this visibility issue which the former Avon County Council were concerned about and ultimately led to their

refusal to adopt the road. Resolving the visibility splay issues would involve felling trees on private land. The access via Purlewent Drive is currently too narrow for a formal road (it is used for garage access by cars) and would probably require purchase of private garden land as well as possibly relocating the Wessex Water treatment compound at the boundary of the field.

Site B would only be accessible via the single track "The Weal" whilst sites marked C1 and C2 would either require access from a similar position and Weston Farm Lane, or via a small gap in the already congested Eastfield Avenue. Neither of these roads is wide enough to take two way traffic, so would struggle to cope with significant traffic increases. Site D could be accessed fairly directly from Lansdown Lane but is the smallest of the sites and can only take a fraction of the proposed housing. Site E bordering Napier Road would require access via a private garden fronting Lansdown Lane, because the gap left originally in Napier Road to allow access into this site was developed some years ago! Of the sites only site E has sensible access and that can only provide 45 houses. The prospect of safe access for say large fire appliances to some of the other sites is somewhat frightening.

In terms of the land suitability on these sites, there are numerous springs within the fields which would require proper culverting, and substantial work would need to be done to ensure that developing these sites does not exacerbate the current rainwater run off issues experienced in Weston village, where the main street has flooded a number of times in recent years. Sites C1 and C2 are currently used for an equestrian business and a farm (including the farm house and buildings). Having spoken to the farmer owning C2, he is categorical that this plot is not for sale, and will not be. Site A is currently subject to a Town Green application which has attracted considerable support (498 statements of evidence of its use as a Town Green were submitted), which if successful would rule this site out. Site B contains a approx £1m luxury house (£962,500 at last sale in 2005) that would need to be demolished to get all of the proposed 152 houses on the site – at least one third of these would be lost if the house were retained. If what is left is the remainder of site B (100 houses), site C1 (203 houses) and site D (45 houses) the chances of getting all 300 homes in plus the required school become less viable.

The required school is a major issue. The existing school is currently over capacity with 2 bulge classes being added in the last 2 years using temporary classrooms. Demographics within the existing housing in Weston have prompted plans to formally expand the school from a 2 class intake to a 3 class intake. However this will not provide any additional capacity for any new housing in the area. Any development will therefore need to provide a school from day one – the issue then is where? Putting it on sites D or E would mean 2 schools on each others doorsteps, its unlikely to fit on site B due to the site shape and site A (although arguably the best site for a school as it would be the other end of the community) has serious availability and access issues.

One of the arguments proposed by Ove ARUP in respect of the sites in Weston relates to sustainability. However this appears to be based on lazy and inaccurate work. For a start their assertion that (see A 1.3.3 of their transport evaluation) the number 20 bus serves Weston every 15 minutes is based on not being able to read a bus timetable!. The number 20 runs half hourly from Bath University to Twerton but only serves the rest of the route hourly (in each direction). In addition unless the passenger wishes to get off at Sainsbury's Green Park and walk into the town centre, the anti clockwise service is not usable to get into town, nor the clockwise service to get home. The other significant error is referring to a historic route – A1.3.3 talks about a bus stop on Lucklands Road – this was directly outside my house, and ceased being served by buses in around 2007 when the council withdrew funding for the Purlewent Drive and Lucklands Road part of the route because of lack of use and delays caused by parked cars along the narrow section of Purlewent Drive. What this means in practical terms is that any residents of a hypothetical site A development would have to walk for 10 minutes to catch a bus from Crown Road in Weston Village, and perhaps more importantly walk back up the steep hill to get home!

Table 29 in the same document looks at travel to work from the Weston Ward – this is lazy work as the more relevant output area stats are available on the same basis. Looking at just the output areas bordering the proposed sites brings the travel to work by bus down to 8% overall, but this disguises some notable exceptions – the area bordering site A averages 1.8% bus use. This is obviously related to the comments above re lack of buses with the 20 not serving this location and the nearest bus stops being on Crown Road. The numbers walking to work drop to 17% overall, but again only 9% from site D which reflects its position high up on Lansdown Lane. (See below for detailed figures taken from 2011 census data).

Other factors in terms of sustainability which should be considered are the lack of any doctors surgeries at all within the ward boundary (there is an outreach clinic from a distant doctors practice once per week in premises near the High Street, but other than this doctors surgeries are either at Combe Park or Newbridge Hill. Within the documentation it is suggested that these facilities would take on the additional numbers, which is understandable, but sick people tend not to walk or

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

cycle to the doctors so car traffic for this will increase. Similarly shopping. Lugging bags of shopping from Weston High Street to these hillside locations is not going to be attractive. However with the car park adjoining Tesco in the village about to be shrunk by one third during forthcoming developments, it is likely that a lack of parking in the local centre will push people to drive either into town to Sainsburys or out of town to Asda at Longwell Green. (worth contrasting this with the Odd Down location which has a large Sainsbury's within level walking distance of the proposed development site).

Beyond these practical factors the community of Weston is a close knit community retaining some of the feel of its rural days before it was absorbed into Bath. It has already seen population growth in recent years via the Broadmoor Lane, Symes Park, and Westbrook Park developments, as well as via the redevelopment at higher densities of social housing around Holcombe Green and Southlands. This sense of community will become diminished as the rural feel of the surroundings are removed and the numbers increase thereby reducing the "everyone knows everyone if only via someone else" feeling. At present the whole village connects around the one school – this will also be lost, along with AONB and conservation area countryside.

Change to the policy requested:

1. Removal of all Bath fringe Greenbelt development sites from the Core Strategy as unnecessary.
2. In the absence of the above, consider the better suited site at Odd Down as a location for all 600 required houses (assuming the Ensleigh site expansion goes ahead) given its coherent size and shape which would allow a sensible development and placement of required infrastructure

Respondent Number: 4698 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** R.Murton

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

the destruction of trees on the weal with out notification or due diligence in carrying out the process and the further destruction of the trees that are left. No justification for the latter if they are now 'dangerous' this was caused by the decimation of the area allowed by the council who is responsible and accountable. The council should make them safe without destroying them. It hasn't escaped the residents of The Weal that there is a proposed building strategy on this area and the adjacent field, so one might surmise there has been some 'blindedness' here with no regard for wild life or the none destruction of beautiful countryside. Just because you decide to take away the green belt status doesn't justify destroying the lower slopes of Weston with housing when there other places where they would be better suited. If the area west of twerton has escaped due to heritage status surely our area should come under the same protection Please state what you would like us to do to put things right: Don't decimate woods without thinking, replant, re instate the green belt area to the lower slopes of Weston Add my comments to the opposition of the proposed core strategy concern afore mentioned area as its the last day to do so I can't find the right place to do this

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4699 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Elizabeth Elliott & Paul Robson

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC89

Plan Reference: Policy B3B

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change SPC 89 is not justified as it's not the most appropriate strategy from an environmental point of view. It would

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

involve developing on green belt land and AONB, including the Cotswolds Way and many other public rights of way. It's an area heavily used by walkers, runners and mountain bikers who enjoy the rurality, tranquillity and viewpoints that the slopes of Weston offer.

Developing here would also affect the World Heritage status of Bath as its setting within a valley surrounded by green slopes is a designated heritage asset.

The need to provide access points for the developers' vehicles would impact further on the environment.

There are plenty of brown field sites within BANES that would provide better alternatives to avoid developing on protected landscape, which should be preserved for current and future generations. There is also significant opportunity within BANES to make more of our waterways by building floating homes.

There are 24 springs across the Lansdown plateau, which would present a significant flooding risk. While developers have the means to overcome such problems, the costs involved would not make this area attractive to them.

Aside from a (prohibitively expensive) bus service there is no provision of green infrastructure, yet Lansdown Lane and Weston village centre are already congested, especially at commuter and school start/end times. Given the proposal is to develop on the slopes there will be little appetite for walking and cycling should links for these be provided, so the environmental impact caused by traffic flow is only going to increase.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC90

Plan Ref.: Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Respondent Number: 224 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Ms Caroline Kay **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Preservation Trust

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC90

Plan Reference: Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

While BPT supports the development of the MOD site at Ensleigh, subject to various landscape and height constraints, and potentially accepts the inclusion of the Royal High Playing Field in that development land allocation, we do not believe that it would be at all appropriate for this development to extend 'over the ridge' into the Kingswood Playing Fields site, or at least not in any significant way. It is implied that this part of the site could be acceptable in SPC 90 sub paragraph b; although there is no indication of this land being included in the SHLAA trajectory.

The landowner for the playing fields, which we understand to be the Charitable Foundation to which Kingswood School belongs, has made no public statement as to whether or not the land will be available for development at any point during the plan period. Even if it is, the need would be to relocate the playing fields as described in Paragraph SPC 90 (n), presumably further out and into the AONB, approaching the area of the Registered battlefield site and stretching well beyond the natural boundary of the City.

The ARUP (April 2013) document provided as evidence base lists many of the key constraints on this site, many though not all of which are listed in the text of SPC 90.

It should be recognised therefore that for the remainder of the site (ie the vast bulk of the Kingswood site), the proximity to the AONB, its location 'over the ridge', the availability of the land, the challenge of appropriately relocating playing fields, the sensitivity of the views to and from Beckford's Tower and the Registered Garden at Lansdown Cemetery all add up to sufficient constraints to prevent meaningfully planning for development on this site.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

SPC 90 should refer only to the Royal High Playing Field adjoining Ensleigh and the reference to 'the wider Ensleigh site' should be accompanied by an unambiguous map which excludes the Kingswood Playing Fields.

SPC 90 should refer to the registered battlefield in the locality as a constraint in the wider vicinity.

SPC 90 should refer to the particular sensitivity of the site in relation to height of buildings, and the emphasis in the ARUP report for the highest quality to be critical.

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading **Respondent Organisation:** Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC90 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Environment Agency supports the wording of point d of Policy B3C in general. This refers to the need for any development to have well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

Given the previous potentially contaminative use of the site we would also recommend that the policy refer to the need for new development to adequately remediate any land contamination. The presence of land contamination may also restrict the methods of drainage that can be used (e.g. infiltration). This is to ensure that any contaminants are not mobilised, which can result in pollution of the water environment.

Change to the policy requested:

Additional policy wording should be added requiring development to ensure any land contamination is adequately remediated. Wording should also be added requiring that the sustainable drainage strategy for the site be informed by any land contamination constraints .

Respondent Number: 279 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Rohan Torkildsen **Respondent Organisation:** English Heritage

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC90 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Land adjoining the MOD Ensleigh site, Lansdown, Bath

It appears that 150 new homes are proposed to the west of the MOD site in addition to the 350 already identified in the BANES Concept Statement (September 2012).

Can the local authority demonstrate that it has had special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of Beckfords Tower (Grade 1)? Is there an adequate assessment of the how setting contributes to the significance of the asset5? Are the local authority able to apply The Setting of Heritage Assets (EH Guidance October 2011) to do so?

Again, without such an assessment the Inspector may be unable to properly assert that the objectives for sustainable development have been understood and that objectively assessed development needs of the area will be met in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 281 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy**Respondent Organisation:** Natural England**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC90

Plan Reference: Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Ensleigh

The proposed development land at Ensleigh is largely developed or playing fields which has limited its biodiversity value to a substantial degree and we would therefore not expect the proposed level of development to result in significant ecological impacts. Furthermore the area is visible from relatively few places and is bounded by the Lansdown Road and high hedgerows. Therefore, although the site is immediately adjacent to the AONB, we would not expect the amount of proposed development here to significantly affect its purposes or special qualities, although further assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development on the AONB special qualities would help to verify this.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 315 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Penny MacKichan**Respondent Organisation:** Charlcombe Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC90

Plan Reference: Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Charlcombe Parish Council has concerns over proposals to include the Royal High School playing field in development of land adjoining the MoD Ensleigh site. The first concern is that any relocation of the playing field within the Parish (most likely on Lansdown) will involve development within the Green Belt /AONB and thereby will cause harm. It is also likely to result in pupils having to be taken by bus to the playing fields, which will increase traffic and pollution. The second concern is the impact that an additional 120 houses, on top of the proposed 350, will have on the local lanes, in particular Colliers Lane which leads down to Larkhall. This single track lane is ill-equipped to cope with the additional levels of traffic that this development will generate.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4560 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** IM Properties Ltd & Linden Homes**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC90

Plan Reference: Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Policy B3C (Document reference SPC90 – Extension to MoD Ensleigh)

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

IM Properties and Linden Homes welcome the allocation of the RHS land at an extension to MoD Ensleigh and will work with RHS to enable the delivery of both sites to be delivered in a holistic manner. We support the allocation of the site for a primary school and seek confirmation from the Council that this allocation removes the Concept Statement aspiration to deliver a two form primary school on the MoD Ensleigh land.

The Core Strategy seeks that 'development phasing should start with the current MoD Ensleigh site'. In order for development to take place in a deliverable manner, the development management process (i.e. a planning application) should set out the timescales for delivery of this site, which is inexplicitly linked to the delivery of MoD Ensleigh.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: The delivery of RHS site for additional housing and provision of the primary school on the land is not acknowledged in the Concept Statement. Therefore this document has now been superseded and should not be a material consideration to any future planning application. The Concept Statement must be updated as a priority to recognise this additional development opportunity and work with landowners to ensure any capacity and viability assessment is informed by detailed survey work undertaken across the site. IM Properties and Linden Homes seek to reserve their position to make further presentations to any future document. Furthermore, the abnormal costs associated with delivery residential development must be acknowledged and used to inform the Place Making Plan for example: extra ordinary

development costs in terms of asbestos removal, phasing/vacant possession dates, servicing requirements, road access and water pressure enhancements needed to recognise fully understood and the commercial implications considered to ensure a deliverable site solution is identified which support the Council's ability to deliver their five year housing land supply.

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 93 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Jacqui Ashman **Respondent Organisation:** Highways Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC90 **Plan Reference:** Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions. These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements.

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Land adjoining MOD Ensleigh

As with the other two locations in Bath, generally the Agency has no specific issues with this location for the residential led mixed use development of approximately 120 dwellings in the North of Bath. The Agency is encouraged by the need for cycle and pedestrian links and good public transport provision being identified at this early stage but will need to see a robust transport evidence base before specific comments can be made, particularly relating to any potential impact on the A46/A36 and the M4 Junction 18.

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving. In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC90

Plan Reference: Policy B3C

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Policy B3C: delete or edit criteria under "Planning Requirements"

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4719 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Kingswood School

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC90

Plan Reference: Policy B3C

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Policy B3C (Document reference SPC90 – Extension to MoD Ensleigh)

KS recognises the allocation of the Royal High School (RHS) land as an extension to MoD Ensleigh and the potential of

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

further extension onto KS's land interest as proposed in the accompanying ARUP evidence base. However, the School is disappointed that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has at this juncture discounted the KS's playing fields which is inconsistent with the Council's latest advice. The release of KS's land interest adjacent to MoD Ensleigh represents an equally deliverable solution for development and housing delivery to meet the Council's five year housing land supply.

The Core Strategy, Place-making Plan and Concept Statement must all be consistent and commercially deliverable in order to ensure the delivery of a robust and realistic five year housing land supply.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: As noted above and identified on the attached drawing (reference 1711/SU/002), there are a number of land opportunities surrounding the former MOD land at Ensleigh in the ownership of KS which could assist the Council in meeting their five year housing land supply. The Proposals Plan and Concept Statement for Ensleigh must be updated as a priority to recognise this additional development opportunity.

In parallel, the Council should work with landowners to ensure any capacity and viability assessment is informed by detailed survey work undertaken across the sites. KS seeks to reserve their position to make further presentations to any future document.

Change Ref. SPC92**Plan Ref.: Para 2.32****Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**

Respondent Number: 3152 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC92

Plan Reference: Para 2.32

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

To bring the council back in line with the UNESCO Vienna Memorandum on 'World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture – Managing the Historic Urban Landscape' (May, 2005)

Change to the policy requested:

Return to original draft text:

2.33 New development, whilst responding to its context, should add a 21st Century layer to the accumulation of Medieval, Georgian, Victorian and 20th Century buildings that comprise today's city. This will also ensure that the city's Georgian architecture is the authentic product of its time and not confused with modern reproductions.

Change Ref. SPC93**Plan Ref.: Policy B4****Development Location: Comment on new development locations**

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 21 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton

Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC93

Plan Reference: Policy B4

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The adherence to the World Heritage Convention is an international commitment entered into by the UK Government and no Local Authority has the power to vary this commitment in the light of perceived (and therefore highly subject) assessments of public benefit. The Core Strategy cannot be used to claim a level of authority that is not held.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

It should be noted that given the relatively small size of the World Heritage Site and its setting, the impact of even the most effective mitigation against climate change is about as effective as taking a litre of water out of the Avon and claiming a reduction in flood risk. The World Heritage Site should always take precedence over considerations that locally are trivial, no matter how important such things are regarded nationally and globally.

Despite the "Sack of Bath" in the 1960s and 1970s there is still sufficient of the OUV left to be convincing. This is mainly because the Sack of Bath was limited to one district. However inappropriate developments since then, permitted on the excuse of public benefit, have been scattered around the WHS like measles, and the cumulative effect is becoming noticeable. The Core Strategy must not give credibility to continuing this policy.

Change to the policy requested:

The World Heritage Site and its setting

There is a strong presumption against development that would result in harm to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site, its authenticity or integrity,. This presumption applies equally to development within of the World Heritage Site, and to locations that form its setting. Where development has a demonstrable public benefit, the World Heritage Convention might nevertheless require that avoiding harm to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site should take precedence.

Change Ref. SPC94

Plan Ref.: Paras 2.34 - 2.35

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 224 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Ms Caroline Kay **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Preservation Trust

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC94

Plan Reference: Paras 2.34 - 2.35

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

In SPC 94, BPT welcomes the Building Heights Strategy for the Bath WHS. The Strategy is a thoroughly researched evidence-based document which needs to be given substantial weight in the development management process. We agree that the Strategy should be used to inform the Placemaking Plan, but consider that it should also be adopted as an SPD without delay, so as to minimise the risk of inappropriate development being permitted during the preparation of the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 94 needs to be amended to commit the Council to adopting the Building Heights Strategy as an SPD without further delay,

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 22 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC94

Plan Reference: Paras 2.34 - 2.35

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

There is no point in having a Building Heights Strategy and simply using it to inform. It will end up being ignored, as the excellent "Shopfronts Guide" has been. Unless it is adopted as an SPD then it will have no weight in planning appeals, and therefore the Core Strategy must have a commitment to issuing it as an SPD.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

The Strategy has been compiled in such a way that it can be easily become a Supplementary Planning Document, and a target is set of mid-2014 for issuing it as an SPD.

Change Ref. SPC96**Plan Ref.: Policy B5****Development Location: No comment on Development Locations****Respondent** 3554 **Comment** 4 **Respondent** Ms SE Osborne**Number:****Number:****Name:****Respondent****Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC96

Plan Reference: Policy B5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The revised words misrepresent the Planning Policy for Gypsies and Travellers in respect of previously developed, untidy or derelict land, and also the policy recognises the vulnerability of rural sites rather than expressly states 'rural areas may be suitable.'

Change to the policy requested:

Policy 6.81d should read

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that when considering applications the Local Planning Authority should attach weight to effective use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land. It also states that development in the open countryside away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the DP should be strictly limited. Sites in rural areas must respect the scale of and not dominate the nearest settled community and avoid placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure.

Respondent 4711 **Comment** 12 **Respondent****Number:****Number:****Name:****Respondent** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd**Organisation:****Agent ID:** 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC96

Plan Reference: Policy B5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC96

1.76 This policy relates to proposals at the villages outside of the Green Belt, which meets the listed criteria. Saltford falls into this criteria and is therefore arguably an RA1 village. The change states that housing developments of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village within the housing development boundary will be acceptable.

1.77 However, because Saltford is entirely surrounded by Green Belt, for any development to be provided in Saltford to meet need, exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated. Given that the Council is of the view that their Core Strategy meets need, it is therefore difficult to understand how the Council are ever going to accept that exceptional circumstances are demonstrated. As a result, the needs of Saltford will be ignored entirely throughout this Core Strategy period.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC102

Plan Ref.: Para 2.44

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102 Plan Reference: Para 2.44**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Para. 2.44: Transport Strategy: delete or edit detailed transport schemes

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 197 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Bray **Respondent Organisation:** Railfuture Severnside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102 Plan Reference: Para 2.44**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Railfuture welcomes (1) the intention to reduce nitrogen oxide levels caused by Heavy Goods Vehicles; and (2) the decision not to convert the disused railway line between Brassmill Lane and Windsor Bridge into a BRT route. We would not disagree with the concept of a freight consolidation centre but consider there should be provision for access by rail in view of the growth in rail freight traffic in the UK and the likelihood that electrification will improve the economics of more freight being carried by train. Even if the preferred site for the consolidation centre is not accessible by rail, sites should be protected for rail freight terminals including the disused Westmoreland sidings.

We regard the proposed walking and cycling corridor on the Brassmill Lane- Windsor Bridge railway formation as a pragmatic decision which would preserve the integrity of the route in the short term. We note your inclusion of buses within the definition of HGVs and would reiterate the need for an expanded, electrified rail network as part of a long term solution to road traffic pollution. If a light rail or tram system were to be considered in the future, the former railway on this section could form a valuable route between the western suburbs and central Bath. It would probably not require the acquisition of private gardens in the Newbridge area which was a disadvantage of the BRT scheme.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Railfuture would endorse the amendment safeguarding the Brassmill Lane- Windsor Bridge rail formation “as a sustainable route for non-motorised transport” provided that such a definition does not exclude its use for electric light rail.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.44

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The unimaginative approach to transport and the dependency on increasing road use reveal, again, the failure of the authority to address the fact that Bath cannot exist in a vacuum/bubble – the references to bus transport are completely pointless without addressing the fact that bus transport is slow (owing to road congestion), too expensive for most people, and worsening continuously – this will result in the whole of Bath being even more congested as people who are travelling into the town to work have to use cars. The reintroduction of the rail link between Radstock and Frome, providing a link to Westbury and Bath, would relieve the pressure on the roads and decrease the levels of air and noise pollution. The much vaunted commitment to ‘improving ease of access to and attractiveness of rail travel to and from Bath’ is undermined by the additions on page 56.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 23 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.44

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Although the original Transport Package was subject to public consultation and formal adoption, the local press announced that a number of its component parts were dropped and others modified immediately after the last Local Election. This new version was submitted to the DfT for funding approval without the preliminaries of public scrutiny and adoption. It is not available from the Council as a public document. As a result, the exact nature of what is currently referred to as the Bath Transport Package is unknown to anybody outside a core group of Councillors and Council Officers and it has no official status. It cannot therefore form any part of the Core Strategy.

It should also be noted that there was a High Court Opinion issued to VeraCityBath Ltd that the Council could not cherry-pick from the planning permissions granted as part of the original Transport Package and they had to either be developed in their entirety or new applications should be raised. It follows therefore that the extensions to three Park and Ride car parks have been made without valid planning permissions and the Core Strategy cannot promote unlawful developments.

While the aspiration to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels in the Core Strategy is welcomed, there is little confidence that it is achievable with the current mindset. There is an apparent conflict between the stated desire to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels and the introduction of unnecessary traffic lights where Give Way signs would be sufficient, and the introduction of extensive 20MPH zones forcing traffic into a lower gear and therefore generating considerably more exhaust per mile.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Delete:

- Bath Transport Package – comprising a range of measures including three extended Park & Ride sites; upgrading nine bus routes to showcase standard including upgrades to bus stop infrastructure and variable message signs on key routes into the city displaying information about car parking availability.

Respondent Number: 281 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy

Respondent Organisation: Natural England

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102

Plan Reference: Para 2.44

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Infrastructure and Delivery

We note the reference to safeguarding the disused rail line between Brassmill Lane and Windsor Bridge as a sustainable transport route for non-motorised forms of transport. While we are broadly supportive of this proposal, the potential effects of the construction and use of the route on bats associated with the Bath & Bradford on Avon Bat SAC will need to be understood and appropriately mitigated if necessary.

The Council will be aware of the long running issues associated with the Two Tunnels scheme, which were due in part to the inadequate bat survey evidence and lack of mitigation measures that were necessary to understand and effectively offset the effects of the route creation and its use on bats – these inadequacies resulted in some long and unnecessary delays to the implementation of the scheme. We therefore strongly suggest that sufficient consideration is given to any potential effects on bats and other ecological interest at an early stage of the project development.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 384 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Georgina Clampitt-Dix

Respondent Organisation: Wiltshire Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102

Plan Reference: Para 2.44

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support: **Change to the policy requested:**

The emphasis placed on sustainable transport and reducing the need to travel is welcomed and supported by Wiltshire. The means to achieve these aims is largely based on improving sustainable transport choices and as such is broadly in line with the objectives and aspirations of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Of concern to Wiltshire Council is the inclusion of measures to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels in Bath by reducing the level of heavy goods vehicle traffic in the city through:

"...implementing an experimental weight restriction to remove through HGV traffic (of greater than 18 tonnes) from London Road." (paragraph 2.44)

Wiltshire Council would question this inclusion given that this aspiration was the subject of a joint appeal to the Department of Transport (DfT) raised by Wiltshire Council, Somerset County Council and the Highways Agency. The appeal

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

response (29th October 2012) was upheld by the DfT on the following grounds:

- The proposed lorry turning ban is a significant change, as defined by guidance, because of the extent of diversion that it causes. This means that BANES must secure the agreement of affected authorities before implementing the measure - and such an agreement has not been reached.
- Lorry drivers who are unaware of the turning ban have the potential to be seriously inconvenienced by the restriction. In the worst cases, they would have to divert over 45 miles to complete their journey using the PRN. Alternatively, they could continue their journey through less suitable local roads. Either way, the PRN in Bath will be failing in its purpose.
- The issue is exacerbated by the fact that the A46 and A36 are mostly major trunk roads, linking Wiltshire and Dorset with the M4. There is only one short section under local authority control- which is the A36/A4 in Bath. The turning restriction will prevent HGVs from using the SRN in this area.
- No attempt has been made to find an alternative route for freight traffic. The PRN and SRN are therefore both compromised through the introduction of this banned turn.

The DfT's report concluded that the appeal was valid and should be upheld. It was also stated that should the scheme be implemented as proposed, without agreeing a suitable alternative route with the affected authorities, then this would be in breach of the legislation.

Given the above response from the DfT and that no address to these issues have been afforded or agreed, Wiltshire Council would request the removal of this statement from the proposed changes to the submitted core strategy document.

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.44

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

This policy to complement these public transport walking and cycling and parking strategy and continue to priorities management of the car parking in central area and to provide medium and short stay parking.

NB COMMENT NEEDS TO BE CLARIFIED BY RESPONDENT.

Change to the policy requested:

Support the policy of reducing and managing central area parking but would like to see a bus priority measure and improved park and ride site allocated to the East of Bath and a quality bus partnership with First Group and Wessex Buses.

Respondent Number: 4474 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Ediston Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC102 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.44

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Paragraph 2.44 (page 52) – Transportation

We would seek to underscore here that encouragement for and enhancement of nonmotorised transport links between Bath Western Riverside East and the city centre should also be a priority for future developments. The relocation of car parking spaces from other central car parks (e.g. Avon Street, North Quays, Manvers Street) will also reduce car

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

movements within the core area, making this part of the city more pedestrian and cycle friendly. The Pinesgate car park would create a significant increase in pedestrian traffic into the city along the green park corridor. These improvements would be fully in line with the key objectives of the Council's Public Realm and Movement Strategy In addition to the provision of a high quality public realm, pedestrian zone, the proposed access arrangements have the ability to support the Council's objective of a bus route across to James Street West and also provide an alternative vehicular access to BWR and the proposed Sainsbury's store, which would have the benefit of removing vehicles from the existing bridge. This includes a provision of a Priority junction access from Midland Bridge Rd into the Pinesgate site.

In conclusion, our client lends their broad support to the Core Strategy proposed. Having reviewed the proposed changes to the strategy, we remain confident that the plan for the continued development of Bath. In particular, we lend our strong support to the proposals to expand the city centre westwards.

Our comments our provided in the spirit of collaboration, and seek to strengthen and rationalise the proposed strategy for the central area by underscoring the need to ensure that there are adequate and sustainable transportation links between the western river corridor and the existing city-centre. This is particularly important given the pressing need to tackle traffic within the Central Area, and in order to unlock the full potential of identified development sites within the Central Area.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4559	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Somerset County Council.
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC102

Plan Reference: Para 2.44

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change Number SPC102 of your 'Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy' includes the following proposed additional text:

"seeking to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels in Bath by, for example, reducing the level of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) traffic in the city through:

i) the continued support & promotion of the Council's Freight Consolidation Centre for deliveries to central Bath; and implementing an experimental weight restriction to remove through HGV traffic (of greater than 18 tonnes) from London Road."

Somerset County Council (SCC) would like to comment on the proposal for an experimental weight restriction on traffic greater than 18 tonnes on London Road (Bath) set out in Sub-section 2 of this bullet point. The restriction proposed appears (from the limited information available) to be similar in intention and effect to recent proposals for a similar 18 tonne environmental weight restriction for vehicles turning between A36 Bathwick St and A36 Beckford Road.

SCC was concerned by the likely impact of this previous proposal. It was felt that the restriction would divert traffic onto less suitable routes in Somerset, compromise the functioning of the Primary Route Network, impose additional costs on the freight industry, place undue pressure on alternative motorway junctions and increase vulnerability during adverse weather.

Department for Transport (DfT) guidance¹ states that local authorities must secure the agreement of other affected authorities before making significant changes to the Primary Route Network (PRN). Both the A36 and A4 around Bath form part of the PRN. Given the concerns described above and after exhausting opportunities for dialogue with Bath and North East Somerset Council (BaNES), SCC made a joint appeal with Wiltshire Council and the Highways Agency to the Secretary of State for Transport against the proposed restriction. A copy of our appeal and the DfT's response are attached.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

This new proposal would seem likely (based on the limited information available) to raise similar issues. The proposals do not address the concerns noted above or suggest a suitable alternative route. Therefore, it is unlikely that SCC will be able to adopt a different position and support this new proposal. As a result, it is not clear how the new proposal might (legally) be implemented - particularly in the light of the DfT's comments on the A4 in their response (Attachment B).

We are also concerned that this proposal has been made without discussion with SCC. Not only would this seem to be necessary to secure our agreement (for reasons described above), SCC agreed to take part in a working group to help BaNES develop alternative solutions following the appeal decision and this proposal seems to ignore the work undertaken by that group since.

The proposal raises issues in relation to all of the criteria, set out in Section 7b of the guidance note referenced above, for a sound core strategy. In particular, it does not appear to be consistent with national policy on the management of the PRN, nor is it based on effective joint working.

Change to the policy requested:

Based on the comments made in Section 7 and the limited information available, it would seem most appropriate to remove this section of proposed additional text.

Should BaNES wish to work with SCC (and other stakeholders) to identify and agree a more appropriate alternative, we remain willing to engage in further discussion .

Change Ref. SPC105**Plan Ref.: Para 2.48****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 224 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Ms Caroline Kay

Respondent Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC105

Plan Reference: Para 2.48

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

BPT have noted the Black and Veatch technical note supporting the Flood Risk Management Project and (as encapsulated in SPC 105) the fact that this proposes that that developments on the key sites at risk of flooding should be raised on plinths.

This potentially has a significant effect on overall building heights in the basin of the City landscape.

The flood management plan makes it all the more important that the Building Heights Strategy should be adopted as an SPD without delay. The need to incorporate plinths into the design of new developments must not be taken as approval for an increase in the overall height of the new buildings where this would cause damage to the World Heritage Site.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 105 needs to make reference to the Building Heights Strategy by pointing out that the raising of buildings on plinths might reduce the economic capacity of particular sites because the overall height contour of the City will not be raised.

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading

Respondent Organisation: Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC105

Plan Reference: Para 2.48

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We are supportive of the updates to paragraph 2.48 in light of the findings of the Flood Risk Management Project (February 2013). We do however consider that further detail could be added to the supporting text to better explain the latest proposals to manage flood risk in the river corridor.

Change to the policy requested:

We would recommend paragraph 2.47 and 2.48 are revised as follows:

'2.47 In relation to flood risk management in Bath as a whole, the Flood Risk Management Strategy concluded that there is no comprehensive strategic solution for reducing peak flows through Bath which would be both technically and economically viable.

2.48 With a number of potential development locations falling in Flood Zone 3a and 2 there is a need to ensure any land raising/defences needed to protect new development and provide safe access and egress does not increase flood risk elsewhere. Previous studies suggested that upstream storage might be a suitable approach to achieve this, but concluded that further more detailed modelling work would be needed to confirm this approach. The latest Flood Risk Management Project (Black & Veatch, February 2013) has now undertaken this modelling and confirms that the principal impact of raising developments in the Central Area and Enterprise Area is a loss of flow conveyance, rather than a loss of flood storage. It therefore recommends provision of flow conveyance improvements, raising/protecting proposed development sites and improvements to existing defences and buildings to ensure safe access and egress.'

Respondent Number: 4708 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Ian Steed**Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson Regeneration**Agent ID:** 167 **Agent Name:** Savills**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC105

Plan Reference: Para 2.48

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We consider that the plan is not sound as it is not Positively Prepared, Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy. The imposition of the Flood Risk Management Strategy to Bath Western Riverside may affect delivery as there will be significant cost implications to the developer that have not been allowed for.

SPC105 and SCP106 refer to the 'Bath Flood Risk Management Project – Technical Note, February 2013 by B&V' and the recommendation for 'conveyance mitigation measures' to offset the impact of raising the key development sites in the Central Area and the Enterprise Area.

Although the Core Strategy Proposed Changes do not include description of the conveyance mitigation measures, these are described within the 'Bath Flood Risk Management Project – Technical Note' which is referred to in SPC105 and SPC161. This document includes the proposal to extend the existing stretch of the lowered river wall along the full extent of the Bath Western Riverside OPA boundary on the left bank.

Although the conveyance mitigation measures do not provide flood risk management benefits to the BWR site (they are intended to mitigate the effects of taking other sites out of the flood plain) they will seriously impact on the Outline Planning Application (OPA) scheme, both in terms of works already undertaken and on future proposed works.

The conveyance mitigation proposals represent a significant variation to Bath Western Riverside's OPA scheme and will impact the design and construction solutions, including:

- Landscaping and earthworks
- River wall stability and remedial works, including the anchorage system
- Destructor Bridge design (already well advanced) and construction. The proposed mitigation could not be implemented

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

without a redesign of the south bridge abutment.

- Riverside buildings, particularly those proposed within the 8m riverside margin adjacent to the Destructor Bridge
- The potential for creating a contamination pathway between the site and the river under flood conditions thereby increasing the risk of pollution. This is particularly critical within the Gas Works site, which is the most contaminated zone along the river frontage.

It is also our understanding that changes to the river profile by wall lowering would result in a requirement to relocate the Environment Agency's Bath Ultrasonic Gauging Station (BUGS) located immediately upstream of the Destructor Bridge.

The design changes that would be brought about due to implementation of the conveyance mitigation proposals are expected to have a significant financial impact upon the future consultancy and construction costs of Bath Western Riverside development.

The proposed strategy represents a key departure from the Environment Agency's 'in principle' position regarding flood risk management and loss of flood plain storage due to new development. It is not clear that the Environment Agency has accepted the proposed strategy and it is recommended that a clear statement is required from them to better understand the soundness and acceptability of the strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Greater flexibility is required to the plan to make it sound. It is suggested that the FRMS should not rigidly apply to BWR due to the extant planning permission, the significant flood risk work undertaken to date and implemented.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 249	Comment Number: 8	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Royal Mail Group Ltd
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 31 **Agent Name:** BNP Paribas Real Estate UK

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC105

Plan Reference: Para 2.48

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This replacement information on the recent hydraulic modelling carried out for BANES by Black and Vetch and its recommendation "to raise all the development sites and the access/egress routes (or raise defence walls) and implement conveyance mitigation measures" is useful as at the present time but it may not apply throughout the life of the Core Strategy as further flood risk assessment work is carried out by BANES and landowners. It may not be possible (eg for cost / viability reasons) to implement this recommended intervention, so its application needs to be qualified.

Royal Mail's site at Manvers Street is part of the Key Development Opportunity identified in Policy B2. Royal Mail's position on flood risk is that any restriction of land use for its site at Manvers Street owing to hydrological considerations would be premature unless and until:

1. express agreement is received from the Environment Agency to the Black and Vetch technical note,
2. the BANES strategy for implementation of mitigation works has been clarified, and
3. a site specific flood risk review has been undertaken which assesses specific development proposals against emerging policy.

Change to the policy requested:

In the interests of soundness the following sentence should be added at the end of the proposed change:

"This recommendation was made as at April 2013 and the deliverability of these mitigation measures will need to be explored by BANES, the Environment Agency and the owners of the key development sites in the Central Area and the Enterprise Area , along with any potential alternative measures to address flood risk. Regard will be had to site specific flood risk assessments and potential for on-site flood mitigation measures. Strategically important Central Area sites should be assessed on a case by case basis to enable regeneration to take place in a viable and sustainable form. "

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 24 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC105 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.48

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Any increase in water levels will put at greatest risk the listed Newark Works and the listed Norfolk Crescent. The lesson to be learned from this winter's floods in the Somerset Levels is that the only flood mitigation measure that is effective is to increase the capacities of outflows. Therefore any policy for Bath that results in a loss of conveyance automatically increases the flood risk for existing properties, which the NPPF specifically rules against. The Core Strategy therefore cannot promote raising the levels of development sites without first increasing the downstream flow capacity.

Change to the policy requested:

Following the Flood Risk Management Strategy, the Hydraulic Modelling (Bath Flood Risk Management Project Feb 2013 by B&V) was prepared. It confirms that the impact of raising the key development sites in the Central Area and the Enterprise Area in Bath is a loss of conveyance, rather than a loss of flood storage. It recommends, where necessary, to raise all the development sites and the access/egress routes (or raise defence walls) and implement conveyance mitigation measures. To comply with the NPPF, the downstream conveyance capacity must be increased before any land levels are raised in order to avoid increasing the flood risk for existing properties.

Respondent Number: 4660 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Norfolk Crescent Green **Respondent Organisation:** Residents Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC105 **Plan Reference:** Para 2.48

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

SPC105 and SPC161 – in Appendix C (Hydraulic Modelling) of B&V's study all key development sites which were considered (including housing and mixed use) are stated to be raised either in whole or part - please see Section 8 for requested change to text.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 105 and 161 - Request to change supporting text in third sentence from "It recommends, where necessary, to raise all the development sites and"..... to "It recommends to raise all development sites in whole or part as necessary and".....

Change Ref. SPC107

Plan Ref.: Table 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading **Respondent Organisation:** Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC107 **Plan Reference:** Table 5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

While we are pleased to see flood risk management infrastructure included in Table 5, more details is need on cost and delivery of the infrastructure to demonstrate that the plan is deliverable.

In relation to cost we understand the Council have now secured £5.1m from the Local Enterprise Partnership Revolving Infrastructure fund to begin implementation of the scheme and enable development of a number of key Enterprise Area sites. We understand repayment could be through Section 106, CIL or City Deal business rate uplift. This information should be detailed on the table and reflected in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

In relation to phasing the Black & Veatch report did not include any detail of the phasing of specific flood risk management improvements in conjunction with specific development sites. More detailed discussion on phasing/timing will therefore be needed so that sites coming forward have the appropriate flood risk management measures in place to ensure safe access and egress and no increase in flood risk off site. This will need to be a key consideration for discussion in the upcoming Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

BI.2 on table 5 should be updated with appropriate text in relation to cost, funding and delivery.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4660 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Norfolk Crescent Green Residents Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC107

Plan Reference: Table 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC107 – Should this now read “Improvements to Flood Defences and Flood Mitigation for Central and Enterprise Areas” or similar?

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4660 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Norfolk Crescent Green Residents Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC107

Plan Reference: Table 5

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC160 – Apart from safeguarding land at Batheaston Meadows should it need to be used in future, is “the FRMS will be reviewed as new evidence becomes available” still relevant? Please see Section 8 for requested change to text.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC160 - Request to change supporting text “The FRMS will be reviewed as new evidence becomes.

Change Ref. SPC108**Plan Ref.:** Para 3.08**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4600 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Margaret Williams**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 28 **Agent Name:** Nash Partnership**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC108

Plan Reference: Para 3.08

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

In agreement with the three new priorities for Keynsham of Improving the shopping experience, creating new jobs and improving the park.

However as a means to fully achieving these new aims there needs to be a different strategy for the release of Green Belt Land for housing to that proposed at the South West of Keynsham and East of Keynsham. The release of green belt land at the West of Keynsham would be a better strategy for the realisation of the aims of the refreshed 2012 Town Plan because:

- It would provide a bigger critical mass of population closer to the town centre where the shopping experience is to be improved. Allocating land at East Keynsham in particular is more likely to result in jobs, employees and the custom of the occupants of the new housing being lost to Bath and Bristol by commuting along the A4.

- It would provide growth in a more sustainable location where people would be better placed to walk, cycle and take public transport into the town centre, employment locations and the park. This is more sustainable, provides the necessary demand in the places needed to improve sustainable transport and public realm infrastructure and reduces congestion which is an essential component of improving the shopping experience.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Change Ref. SPC109**Plan Ref.:** Para 3.10**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 233 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas**Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC109

Plan Reference: Para 3.10

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support the Joint Waste Core Strategy vision and targets for recycling, composting and residual waste treatment and the identification of land at Broadmead Lane as a strategic location for a residual waste facility. This will help bring forward the delivery of our and others' projects North of the railway line in East Keynsham, which all have similar access and infrastructure needs. The adopted Joint Waste Core Strategy necessitates the need to deliver this long-term ambition of the Council:

2003 - B&NES Project Review of Broadmead Lane Environment Park

2005 – Keynsham Environment Park Environmental Baseline Study by W S Atkins

2007 - Site K3 in the Adopted B&NES Local Plan 2007

2008 – Ground Condition, Transport, Ecology and Flood Scoping studies

2009 – Feasibility Summary, Potential for Development of a Waste Treatment Facility

2009 - Geotechnical and Contamination Risk Assessment

2012 - Site BA19 Broadmead Lane in the West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy

2013 – Site K3 as a Site Saved in this Core Strategy

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

We encourage the Council to support a collective approach to resolve infrastructure and access needs of Somerdale, Broadmead Peninsula and Avon Valley in order that wider benefits to the community can be achieved. This is one of four clear requirements of the current Keynsham Town Plan: 'Ensuring all necessary services and infrastructure are maintained and enhanced'.

This is why we clearly support the Joint Waste Core Strategy identification of Site BA19 Broadmead Lane to meet the immediate and sustainable needs of Keynsham's infrastructure and enhance the deliverability of developments and improvements North of the railway line for a number of interested parties, not least B&NES Council. The map attached to this response shows that there is definitive need for a joined-up solution that we would welcome.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC110

Plan Ref.: Vision

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4600 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Margaret Williams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: 28 **Agent Name:** Nash Partnership

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC110

Plan Reference: Vision

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.1. We are in agreement with the change stating that 'Keynsham will expand to accommodate a growing population' ensuring it retains its independence and its separate identity within an attractive rural setting'.

1.2. However as a means to fully achieving the aim of ensuring Keynsham retains its independence and its separate identity within an attractive rural setting there needs to be a different strategy for the release of Green Belt Land for housing to that proposed at the South West of Keynsham and East of Keynsham. The release of green belt land at the West of Keynsham would be a better strategy for the realisation of the aims because:

- Releasing land from the Green belt to the South West of Keynsham, as identified in the Green Belt Stage 1 report threatens encroachment into the gap between Queen Charlton and Keynsham which is essential in maintaining separate identities for each of these settlements. The green belt review stage 1 report notes that 'The Green Belt in this land parcel 'protects the individual character and strong urban edge of Keynsham and prevents the merger of Queen Charlton with Keynsham. It is noted that the western part of the land cell bounds provides the setting for the Queen Charlton Conservation Area'. Releasing green belt land for housing development here would therefore compromise the aims of retaining Keynsham's independence and its separate identity within an attractive rural setting'

- The same report notes that 'the study area [South West of Keynsham] lies on the mid-slope of a gently sloping plateau falling towards Keynsham from the southwest. Within the boundary there is a change in level of around 30m from south-west to north-east, making the southern and western parts more exposed and visible.' This exposure and visibility renders the site unsuitable for release from the Green Belt due to notable potential impact of any development here on views and the local open countryside character. The report states that 'Development could have a significant impact on landscape character and views from surrounding areas from the east and south east, particularly across the Chew Valley'. These landscape character impacts are not present in potential development of Lay's Farm which should therefore be considered as a preferable location for release of green belt land for housing development.

- The potential locations for green belt release for housing development to the East of Keynsham fall within two areas analysed as part of the Green Belt stage 1 report – Land South East of Keynsham and Land North East of Keynsham. Both of these sites are described in the green belt review as being 'of high importance on the basis that [they] lie directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt). It prevents the merger of Bath and Keynsham, while acknowledging that the area of land remaining open between Bath and Keynsham (and Bath and Saltford) is wider than that remaining open between Bristol and Keynsham'. Maintaining a separation and separate identities between Bath and Keynsham is a key aim of the Core Strategy and maintained by change SPC110 and therefore releasing green belt in this area is contrary to these aims and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

should be considered unsound. To the same end it notes that 'It is considered that the Green Belt does play a role in constraining the potential urban sprawl of Bristol (Oldland and Willsbridge) in a southerly direction towards Keynsham'. Therefore losing this Green Belt to housing would threaten the separate identities of Bristol and Keynsham secured by this designation. In this regard the removal of green belt designation here would have more significant adverse impact than removal at Lays Farm, where sprawl is more naturally restricted by the adjacent topography and proximity to other settlements.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC110 **Plan Reference:** Vision

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

None

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Change Ref. SPC111**Plan Ref.: Para 3.13****Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas **Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC111 **Plan Reference:** Para 3.13

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support the need to release land from the Green Belt in East Keynsham "...to accommodate both employment floorspace and housing, but maintains the key Green Belt purposes of preventing the town from merging with Bristol and Saltford." We believe that any mixed use sustainable development like that proposed by our project, must maintain as much as possible those Green Belt purposes and be as inconspicuous as possible. This is just as important as creating local jobs alongside housing need. Our project plan North of the railway line is the most inconspicuous location being considered for release from the Green Belt and will have least impact on the Green Belt purposes. It will provide a definite increase in a diverse range of affordable and private housing, jobs and skills for local people and provide educational attainment for all whilst maintaining an inconspicuous distance from both Bristol and Saltford. Our initial designs are also considerate of any impact of views from Saltford especially.

However, we have concern that the desk-based Green Belt Review conducted by Arup identifies Saltford as a Town in the Green Belt appraisal criteria, when by definition Saltford is not a Town. Whilst we recognise that Saltford is an independent location in its own right and should not be merged with Keynsham, we feel that by due process in the Green Belt Review that Saltford is not a town.

We also believe that there needs to be a clear distinction between the five statutory 'Purposes' of the Green Belt Review by Arup with the additional informal requirements that they have added to the Review; for clarity these are the additional sixth 'Purpose' and three 'Secondary Criteria' that Arup have chosen to add. The council needs to ensure that these do not

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

confuse readers of the Green Belt Review, the Sustainability Appraisal and the eventual Placemaking Process that will inform the allocation of lands in the Placemaking Plan. May we suggest that these additional, non-statutory sixth Purpose and three Secondary Criteria are included in separate tables in the report to eliminate confusion? We ask this because we believe there will be much interest in the Green Belt Review and subsequent reports and those future decisions need to be based on non-subjective due process.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC112

Plan Ref.: Para 3.14

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4600 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Margaret Williams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: 28 **Agent Name:** Nash Partnership

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC112

Plan Reference: Para 3.14

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.0. Overview

1.1. SPC112 States that Green Belt releases will be made to the east of Keynsham to accommodate 250 dwellings and employment floorspace, and to the south west of Keynsham to accommodate 200 dwellings.

1.2. Whilst we are in agreement with the council's revisions to housing allocations in Keynsham, it is our belief that the decision to change the green belt boundary to the South West and East of the town is not an approach to making this allocation which is effective at delivering the wider aims of the Core Strategy or consistent with national policy. As such SPC112 is unsound.

1.3. It does not offer the best approach to maintaining the separate identity of the town and is therefore in conflict with this ambition of the Core Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol. In this regard it should also be regarded as not legal.

1.4. Evidence demonstrates it is a less sustainable location for development than Lay's farm to the West of Keynsham, which should be named in SPC112 instead as a location for green belt land release.

1.5. The two areas covered in SPC112 which would have sites released from the Green Belt – the boundaries to the South West and East of the town - are discussed in turn below and in comparison to the alternative for releasing land to the West of Keynsham, specifically at Lays farm.

2.0. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the South West of Keynsham

2.1. All Green Belt sites considered for release in light of the revisions to the Core Strategy have been analysed as part of Arup's Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013). Within the conclusions and recommendations of this report, land to the South West of Keynsham is listed as a 'worst performing' development option. The report states that 'Land adjoining South West Keynsham has similar transport characteristics to the west of Keynsham. The development area is further from Keynsham town centre making it less accessible on foot and the east-west alignment of the area could make it difficult to integrate buses into the development so travel patterns are likely to be car dependent'.

2.2. Further to this assessment, the Arup Development Concept Options Report for this area – considered as part of the land south of K2 parcel – notes that 'The area is remote from the town and has limited vehicle and pedestrian connections to the neighbouring residential area....a regular bus service runs through the residential area to the north (Cedar Drive/Newland Road) though this is some distance from the site. No regular services run directly through or past the study

area. Extension of these routes to serve the area may prove difficult due to limited access opportunities. The study area lies around 2km from Keynsham railway station'. It goes on to state that 'The study area lies around 1.7km from the town centre and has few tangible connections in this direction due to the layout of the existing residential area. Though adjacent to a primary school, the study area is over 500m from the neighbourhood centre on Queens Road. This poses issues regarding the social and environmental sustainability of future development and could lead to the creation of an isolated and car-dominated environment.[...] The peripheral location means that additional bus services are less likely to come forward.

2.3. This is evidence that releasing green belt land at the South West of Keynsham ahead of land at the West of Keynsham (incorporating Lay's Farm) is a less sustainable option and should be considered contrary to paragraph 34 of the NPPF which states 'Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised'. In this regard the changes to the Core Strategy are unsound.

2.4. Further to these poor sustainable transport credentials, the Development Concept Options Report goes on to state that 'The study area is very constrained in terms of vehicle access opportunities. Access relies on the suitability of Charlton Road as there is insufficient capacity on Redlynch Lane (south/east) and no suitable access points from the north (the K2B scheme does not allow for a vehicle connection). If Parkhouse Lane is to be used as an access there will be a need to improve its capacity though through access to Keynsham centre would be unsuitable. The limitations on access and connectivity indicate that it may not be feasible or desirable to develop the entire area.' Given that the viability of access to the site has not been established, it is not sound plan-making practice to release the site from the Green Belt for housing development ahead of Lay's Farm, which is located in a more sustainable location for transport and has access arrangements already established through the trading estate.

2.5. Releasing land from the Green belt to the South West of Keynsham, as identified in the Green Belt Stage 1 report threatens encroachment into the gap between Queen Charlton and Keynsham which is essential in maintaining separate identities for each of these settlements. The green belt review stage 1 report notes that 'The Green Belt in this land parcel 'protects the individual character and strong urban edge of Keynsham and prevents the merger of Queen Charlton with Keynsham. It is noted that the western part of the land cell bounds provides the setting for the Queen Charlton Conservation Area'.

2.6. In a similar regard to heritage, the green belt review states that Green belt allocation here also 'protects the setting of Parkhouse Farmhouse, which is a Grade II listed building.' In this regard green belt which does not serve the function of protecting the setting of listed buildings should be developed ahead of Green Belt which does serve this function.

2.7. The green belt review identifies this parcel as serving a strong agricultural purpose which would be lost as a result of being released from the green belt for housing. Releasing land at the South West of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality'.

2.8. The green belt review notes that 'The stream that passes to the east of Queen Charlton is designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. It is reasonable to assume that Abbots Wood would have relatively high biodiversity value, although it is not currently designated'. The allocation of green belt land for housing development within the South West of Keynsham study area ahead of other areas with lower biodiversity constraints is not in pursuit of sustainable development, as is a requirement of paragraph 9 of the NPPF. This states that 'Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life, including (but not limited to): [...] moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature'. In this regard the changes to the core strategy should be considered unsound.

2.9. Further to the Green Belt review, B&NES commissioned Arup to produce a 'Development Concept Options Report' in light of the inspectors' requirement to make more housing land allocations which adds further evidence that land to the South West of Keynsham (assessed as part of the 'South of K2' parcel) is a more unsustainable location for release of green belt land than at Lay's Farm.

2.10. Firstly the report notes that 'the study area lies on the mid-slope of a gently sloping plateau falling towards Keynsham

from the southwest. Within the boundary there is a change in level of around 30m from south-west to north-east, making the southern and western parts more exposed and visible.' This exposure and visibility renders the site unsuitable for release from the Green Belt due to notable potential impact of any development here on views and the local open countryside character. The report states that 'Development could have a significant impact on landscape character and views from surrounding areas from the east and south east, particularly across the Chew Valley'. These landscape character impacts are not present in potential development of Lay's Farm which should therefore be considered as a preferable location for release of green belt land for housing development.

3.0. Alterations to Green Belt Boundary to the East of Keynsham

3.1. Paragraph 6.6 of BNES/40 ('B&NES response to Inspector's note on proposed changes to the Submitted Core Strategy') states that 'At Keynsham the Council considers that at the location on the eastern side of the town there is no capacity for longer term development and therefore, the Placemaking Plan will not consider the identification of safeguarded land. This is because land in this location is of significant importance to the Green Belt. As set out in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review undertaken by Arup (available as part of the supporting evidence throughout the consultation period) land in this area is of high importance in Green belt terms as it lies directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt) and it prevents the merger of Bristol, Bath and Keynsham'. The parts of the green belt proposed for release for housing development serves the same function as this land and therefore, by extension of the council's own logic, should not be released for development and an alternative approach sought.

3.2. The potential locations for green belt release for housing development to the East of Keynsham fall within two areas analysed as part of the Green Belt stage 1 report – Land South East of Keynsham and Land North East of Keynsham. Both of these sites are described in the green belt review as being 'of high importance on the basis that [they] lie directly in the Green Belt corridor between Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath (fundamental to the reasons behind the designation of Bristol and Bath Green Belt). It prevents the merger of Bath and Keynsham, while acknowledging that the area of land remaining open between Bath and Keynsham (and Bath and Saltford) is wider than that remaining open between Bristol and Keynsham'. Maintaining a separation and separate identities between Bath and Keynsham is a key aim of the Core Strategy and therefore releasing green belt in this area is contrary to these aims and should be considered unsound. To the same end it notes that 'It is considered that the Green Belt does play a role in constraining the potential urban sprawl of Bristol (Oldland and Willsbridge) in a southerly direction towards Keynsham'. Therefore losing this Green Belt to housing would threaten the separate identities of Bristol and Keynsham secured by this designation. In this regard the removal of green belt designation here would have more significant adverse impact than removal at Lays Farm, where sprawl is more naturally restricted by the adjacent topography and proximity to other settlements.

3.3. The area to the East of Keynsham is identified in Arup's Development Concept Options Report as Agricultural Land Class 2 'very good agricultural land' and is therefore ill suited to release from the green belt ahead of other sites available which are likely to be of lesser agricultural quality. Releasing land at the East of Keynsham for housing is therefore contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF which states 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality'.

3.4. The site is also constrained by incorporating, or being near to a number of landscape and biodiversity designations which are not present at Lays Farm. The presence of Broad Mead Farm SNCI and the site's proximity to Stidham Farm SSSI/ Conservation Areas (Keynsham and Saltford) and the Cotswold AONB should all be considered as reasons for developing Lays Farm ahead of East of Keynsham. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF lists 12 key principles that plan making should adhere to, one of which is to 'contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework'. The release of land from the green belt at the East of Keynsham ahead of sites with lesser environmental value and designations such as Lays Farm should be considered contrary to the NPPF and therefore unsound plan-making practice.

3.5. The impact on the existing road network resultant from releasing land to the East of Keynsham is especially significant and certainly moreso than allocating land at Lays Farm. The Development Concept options Report states that 'Any development in this area would have a significant impact on the A4 which already has issues with its capacity. This would necessitate road and junction improvements, particularly at the roundabout. Manor Road to the south is particularly

narrow leading towards Saltford and it would not be desirable to introduce high volumes of traffic onto this road. Access from the west is possible via the existing residential development though capacity is limited’.

3.6. Within Arup’s Core Strategy Transport Evaluation (March 2013), land to the East of Keynsham is classified as an averagely performing site for the location of development. In this sense it should not be considered suitable for development ahead of better performing sites.

4.0. Proposed Location – Lay’s Farm, West of Keynsham

4.1. The main advantages of releasing land from the Green Belt to the West of Keynsham and specifically at Lays Farm have been discussed in contrast to the council’s preferred sites for release above.

4.2. In addition to these comparative advantages, Arup’s Development Concept Options Report dismisses development on a large part of Lay’s Farm, which it suggests is the location of a large underground gas pipe ‘protected by an HSE-regulated buffer zone which permits residential development within only the outer zone (beyond 70m either side of pipeline)’. This constraint is discussed as the primary issue with the site. However this assertion is incorrect. The pipeline is in a different location and according to its operators only has a 5m buffer zone. The pipeline is also of an aged nature and the operator would be willing to accept its re-location and replacement with a modern efficient structure. The pipeline does therefore not represent an issue of constraint against development.

4.3. The evidence base upon which the Core Strategy base is therefore unsound and as such the Core Strategy should also be considered unsound by default.

4.4. The Development Concept Options Report identifies a number of significant strengths in the Lays Farm site which are not identified at Land to the South West and East of Keynsham. It notes that the area ‘has an existing vehicle access to Lays Farm which could be utilised and expanded for development. The southern part is directly adjacent to Charlton Road which gives opportunity for a new connection’. Similarly the study area is within walking distance of existing facilities in the Keynsham area including retail, primary schools and bus routes. Development has the opportunity to connect to these facilities via existing pedestrian routes.

4.5. There has been no visual impact assessment carried out on the impact development on the site would have on views towards Keynsham. Although the Development Concept Options Report states ‘The area itself is visible from across the valley meaning development could have a strong visual impact’ there is no evidence of this. The only areas of public road the site would be visible from outside of immediately adjacent neighbourhoods is Stockwood Vale and Stockwood Road. Due to the topography of the valley between these roads and the presence of a tree screen at the brow of the valley slope, it is likely that the impact of development at land to the West of Keynsham on views across Charlton Valley would be negligible or nil. The evidence presented as part of the base supporting the council’s proposed changes to the Core Strategy should be considered unreliable, rendering the Core Strategy unsound.

5.1. Conclusions

5.1. In summary, in comparison to the Land to the South West and East of Keynsham, releasing Lays Farm from the Green Belt for development would:

- Have less of a threat on development encroachment towards, and impact on, the individual identities of Keynsham, Bristol, Bath and Queen Charlton
- Have lesser impact on heritage assets
- Have a lesser visual impact on the natural landscape
- Have a lesser impact on biodiversity
- Use poorer quality agricultural land for development
- Be easier to accommodate sustainable transport and bus services; especially over land South West of Keynsham which is particularly isolated and suffering severe access issues.

5.2. As a result of these outcomes the Core Strategy could be considered compliant with national policy, consistent with the wider aims of the Core Strategy as agreed through the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol, effective at delivering these and therefore be considered sound and legal. In its current form the Core Strategy should not be considered to be either of these.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

5.3. Furthermore, as demonstrated above, the evidence base reports produced for the council as a means to making decisions on the release of green belt following the Inspector's Report on the Core Strategy is factually incorrect and cannot therefore be considered as a reliable source of information for sound plan-making.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC112, p.63 para 3.4:

2,100 new homes will be built between 2011 and 2029 to support economic growth of the town and accommodate a growing population. Approximately 700 homes are already accounted for, having either already been built since 2011, have planning permission, or are allocated in the Local Plan. The Local Plan allocations include the 500+ dwelling development in South West Keynsham known as 'K2'. Development requirements are outlined in the Local Plan, including the need for satisfactory vehicular accesses. 700 dwellings are directed towards the town centre/Somerdale policy area (Policy KE2) which will serve as the focus of future development within Keynsham. Green Belt releases will be made to the east of Keynsham to accommodate 250 dwellings and employment floorspace, and to the south west of Keynsham to accommodate 200 450 dwellings.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC112 **Plan Reference:** Para 3.14

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Proposed Change SPC 112 identifies the number of dwellings to be built in the Keynsham area in the plan period as 2,100 dwellings. However, the composite version of the Local Plan (March 2013) paragraph 3.14 refers to 2,000 new homes. Pegasus considers that this housing provision should be increased once a collaborative SHMA has been produced. The provision is considered to be unsound (see our representations on SPC 13 and SPC 14.).

The principle of Green Belt release is supported and in particular that land for around 200 dwellings will be released to the south west of Keynsham. However, it is considered that the Core Strategy should identify the site as it is key to the delivery of the housing provision in the plan (NPPF para 47), consideration should be given to a larger area of land being released to enable further development in the plan period and some flexibility should other sites not delivery as envisaged. When redrawing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development (NPPF para 84) and where necessary identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt in order to meet the longer term development needs. Stretching beyond the plan period. It is clear that the Proposed Changes do not address the issue of flexibility or identify safeguarded land in this location for the longer term. This is the only area around Keynsham that at the time of the last Local Plan Inquiry was considered as suitable sustainable direction for growth in the long term.

Change to the policy requested:

Provision to Keynsham should be increased to reflect a collaborative assessment of the housing needs (SHMA) The site of south west Keynsham should be identified and allocated in the Plan. (see representations on SPC 111) and provision made for the longer term.

Change Ref. SPC113**Plan Ref.: Para 3.15****Development Location: Comment on general development locations**

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas **Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC113

Plan Reference: Para 3.15

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst we support the need to release land from the Green Belt in East Keynsham for 25,000 – 30,000 m3 of employment floor space and to meet a job growth figure of 1,600 in 2011-2029 by office floor space in the town and an extension of the Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate, we feel that other locations can positively add to that job growth figure and should not be ignored in the Core Strategy and Placemaking Process.

We believe that any mixed use sustainable development like that proposed by our project, must clearly account for local jobs alongside housing need. It should ideally include live/work opportunities and food production for households in allotments and/or market gardens. Our project plan includes a marina and associated boat and boating services, a water ecology park to diversify rural income to the farm and an early learning aquatic centre to increase the number of visitors and schools to the area. This will provide a definite increase in a diverse range of affordable and private housing, jobs and skills for local people and provide educational attainment for all.

Our proposals include an additional 8 full time (FT) park jobs, 30 FT craft and retail unit jobs, 30 FT live/work jobs, 30+ FT micro business jobs, 14 FT marina and boatyard jobs and 2 FT education jobs, in addition to around 25+ part time / summer vacation jobs in peak seasons.

Although we agree it is necessary for office floor space in the town centre and additional industrial floor space in Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate, we do not believe that the policies in K1 and K3 go far enough to recognise the positive contribution that rural diversification, environmental and educational jobs like those proposed in our development add to sustainable communities.

Change to the policy requested:

Please add: "...stock of office floorspace in the town, complemented by an extension to the Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate and developments that incorporate jobs into their overall design."

Change Ref. SPC114**Plan Ref.:** Policy KE1**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 106**Comment Number:** 12**Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling**Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Other representations have been made by Pro Planning in relation to Proposed Changes to policies for housing and employment development in the Rural Areas and Somer Valley.

These representations raise concerns about the proposed number and extent of potential encroachments into the inner Green Belt boundary for Keynsham to accommodate housing and economic development within the period of the Core Strategy. The concerns arise for a number of reasons, as follows.

1.The Proposed Changes make provision for a large number of separate intrusions into the Green Belt with apparently, limited subsequent policy control to restrict the actual number or extent of encroachments to be allowed during this period. It is accepted that the detail boundary should be prepared though the Placemaking Plan, but the Proposed Changes appear to enable all of these encroachments to be made without the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Such erosion of this part of the Bristol/Bath Green Belt would seriously undermine its function.

2.Following from this point, the Green Belt is already under its severest pressure in the corridor between Bristol and Bath and particularly between Bristol at Whitchurch and Keynsham and between Keynsham and Saltford. Even where Green Belt land remains, the pressures upon it are in danger of undermining its ability to serve a meaningful Green Belt function. The provision in the Core Strategy to allow further development in BANES at Whitchurch and on sites to the west, south and east of Keynsham cannot be considered to result in balanced or sustainable development in relation to BANES as a whole.

3.By contrast, the reduction in proposed housing and jobs at Midsomer Norton in the Somer Valley is not considered to be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

justified as other representations have shown. Furthermore, the growth at Somer Valley can be accommodated on land not within Green Belt, which enhances its sustainability credentials and where further growth and development should be encouraged and facilitated in preference to such extensive erosion of the Green Belt at Keynsham.

4. Keynsham and Norton Radstock are acknowledged to be major urban areas within BANES and, whilst Keynsham has the benefit of the railway line and easier access to the motorway, Somer Valley is better located to provide cheaper market housing and therefore greater choice, as well as a range of potential employment opportunities, thus delivering a better and more sustainable balance of major development sites across the district.

Change to the policy requested:

Re-evaluate the sites where the Core Strategy proposes to allow incursions into the Green Belt in the vicinity of Bristol and Keynsham and reduce the number to ensure longevity and validity of the remaining Green Belt between the settlements of Bristol, Keynsham and Saltford.

Revisit the potential for additional housing and employment in the Somer Valley to achieve a better balance of strategic housing employment development across the district.

Respondent Number: 114 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Society of Merchant Venturers

Agent ID: 150 **Agent Name:** Smiths Gore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

change SPC114

2. The proposed change refers to Policy KE1, Keynsham Spatial Strategy and proposes to insert the text (shown underlined) under the Policy heading Natural and Built Environment to “Maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, allowing releases of Green Belt land to the east and south west of Keynsham to accommodate employment and housing growth.”

4. The amendment at SPC114 does not provide the sufficient flexibility that the Inspector requires to ensure housing delivery at Keynsham. This lack of flexibility results in the plan not being positively prepared or effective and the plan is therefore unsound.

6. The deliverability of the sites carried forward from the previous Local Plan have already been highlighted as an issue in submitted statements to the Council during the course of the examination of the Core Strategy thus far. The Inspector has recognised these deliverability issues in his letter to the Council of June 2012 [ID/28].

7. The allocation in the previous 2007 Local Plan at South West Keynsham is divided into two parts known as sites K2A and K2B. Both of these sites are indicated for early delivery within the Core Strategy with site K2B delivering 42 dwellings in 2013/2014. Whilst site K2B has planning consent (via appeal) reserve matters are still in the process of being discharged and there is no indication of a start on site. Site K2A is expected to start delivering houses on site in 2015/16 yet remains without any planning approval or planning application submission since its allocation in 2007.

8. The Somerdale Factory Site is also a 2007 Local Plan allocation carried over to the Core Strategy. The complications of a brownfield site are very likely to delay this development coming forward. This site is intended to start delivering housing in 2015/2016.

9. Part of the Somerdale Factory Site lies within Flood Zones (FZ) 2 and 3. The Inspector’s letter of June 2012 [ID/28] comments that, “Theoretically, there is sufficient land at Somerdale outside FZ2 and FZ3 with climate change to accommodate 600 homes. But there is not the evidence to demonstrate that 600 homes can be so accommodated whilst securing other appropriate objectives for the site and making it successful. Furthermore, there is not the evidence to demonstrate that least 600 homes are needed to make all other aspects of the proposal work or that at least 600 dwellings should be accommodated here regardless of flood risk”. The Bath and North East Somerset Council Flood Risk: The Sequential and Exception Tests Update [CD4/FR39], comments that 260 homes from the Somerdale site cannot be accommodated within Flood Zone 1. The document goes on to state that through the SA assessment there are no reasonable alternative sites in Keynsham to accommodate 260 homes. Whilst the document further advises that the proposed allocation at the Somerdale site should be subject to the exceptions test this places some uncertainty on the deliverability of at least 140 dwellings that lie in Flood Zone 1 and 120 homes that lie in Flood Zone 2. Paragraph 101 of the NPPF advises that development should not be allocated if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

10. The proposed changes include a new Policy KE4 to deliver a mixed use development of 200 houses fronting both Charlton Road and Parkhouse Lane. This will take the form of a removal of land from the Green Belt the boundary of which together with the red line allocation will be shown in a forthcoming Placemaking Local Plan. The proposed Policy KE4 requirements (i.e. 200 houses fronting both Charlton Road and Parkhouse Lane) however have the effect of positioning the development immediately south of site K2A. The new 'allocation' will therefore need to be comprehensively planned alongside site K2A and the policy requires it to be well integrated with the surrounding development proposals. As site K2A appears to be delayed in its delivery then the delivery of the new 'allocation' is likely to be delivered towards the end of the plan period if not further delayed. The new 'allocation' is dependent up on the delivery of K2A the delivery timing of which is questionable.

11. The new South West development is included in the Council's housing trajectory for delivery commencing 2015/16; however the red line allocation of a site is not intended by the Council to be an adopted allocation until summer 2015 via the adoption of the Placemaking Local Plan. This timetable suggests delivery of housing from the new allocation by 2015 is challenging in the extreme.

12. Policy KE3 proposes a new mixed use development to include 25,000-30,000 m2 of employment land in an expansion to Broadmead/Ashmead/ Pixash Industrial Estate and around 250 dwellings in the plan period at a location to the east of Keynsham.

13. Whilst the location is well located in terms of access to the town centre a significant trade-off is required in terms of the land's Green Belt purpose. The land is located between the two settlements of Keynsham and Saltford providing a break in the urban form and helping to maintain their distinct identities. The land also provides a valuable recreational resource and the physical separation from Saltford is seen locally as having high importance (as identified in the ARUP Development Options Report for East Keynsham).

14. The area of land contains Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the area to south of the A4 will require significant attenuation. It is also understood that the site is in multiple ownerships. The site constraints and ownership issues are very likely to delay the delivery of the site.

16. The planned scale of housing for Keynsham is 2,100 dwellings as given in the proposed change [SPC114] to policy KE1 for the period 2011 to 2029. The Council's housing trajectory provides for the cumulative delivery of 2,090 dwellings. This trajectory marginally under-provides and gives no flexibility or contingency to the delivery risks of key sites that have existing delivery issues already identified.

17. The Council's trajectory also heavily focuses development in the south west part of Keynsham with delivery of around 150 dwellings annually for 5 years from 2015 to 2020. The ability of this sustained delivery in a focused part of the town is highly questionable and suggests at least three outlets operating in the area within that timeframe.

18. The Council's monitoring framework includes change reference SPC203 which advises that housing delivery will be reviewed every 5 years and if after 5 years monitoring demonstrates that the planned housing provision "is not being delivered at the levels expected and there would be no reasonable prospect of the delivery of 21,700 homes to 2029," then a review of the Core Strategy would occur.

19. It is considered that the Core Strategy be more explicit about what would be reviewed/when and what might trigger a contingency or review of the spatial strategy. The proposed insertion that a review would only be triggered if "there would be no reasonable prospect of the delivery of 21,700 homes to 2029" is not specific enough. It is considered that there is inadequate provision to deal with under-delivery, and the monitoring framework does not allow a speedy reaction to any housing delivery issues identified.

20. The need for flexibility within the plan for the provision for housing to allow for a range of sites to come forward to meet the housing trajectory is required. This provides a more re-active framework than the 5 year land supply process.

21. Given the risks highlighted above in the delivery of housing from allocated sites brought forward from the previous Local Plan and new allocations yet to be made within broad locations identified, there is a clear inherent risk in the delivery of housing for Keynsham within the timescales identified. In addition there is no contingency or flexibility identified for Keynsham should sites fail to deliver as anticipated or reactive monitoring position. It is therefore strongly contested that additional land should be allocated to provide for flexibility and availability in housing delivery for Keynsham. This will ensure the plan is effective, deliverable and sound.

Change to the policy requested:

22. Land to the south of Keynsham at Uplands was one of four study areas selected by the Council for consideration to identify viable potential development capacity. The Land at Uplands Development Concept Options report March 2013 by ARUP comments that;

- land is well contained and could be designed to have limited impact on the wider landscape,
- it is close to an existing employment site to the south,
- the B3116 provides good access to the A4 and town centre and industrial estate to the north,
- the area is adjacent to an established residential area and as such is a complementary use with socially sustainable

benefits,

- the Manor Road Community Woodland is a major Community Asset lying nearby,
- the land identified is all within Flood Zone 1,
- the land immediately south of the existing residential development would form a natural extension and could deliver in the region of 350 dwellings,
- the site is available,
- the site is in single ownership, and
- a viable housing scheme could be delivered on the site.

23. The Council's Green Belt Review Stage 1 report April 2013 evaluates a broad land parcel to the south of Keynsham including the village of Chewton Keynsham. It is commented at page 32 that, 'It is considered that the Green Belt directly to the south of Keynsham is not of importance for preventing the merger of Bristol and Keynsham'. The report identifies that the Green Belt in this location performs the role more of a countryside designation in preserving the countryside for its own sake and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

24. The only aspect on which the Uplands land does not score highly is in terms of its distance from the town centre and access to services and facilities. However, the Core Strategy Transport Assessment (February 2013) indicates that walking linkages could be improved via new pedestrian footways along Wellsway with potential for a link to Hardington Drive. In addition cycling into central Keynsham is possible within a 20 minute journey time. As regards public transport a number of services already exist along the B3116 Wellsway including the No. 178 service which could serve further development to the south at Uplands. The report further comments that in highway terms traffic increase from the development is likely to be manageable. (Transport Evaluation, Page G7).

25. There is also scope at the Uplands site to include local services and facilities as part of a development proposal. These could serve a wider area supporting the sustainability and access to services and facilities for the southern residential estates of Keynsham. The allocation of development in the Uplands area could also offer the opportunity for a primary school site. This provision could be aligned with the allocation of the East of Keynsham site which under proposed Policy KE3 bullet point I., is required to provide a primary school on site to serve a development of around 250 houses. The development of East Keynsham for 250 houses and Uplands at 250 houses could together contribute (either financially or by land provision) to a new primary school. From a sustainability perspective if a new primary school is required then a site to the south of Keynsham would be preferable in terms of spreading accessibility, rather than concentrating primary education to the north of Keynsham where Chandag Primary and Infant schools already exist close to the East of Keynsham proposed allocation. The ARUP Development Concept Options report for Uplands identifies at page 16 that there are advantageous opportunities for developing the two areas of East Keynsham and Uplands in tandem to create a more comprehensive and sustainable solution.

26. The plan at Appendix 1 shows a concept plan for potential development of land at Uplands. This provides for some 250 dwellings together with a neighbourhood centre providing local services and facilities for the development and which could serve a wider area improving sustainability locally. The land can also provide open space and a link through to the residential development to the north as well as footways along the Wellsway fronting the site (as suggested by the ARUP Transport Evaluation). Highway infrastructure to provide access into the site could also act as a traffic calming/slowing measure into the urban area from the faster rural section of the B3116, managing the flow of traffic into the town. The site could also provide for a primary school site to further aid sustainable access to educational facilities in the southern part of Keynsham.

27. The land at Uplands is well related to the existing urban area. It would involve the rolling back of the Green Belt in an area where the Green Belt serves no strategic purpose, in an area which is well-contained visually and would have minimal impact on the landscape as acknowledged by the Land at Uplands Development Concept Options report March 2013 by ARUP and the SA/SEA Annex L.

28. The development is accessible to the large employment/industrial estate to the North and by public transport provision to the town centre. Unlike the sites at Keynsham East and the Somerdale factory site none of the land at Uplands is within Flood Zones 2 or 3.

29. The site is well contained to the south by the range of Uplands Farm buildings for which the barns have residential conversion consent. Whilst Uplands Farm House is listed development of the Uplands site would not prejudice or detract from its setting.

30. The land at Uplands, has been assessed by the Council, but has been wrongly rejected as a potential development site to deliver housing for Keynsham. Its suitability for development is demonstrated above and the site is in single ownership and has the opportunity to come forward rapidly.

31. The site should be identified as an allocated housing site to provide certainty of delivery of housing at Keynsham and to provide much needed flexibility in delivery should other sites fail to come forwards as anticipated. The site should be allocated as an additional to the sites already proposed.

32. In order to make the plan sound the representation considers the following amendment to Policy KE1 should be made (as shown in italics and underlined).

At Policy KE1 part 1. a. reword as follows:-

Maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, allowing releases of Green Belt land to the east, south and south west of Keysham to accommodate employment and housing growth.

Add the following new policy as follows:-

Policy KE5 Land at South Keynsham

Land at South Keynsham will be removed from the Green Belt as shown on inset map 1 in order to provide for development of around 250 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the Plan period.

Planning requirements to:

a. Provide around 250 dwellings in the plan period.

B. Be developed to a comprehensive Masterplan, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with Keynsham. Dwellings should face onto the open countryside and create an attractive boundary treatment.

C. Ensure that the principles and benefits of Green Infrastructure contained in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and other guidance and best practice are embedded in the design and development process from an early stage. Key requirements include provision of habitat connectivity; provision of well integrated green space (formal, natural and allotments); provision of cycle and pedestrian links through the site connecting to the existing network particularly towards Keynsham town centre; and provision of well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

D. Appropriate site assessment and ecological surveys to be undertaken to inform site master planning with particular attention to potential impacts to protected sites and priority species. Species rich hedgerows, ponds, ditches and trees should be retained and enhanced, and habitat suitable for priority species provided as required.

E. Identify and assess the landscape character, landscape features and significant view points and the likely effects of development on them. Protect and enhance these aspects and mitigate to avoid or minimise the effects.

F. Assess and evaluate any direct or indirect impacts on designated heritage assets and their visual/landscape settings. Prepare and implement management schemes (including avoidance or physical separation) in order to mitigate the impacts of development and ensure the long-term protection and enhancement of the designated heritage assets and their settings.

G. Assess and evaluate any impacts on non-designated heritage assets. The degree of harm to or loss of non-designated heritage assets will be balanced against the positive contribution made by the development and the extent to which harm/loss can be mitigated.

H. Ensure good public transport provision particularly towards Keynsham town centre, the railway station and other local facilities and services.

i. Development should scope potential for and incorporate renewable energy.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

J. Educational needs generated by the development must be met.

K. Provide integrated waste management infrastructure.

L. New water mains and sewer site connections required, including separate systems of drainage and downstream sewer improvements to critical sewers.

There may be other consequent changes to the plan to ensure consistency.

Respondent Number: 3511 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Duncan Tyler

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I would like to express my objection to the level of house building in the Keynsham area. We already have the Somerfield development and K2 - a substantial increase in housing in the area already.

My objections are as follows:

- Firstly and most importantly: destruction of the green belt land. Keynsham is surrounded by beautiful countryside. A reason many of us were attracted to the area and what makes it such a lovely place to live. The green belt was put there to protect Keynsham from urban sprawl like this and is very important for residents quality of life.
- Demarcation: further expanding Keynsham risks it losing its individuality, it is very close to both Bristol and Saltford, it needs to be protected from merging with these.
- Impact on wildlife: obvious impact on wildlife.
- Impact on the environment: house building, more cars, etc.
- Impact on traffic levels, already bad in the area. (the lack of any new access road to the K2 site is evidence that the focus on house building is ignoring traffic impacts)
- Local community spirit: Keynsham has a fantastic strong community spirit due to being a small town. Further enlarging it risks losing this and impacting quality of life.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The rejection of Redrow's land at Lays Farm (See attached Site Location Plan and Site Analysis) on the grounds that a gas pipeline runs through the central southern part of the site and that the "HSE buffer zone severely limits development" or "effectively limits development to a very minor area to the north west of the site" is simply wrong and wholly misleading (Ref: BANES Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2013).

We are clear that an old high pressure (steel) gas main runs across the site at a depth of approximately 1.2m. However, the route of this pipeline as shown on the (unnumbered) plan attached to the SHLAA, does not accord with the records held by

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

the company who own and operate the pipeline, namely Wales and West Utilities Ltd (see attached W&WU Pipeline Plan). Moreover, the existing easement is only 7m and Wales and West has confirmed that it would require a no-build zone of 16m although a highway may be constructed across the main.

The impact of the existing pipeline on the development potential of the site is consequently minimal and certainly not such that would warrant disregarding it completely as a sustainable option. Moreover, it is feasible to divert the main, and Redrow have recently done just that elsewhere in Bristol, and by using modern materials it would further reduce any no-build easement to 6m.

The site, south of Lays Farm (Ref: Area 10 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L) is bound on two side by development and forms a far more logical addition to the built-up area of Keynsham than that proposed to be released from the Green Belt to the south (Ref: Area 13 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L). Development would project no further west than the existing Lays Farm Business Centre. Moreover, the submitted site analysis shows that the distance and the intervening topography ensure that the role of the remaining Green Belt separating Keynsham from Stockwood (identified as Stockwood Vale) would not be unacceptably eroded. In no sense would the release of this site result in the coalescence of Keynsham with Bristol.

It appears to us, from close examination of the SHLAA and the Green Belt Review, that the Council's primary reason for not also identifying the land at Lays Farm for release from the Green Belt was based on incorrect information about the route and scale of any safeguarding associated with the gas pipeline.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Change to the policy requested:

Land at Lays Farm is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing (150 dwellings)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton

Respondent Organisation: J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

In principle the Proposed Change to Policy KE1 1 Natural and Built Environment is supported in terms of releasing land from the Green Belt to the south west of Keynsham to accommodate housing and employment growth, but it is considered that the release of Green Belt land in the south west should be greater in order to safeguard land for the longer term and in order to be considered consistent with national policy and in order to be effective. (see representations in respect of SPC 108, 107 and 106 and 116).

Pegasus have submitted a detailed Sustainability Appraisal which included a Landscape and Visual Appraisal, Ecology Assessment, Archaeological and Heritage Appraisal, flood risk and Drainage and Traffic and Transport and Utilities along with a concept plan illustrating the layout for approximately between 900 dwellings at 30 dph to about 1,100 dwellings at 38 dph.

It is noted that the Development Concept Options Report has been produced for south of K2 ie south west Keynsham and this report concludes that a viable housing scheme could be delivered on this site. It is not clear whether this report is part of the Council's evidence base, whether it is the Stage 2 assessment of the Green Belt - it clearly has no planning status and is not Council policy and our clients do not agree with the assumptions about the level of housing provision that could be accommodated, no dialogue has taken place with our clients following the submission of the Sustainability Appraisal and SHLAA submissions.

2. Housing

Although the housing provision has increased from 1,500 to 2,100 Pegasus object to the increase as the overall housing provision is not based on a SHMA which is NPPF compliant.

Change to the policy requested:

The following wording should be added to 1. Natural and Built Environment.

a: Maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, allowing releases of Green Belt land to the east and south west of Keynsham to accommodate employment and housing growth. The areas to be released from the Green Belt are allocated

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

in Policies KE3 and KE4.

b: Land will be safeguarded to meet the longer term development needs at south west Keynsham or if housing delivery indicates a shortfall in provision the additional area consideration should come forward to meet housing needs.”

c: Make better use of the existing green and blue infrastructure (for example parks and rivers) running through and surrounding the town which will be enhanced, made more accessible and linked up...The housing provision to Keynsham set out in 2. Housing should be increased to reflect a revised SHMA which has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF (para 158 – 159)

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Although the Proposed Changes allow revisions to be made to the Green Belt boundary at Keynsham to accommodate both employment floorspace and housing, which is in principle supported.

However, it is considered that the Green Belt review should be completed for the purposes of the Core Strategy in accordance with the NPPF in particularly paras 83 – 85 ie that when altering the Green Belt boundaries through the preparation or review of the Local Plan, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Local Planning authorities should also identify “safeguarded land” between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching beyond the plan period.

The methodology for the Green Belt Review in the Draft (February 2013) refers to a two stage process: Stage 1 Completion of a high level district wide Green belt review to ascertain the extent to which different parcels of land serve national Green Belt purposes. It is understood that the scope of this work was intended to inform any update of the Core Strategy and potentially the identification of broad areas for Green Belt release. Stage 2 i.e. more detailed area based studies would be undertaken if the Council determined that alterations to the Green Belt were necessary. This would then inform detailed boundary changes that may be consulted upon through the preparation of a Site Allocations Plan document (Placemaking Plan).

It is not clear whether Stage 2 has taken place and in particular what role the Arup Concept Options Reports (March 2013) have, especially as they do not refer to comprising the Stage 2 Green Belt review and are caveated to the effect that they are not Council policy and have no planning status. It is noted that the Concept Option Reports are “only assessments used to help the consideration of potential development locations. By publishing these reports the Council is not agreeing to the development layout or capacities identified within them. The Council’s planning policy relating to any locations taken forward through the Core Strategy, including the identification and allocation of specific areas of land for development, will be established through the Placemaking Plan in conjunction with the local community.”

Change to the policy requested:

It is considered that given the reliance on the release of locations from the Green Belt in order to meet the housing requirement for the plan period – that the sites should be identified in the Core Strategy in accordance with the NPPF para 47 and para 83 – 85. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.

Para 3.13 of the Proposed Changes should refer to the release of land from the Green Belt to the south west of Keynsham which should specifically be identified in Policy KE4 ie Policy KE4 should be site specific rather than be deferred to the Placemaking Plan.

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 17 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

In principle the Proposed Change to Policy KE1 1 Natural and Built Environment is supported in terms of releasing land from the Green Belt to the south west of Keynsham to accommodate housing and employment growth, but it is considered that the release of Green Belt land in the south west should be greater in order to safeguard land for the longer term and in order to be considered consistent with national policy and in order to be effective. (see representations in respect of SPC 112, 111 and 110 and 120).

Pegasus have submitted a detailed Sustainability Appraisal which included a Landscape and Visual Appraisal , Ecology Assessment, Archaeological and Heritage Appraisal, flood risk and Drainage and Traffic and Transport and Utilities along with a concept plan illustrating the layout for approximately between 900 dwellings at 30 dph to about 1,100 dwellings at 38 dph.

It is noted that the Development Concept Options Report has been produced for south of K2 ie south west Keynsham and this report concludes that a viable housing scheme could be delivered on this site. It is not clear whether this report is part of the Council's evidence base, whether it is the Stage 2 assessment of the Green Belt - it clearly has no planning status and is not Council policy and our clients do not agree with the assumptions about the level of housing provision that could be accommodated, no dialogue has taken place with our clients following the submission of the Sustainability Appraisal and SHLAA submissions.

2. Housing

Although the housing provision has increased from 1,500 to 2,100 Pegasus object to the increase as the overall housing provision is not based on a SHMA which is NPPF compliant.

Change to the policy requested:

The following wording should be added to 1. Natural and Built Environment.

"a: Maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, allowing releases of Green Belt land to the east and south west of Keynsham to accommodate employment and housing growth. The areas to be released from the Green Belt are allocated in Policies KE3 and KE4.

b: Land will be safeguarded to meet the longer term development needs at south west Keynsham or if housing delivery indicates a shortfall in provision the additional area should come forward to meet housing needs."

b: c: Make better use of the existing green and blue infrastructure (for example parks and rivers) running through and surrounding the town which will be enhanced, made more accessible and linked up.....

The housing provision to Keynsham set out in 2. Housing should be increased to reflect a revised SHMA which has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF (para 158 – 159)

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt

Respondent Organisation: Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1) RPS objects to this policy designation on the basis that the spatial strategy is flawed in the first instance and that development at Keynsham is not the next most sustainable location in B&NES behind Bath.

2) The CS establishes that this is a strategy to deliver growth at the Bath HMA. Keynsham falls within the Bristol HMA which is ignored through this CS. Whilst Keynsham is not an inherently unsustainable location in its own right, and growth here is supported, it is inconsistent with the aims of this (flawed) CS. If the needs of the Bath HMA are to be met, then it should be in the Bath HMA, not dissipated to elsewhere in the District so that difficult decisions don't have to be taken in respect of further growth at Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

1) The CS cannot be found sound on the basis of the terms of DW1. The evidence base is fundamentally flawed and NPPF compliant conclusions cannot be drawn to be in a position for solutions to find overall soundness to be contemplated. The District needs to complete SHMAs for the Bristol and Bath HMAs. Finding the plan unsound now would enable the results

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

of the Wes of England SHMA to be fully considered.

2) The locational strategy is equally flawed and as a consequence the choice of Green Belt releases is not properly justified. Development at Keynsham needs to be considered in the context of both HMAs affecting the district. Only then can reasoned decisions be taken.

Respondent Number: 4453 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Burnett Business Park Ltd

Agent ID: 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Policies KE1 and KE3 provide for Green Belt Land releases around Keynsham for both housing and employment development during the Plan period. These representations, on behalf of Burnett Business Park, are primarily concerned with the proposed alteration to the Green Belt boundary at Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate to provide 25,000-30,000 sqms of additional employment land.

There are a number of reasons why the Proposed Change to identify this as a site specific Green Belt amendment within the strategic Core Strategy through Proposed Changes 111, 112 and 119, amongst others, is considered to be unsound.

1. The proposed changes allow for a number of major encroachments into the Green Belt around Keynsham to the east and south east towards Saltford and to the west towards Bristol. The majority of these encroachments are to accommodate additional housing development and, whether the extent of such encroachment within the Bristol/Bath Green Belt can be considered sustainable within the terms of the Core Strategy, is examined in other representations. The proposed encroachment at Pixash Lane however, would reduce the extent of the Green Belt between Keynsham and Saltford to such an extent that the role and purpose of the Green Belt in terms of separating these two major settlements would be wholly compromised. It cannot be considered to be sustainable, therefore rendering the Core Strategy unsound in this respect.
2. The importance of providing further employment opportunities for the existing and large numbers of proposed new residents of Keynsham is acknowledged, particularly following the closure of the Cadbury factory. The Council does not however, appear to have considered other potential employment sites, such as Burnett Business Park, which have demonstrably had an important role to play in providing employment opportunities for the residents of Keynsham in recent years. The Business Park has a waiting list for occupiers.
3. The Core Strategy appears to anticipate limited interest in the further development of land to be allocated at Pixash Lane, questioning its deliverability in the Plan period. This lends all the more weight to considering other established employment sites in the vicinity where demand throughout the recession has been strong and sustained.
4. Burnett Business Park was designated as a Major Existing Developed Site (MEDS) in the BANES Local Plan and has taken advantage of that designation to maximise employment opportunities within the established boundary. There is a very logical extension of the Business Park to bring it to the road frontage at Gypsy Lane. It would involve an amendment to the Green Belt boundary, but this part of the Green Belt does not lie between Keynsham and Saltford and does not therefore suffer the same disadvantage in terms of narrowing that already narrow and diminishing gap between these two currently distinct settlements. Furthermore, this area of Green Belt amounting to some 2.4 hectares (5.91 acres) does not fulfil any positive Green Belt use or purpose since it is relatively inaccessible agricultural land lying between the Business Park and the road.

These Proposed Changes were made in response to comments received from the Core Strategy Inspector in document ID/28. In his main conclusions at paragraph 4, bullet 6 he referred to the "general lack of flexibility to adapt to rapid change, including being able to accommodate more business growth, if opportunities arise."

These representations have shown that, not only is proposed change unsound in relation to arguments relating to the Bath North East Somerset Council

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

sustainability of the Green Belt amendments proposed in the Core Strategy, but furthermore it shows that the proposed changes continue to fail to address this principal comment identified by the Core Strategy Inspector during the Examination.

For these reasons it is considered that the Council have been too site specific in identifying a Green Belt amendment at Pixash Lane for employment development. The Core Strategy should just identify the principle of the acceptability of Green Belt amendments to provide additional employment land where the development would be sustainably located in relation to the existing and expanded Keynsham. This would have allowed the “flexibility” sought by the previous Core Strategy Inspector and as accepted by the Council. It would also allow the most appropriate and sustainable amendment to the Green Belt to be made at the appropriate time during the life of the Core Strategy and in response to market demand.

Change to the policy requested:

All site specific references to “expansion to Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate” to be deleted where they refer to employment development.

Replace by, in all the appropriate references and sections:

“The Core Strategy provides for an amendment to the Green Belt boundary of Keynsham or to existing employment sites in the vicinity of Keynsham, where additional employment development can be sustainably located and will serve the existing and expanded population of Keynsham, to accommodate 25,000-30,000 sqms of employment land. Any Green Belt amendments required to accommodate this development will be defined in detail through a Placemaking or Neighbourhood Plan.”

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Withies Farm Landowners’ Group,

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC114

Plan Reference: Policy KE1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The spatial strategy for Keynsham is not appropriately defined having regard to its status and position within the settlement hierarchy and essential role in accommodating and delivering the development requirements of the District in a sustainable manner. As such, the Plan is unsound since it has not been positively prepared, is not properly justified, and is unlikely to be effective.

It is acknowledged in the Vision for Keynsham that the town occupies a strategically important location between Bristol and Bath, and is therefore well placed to improve and attract investment. The ambition for the town to expand and evolve as a more significant business location in response to the loss of a major employer, is also foreshadowed in the Vision.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the original spatial strategy for Keynsham sought to maintain the Green Belt boundary around Keynsham rather than engage in a positive review pursuant to delivering ambitions for the town. It is only because of the Inspector’s findings regarding the deficiencies of the original plan that the Council is now contemplating reviewing the Green Belt boundaries to allow for some development on the edge of the town. However, the strategy remains cautious and defensive, and is not conducive with maximising the potential of Keynsham or the opportunity to achieve the Vision, and to accommodate development in the most sustainable way. It also shows little regard for the ‘duty to cooperate’ and to deliver a flexible plan that can respond to necessary contingencies arising from the significant constraints at Bath, as well as potential reductions in capacity at Keynsham owing to flood and recently discovered heritage issues (Roman Settlement) at Somerdale.

The environs of Keynsham are comparatively unconstrained relative to Bath in terms of heritage and landscape quality. Flood risk affects some areas to the west and north, and Green Belt is particularly sensitive to the west owing to the proximity to the Bristol urban boundary. However, there are significant opportunities for accommodating development elsewhere, most particularly to the east of the town where landscape quality is low. Having regard to the division in Housing Market Areas identified in the SHMA, the town is well placed to accommodate requirements generated within the Bristol HMA, with its proximity to the Bath HMA rendering it an entirely suitable location for accommodating needs that

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

cannot be accommodated within the city. HMA boundaries, by their very nature, are inevitably overlapping and fluid, and Keynsham will undoubtedly already accommodate residents whose employment focus is in Bath. Its position between Bristol and Bath means that it is ideally placed to serve both cities, which both exert considerable influence over housing markets within the District. The already well developed transport links between the town and the two cities, by both buses along the A4 transport corridor and rail, means that its potential to encourage travel by alternative means than the car is very real.

The scale of growth identified in the spatial strategy seems to be driven by a bottom-up assessment of the capacity of the two urban extensions identified in the plan based on the concept plans that have been prepared, rather than a top-down assessment of an appropriate scale of growth for the town having regard to the vision for the town, its role within the District, and the limitations on achieving sustainable development at Bath.

The scale of growth should reflect the potential for Keynsham to attract high value jobs and reduce out commuting which is a key element of the Vision for the town.

Change to the policy requested:

The strategy should be amended to identify a more positive and broader role for Keynsham in accommodating the development needs of the District that acknowledges the context and role of Keynsham in terms of:

- Its relationship with housing markets focused on both Bristol and Bath.
- Its role in accommodating development that cannot be achieved sustainably at Bath.
- Its potential for attracting investment and ensuring that the provisions of the Plan are deliverable over the plan period.
- Its potential for encouraging non car-borne trips to both Bristol and Bath.
- Its comparative freedom from constraints relative to Bath.

Policy KE1 should be reviewed and changes made to give greater emphasis to growth and less to protectionism through:

- Re-ordering of the policy to identify the requirements for growth ahead of potential Green Belt constraints.
- Having regard to the potential of Keynsham to deliver sustainable development and the likely capacity constraints at Bath (for reasons set out in representations to SPC54 and SPC89), and the resultant need to allow for contingencies at Keynsham as well as flexibility to cooperate on cross-boundary requirements with Bristol, the housing provision should be increased to at least 3,000 dwellings at Keynsham. This would also provide a better balance with the level of employment land for which the Plan is making provision.
- The policy for the natural and built environment should be more positively phrased to provide for the review and adjustment of Green Belt boundaries at Keynsham to provide for development requirements within and beyond the Plan period.

Change Ref. SPC115

Plan Ref.: Diagram 12 Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 114 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Society of Merchant Venturers

Agent ID: 150 **Agent Name:** Smiths Gore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC115 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 12 Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

15. Whilst proposed change SPC115 refers to a Diagram 12 'Keynsham Spatial Strategy' which indicates where areas of land were to be released from the Green Belt, this plan was not included in the Schedule of Proposed Changes deposited by the Council, and its omission was brought to the attention of the Council within the consultation period.

Change to the policy requested:

22. Land to the south of Keynsham at Uplands was one of four study areas selected by the Council for consideration to

identify viable potential development capacity. The Land at Uplands Development Concept Options report March 2013 by ARUP comments that;

- land is well contained and could be designed to have limited impact on the wider landscape,
- it is close to an existing employment site to the south,
- the B3116 provides good access to the A4 and town centre and industrial estate to the north,
- the area is adjacent to an established residential area and as such is a complementary use with socially sustainable benefits,
- the Manor Road Community Woodland is a major Community Asset lying nearby,
- the land identified is all within Flood Zone 1,
- the land immediately south of the existing residential development would form a natural extension and could deliver in the region of 350 dwellings,
- the site is available,
- the site is in single ownership, and
- a viable housing scheme could be delivered on the site.

23. The Council's Green Belt Review Stage 1 report April 2013 evaluates a broad land parcel to the south of Keynsham including the village of Chewton Keynsham. It is commented at page 32 that, 'It is considered that the Green Belt directly to the south of Keynsham is not of importance for preventing the merger of Bristol and Keynsham'. The report identifies that the Green Belt in this location performs the role more of a countryside designation in preserving the countryside for its own sake and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

24. The only aspect on which the Uplands land does not score highly is in terms of its distance from the town centre and access to services and facilities. However, the Core Strategy Transport Assessment (February 2013) indicates that walking linkages could be improved via new pedestrian footways along Wellsway with potential for a link to Hardington Drive. In addition cycling into central Keynsham is possible within a 20 minute journey time. As regards public transport a number of services already exist along the B3116 Wellsway including the No. 178 service which could serve further development to the south at Uplands. The report further comments that in highway terms traffic increase from the development is likely to be manageable. (Transport Evaluation, Page G7).

25. There is also scope at the Uplands site to include local services and facilities as part of a development proposal. These could serve a wider area supporting the sustainability and access to services and facilities for the southern residential estates of Keynsham. The allocation of development in the Uplands area could also offer the opportunity for a primary school site. This provision could be aligned with the allocation of the East of Keynsham site which under proposed Policy KE3 bullet point I., is required to provide a primary school on site to serve a development of around 250 houses. The development of East Keynsham for 250 houses and Uplands at 250 houses could together contribute (either financially or by land provision) to a new primary school. From a sustainability perspective if a new primary school is required then a site to the south of Keynsham would be preferable in terms of spreading accessibility, rather than concentrating primary education to the north of Keynsham where Chandag Primary and Infant schools already exist close to the East of Keynsham proposed allocation. The ARUP Development Concept Options report for Uplands identifies at page 16 that there are advantageous opportunities for developing the two areas of East Keynsham and Uplands in tandem to create a more comprehensive and sustainable solution.

26. The plan at Appendix 1 shows a concept plan for potential development of land at Uplands. This provides for some 250 dwellings together with a neighbourhood centre providing local services and facilities for the development and which could serve a wider, area improving sustainability locally. The land can also provide open space and a link through to the residential development to the north as well as footways along the Wellsway fronting the site (as suggested by the ARUP Transport Evaluation). Highway infrastructure to provide access into the site could also act as a traffic calming/slowing measure into the urban area from the faster rural section of the B3116, managing the flow of traffic into the town. The site could also provide for a primary school site to further aid sustainable access to educational facilities in the southern part of Keynsham.

27. The land at Uplands is well related to the existing urban area. It would involve the rolling back of the Green Belt in an area where the Green Belt serves no strategic purpose, in an area which is well-contained visually and would have minimal impact on the landscape as acknowledged by the Land at Uplands Development Concept Options report March 2013 by ARUP and the SA/SEA Annex L.

28. The development is accessible to the large employment/industrial estate to the North and by public transport provision to the town centre. Unlike the sites at Keynsham East and the Somerdale factory site none of the land at Uplands is within Flood Zones 2 or 3.

29. The site is well contained to the south by the range of Uplands Farm buildings for which the barns have residential conversion consent. Whilst Uplands Farm House is listed development of the Uplands site would not prejudice or detract from its setting.

30. The land at Uplands, has been assessed by the Council, but has been wrongly rejected as a potential development site

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

to deliver housing for Keynsham. Its suitability for development is demonstrated above and the site is in single ownership and has the opportunity to come forward rapidly.

31. The site should be identified as an allocated housing site to provide certainty of delivery of housing at Keynsham and to provide much needed flexibility in delivery should other sites fail to come forwards as anticipated. The site should be allocated as an additional to the sites already proposed.

32. In order to make the plan sound the representation considers the following amendment to Policy KE1 should be made (as shown in italics and underlined).

At Policy KE1 part 1. a. reword as follows:-

Maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, allowing releases of Green Belt land to the east, south and south west of Keysham to accommodate employment and housing growth. Add the following new policy as follows:-

Policy KE5 Land at South Keynsham

Land at South Keynsham will be removed from the Green Belt as shown on inset map 1 in order to provide for development of around 250 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the Plan period.

Planning requirements to:

a. Provide around 250 dwellings in the plan period.

B. Be developed to a comprehensive Masterplan, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with Keynsham. Dwellings should face onto the open countryside and create an attractive boundary treatment.

C. Ensure that the principles and benefits of Green Infrastructure contained in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and other guidance and best practice are embedded in the design and development process from an early stage. Key requirements include provision of habitat connectivity; provision of well integrated green space (formal, natural and allotments); provision of cycle and pedestrian links through the site connecting to the existing network particularly towards Keynsham town centre; and provision of well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

D. Appropriate site assessment and ecological surveys to be undertaken to inform site master planning with particular attention to potential impacts to protected sites and priority species. Species rich hedgerows, ponds, ditches and trees should be retained and enhanced, and habitat suitable for priority species provided as required.

E. Identify and assess the landscape character, landscape features and significant view points and the likely effects of development on them. Protect and enhance these aspects and mitigate to avoid or minimise the effects.

F. Assess and evaluate any direct or indirect impacts on designated heritage assets and their visual/landscape settings. Prepare and implement management schemes (including avoidance or physical separation) in order to mitigate the impacts of development and ensure the long-term protection and enhancement of the designated heritage assets and their settings.

G. Assess and evaluate any impacts on non-designated heritage assets. The degree of harm to or loss of non-designated heritage assets will be balanced against the positive contribution made by the development and the extent to which harm/loss can be mitigated.

H. Ensure good public transport provision particularly towards Keynsham town centre, the railway station and other local facilities and services.

i. Development should scope potential for and incorporate renewable energy.

J. Educational needs generated by the development must be met.

K. Provide integrated waste management infrastructure.

L. New water mains and sewer site connections required, including separate systems of drainage and downstream sewer improvements to critical sewers.

There may be other consequent changes to the plan to ensure consistency.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 17 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC115 **Plan Reference:** Diagram 12 Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Proposed Change is unsound as it is not consistent with the NPPF paras 47, 83- 85. Sites which are critical to the

delivery of the housing provision should be identified.

Change to the policy requested:

Diagram 12 should be amended to identify the allocated site for land off Charlton Road, South West Keynsham.

Change Ref. SPC118

Plan Ref.: Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 16 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC118

Plan Reference: Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC118 Para 319. New housing of the SPC119, SPC120 Edge of Keynsham and site on KE3 and KE4 land adjoining South West Keynsham.

Whilst welcoming the extra housing at Keynsham to meet the needs of the housing waiting list and economic growth.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC118
SPC119
SPC120

KE3 and KE4 need clear policy on the public transport access to Keynsham and improvement to the Railway station including electrification of the London, Bath, Bristol Temple Meads Rail Service and site of a new station at Saltford between Keynsham and Saltford.

Respondent Number: 4639 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Lands Improvement

Agent ID: 156 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC118

Plan Reference: Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Overview

Lands Improvement has significant concerns in respect of the level of growth now being proposed at Keynsham and considers that there are more appropriate and sustainable locations for growth including at Whitchurch. This representation should be read in conjunction with others submitted in respect of overall housing numbers and SPC 119 (land adjoining East Keynsham) and SPC 120 (land adjoining South West Keynsham).

Deliverability

The Proposed Changes advocate that 2,100 dwellings will be provided for at Keynsham during the plan period which represents a 600 dwelling increase from previous versions of the Core Strategy. This includes allocations in the existing Local Plan, notably the K2 allocation. We believe that the level of development being proposed for the Town is excessive, will significantly harm its character and is unlikely to be delivered in the timeframes relied upon in the Core Strategy.

We are familiar with the history of the K2 allocation. This site, whilst a single local plan allocation, is effectively in two parts separated by a wooded area owned by the Woodland Trust. The eastern part of the site is controlled by Taylor Wimpey and the western part owned by the Council. Taylor Wimpey actively pursued a planning consent on their interests following its allocation in 2007. Despite its Local Plan status, planning permission was issued only recently and even then only after

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

the developers were forced to go to appeal. As a consequence, the delivery of this element of the K2 allocation, and its associated benefits, has been seriously delayed. The western part of K2 is even further behind and we note that the SHLAA now does not anticipate delivery on this element until 2015/2016. We consider that even this is likely to be optimistic.

We also note from the SHLAA that the new sites identified in the Proposed Changes (WSPC 119 and SPC120) are anticipated to bring forward completions in the period 2015/2016. Given the fact that the K2 allocation has yet to see meaningful completions over 6 years after the adoption of the Local Plan, we consider that the Core Strategy and the SHLAA is being wildly optimistic in its assumptions. This belief is further strengthened by the fact that the sites will be allocated and identified in the Placemaking Plan including its removal from the Green Belt. We provide greater detail of our concerns in our responses to SPC 119 and SPC120.

Infrastructure

The two additional sites being proposed at Keysham total approximately 450 dwellings plus other uses including up to 30,000sqm of employment land. This is in addition to the 700 dwellings identified on the Somerdale site and the existing Local Plan allocations including K2 (referred to above).

Development of this scale will place an unsustainable burden on the town's services and infrastructure. We note that this is, at least in part, acknowledged in the background papers including the SHLAA and the report to Council on 4th March including in terms of transportation issues and congestion on the A4. This will have significant impacts on existing and future residents.

Housing Market

The delivery of this number of houses within a town the size of Keynsham cannot realistically be sustained by the market. This is evidenced in the latest SHLAA which shows that the majority of development on the allocations is anticipated to come forward in the period 2015 to 2022; that is to say the sites will be effectively competing against each other for sales. These concerns are amplified by the fact that, for example, the Somerdale site and the K2 allocation are controlled by the same developer. Therefore, whilst development may ultimately and eventually be realised, this is unlikely to be within the timescales relied upon in the Core Strategy.

We also consider that this level of development at Keynsham fails to accord with the requirements of the NPPF. This includes the principle of providing a wide choice of quality homes including a range of locations

Finally, it is clearly acknowledged that Keynsham is not within the Bath Housing Market Area. The new residential allocations at the Town will not therefore be meeting the needs of Keynsham or Bath City but rather, in our view, be taken up by people working in Bristol. Other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement set out why we feel that the Core Strategy should identify a significantly increased residential requirement including to take account of the shortfall of provision in the Bristol Core Strategy. Consequently, and given the above, we firmly believe that Whitchurch offers a more sustainable and appropriate strategy for meeting this need.

Conclusions

For the reasons set out above, we consider that the Core Strategy is unsound on the basis that:

1. It is not positively prepared in that it does not seek to meet objectively assessed needs
2. It is not justified in that it does not promote the most appropriate strategy
3. It will not be effective in that it is unlikely to be deliverable as envisaged by the Council
4. It is not consistent with National Policy in the form of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas

Respondent Organisation: Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC118

Plan Reference: Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst we support the release of land from the Green Belt to meet identified housing and employment needs that will be eventually defined and allocated in the Placemaking Plan (Local Plan Part 2), we believe it is important to safeguard land to meet longer term development needs – such as a possible Saltford Bypass.

We encourage the Council to take account of all infrastructure requirements including a possible Saltford Bypass so that overall infrastructure investment generated from development through the Community Infrastructure Levy and other complementary financial incentives adds value to Keynsham and the District as a whole. Land released from the Green Belt South of the A4 should be safeguarded for future potential strategic use. The map attached to this response shows that there is definitive need for a joined-up, strategic solution that makes allowance for a future Saltford Bypass.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South East Keynsham****Respondent Number:** 4588**Comment Number:** 8**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Withies Farm

Landowners' Group,

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC118

Plan Reference: Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Amendment SPC118 is supported to the extent that it acknowledges the need to remove land from the Green Belt at Keynsham to meet additional needs for development. It is also supported to the extent that it acknowledges the need to look beyond the Plan period and consider safeguarding land to meet longer term development requirements, and commits the Place-Making Plan to doing this. For reasons set out in relation to SPC19 and SPC24, other policies and provisions of the Plan need to be amended to reflect this requirement.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4588**Comment Number:** 10**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Withies Farm

Landowners' Group,

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC118

Plan Reference: Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Amendment SPC118 is supported to the extent that it acknowledges the need to remove land from the Green Belt at Keynsham to meet additional needs for development. It is also supported to the extent that it acknowledges the need to look beyond the Plan period and consider safeguarding land to meet longer term development requirements, and commits the Place-Making Plan to doing this. For reasons set out in relation to SPC19 and SPC24, other policies and provisions of the Plan need to be amended to reflect this requirement.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 114 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Society of Merchant Venturers

Agent ID: 150 **Agent Name:** Smiths Gore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC118

Plan Reference: Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1. On behalf of the Society of Merchant Venturers, Smiths Gore Planning objects to proposed change SPC118 .
2. Section 9 of the NPPF deals with protecting the Green Belt and advises at Para 83 that 'once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.' It further comments that any review of Green Belt boundaries should have regard to their intended permanence and should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.
3. It has already been established that there are exceptional circumstances that require a review of the Green Belt boundary in this instance. The Council intends that the re-delineation of the Green Belt boundary to accommodate development will be made through the forthcoming Placemaking Local Plan for which preferred options consultation is timetabled for autumn of this year.
4. The NPPF at Section 6, Paragraph 47 requires Local Planning Authorities to support the achievement of sustainable development by significantly boosting housing supply. They should identify specific deliverable sites [Smiths Gore emphasis] to provide five years of supply of housing including an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market.
5. The Councils 5 year land supply for Keynsham relies on the identification of broad locations and therefore does not fit the NPPF requirement of being specific deliverable sites. Whilst NPPF advises broad locations can be relied upon for years 6 – 10 years, for the 5 year land supply sites identified should be specific. In addition the supply relies up on the delivery of 60 dwellings for the Fire Station and Riverside site in the period 2016/17 – 2017/18, whereas the Councils SHLAA advises that the site will not be achievable until 2018 at the earliest.
6. It is considered that the Core Strategy should provide the clarity and certainty required to provide for the delivery of housing, particularly in the first five years of the plan period. The Council has all the information it requires to make the appropriate adjustments to the Green Belt boundary in this Core Strategy Local Plan and there is no clear or obvious need to devolve this function to the part 2 Local Plan.
7. It is strongly considered that the Core Strategy should make the required Green Belt changes in this Local Plan to facilitate and to support the delivery of housing and to ensure the plan is effective and deliverable. If the Council is reliant on the Placemaking Plan to identify sites to deliver housing in the first 5 years of the Core Strategy there is an in-built delay to bringing those sites forward. The Placemaking Plan is timetabled for Adoption in summer 2015 and the sites as yet unallocated and within the Green Belt are shown as broad locations, but expected to deliver housing in the Council's housing trajectory in 2015/16. To achieve the housing trajectory the 'unallocated' sites would have to have planning permission as redline sites by 2014 whereas the hearings for the Placemaking Plan are not timetabled until early spring 2015, making any consideration or examination of options academic.
8. There is no conceivable reason why the necessary changes to the Green Belt cannot be made at this stage in the plan making process given the extent of the Council's evidence base.
9. The plan at Appendix 1 to this representation sets out a red line site boundary for allocation for development at Uplands, South Keynsham to deliver a sustainable site of 250 dwellings. The plan also shows a realigned Green Belt boundary which rolls back the Green Belt boundary to accommodate the site and safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt in order to meet longer-term development needs beyond the plan period.

Change to the policy requested:

In order to make the plan sound the representation considers the following amendment to Para 3.19A should be made:

At Para 3.19A reword as follows:- Development on the edge of Keynsham

In order to meet the need for additional development within the District during the Plan period, land needs to be removed from the Green Belt to provide for housing and employment floor space in three locations on the edge of Keynsham on the eastern, southern and south western edge of the town. The revised Green Belt Boundary for Keynsham is shown on Plan X.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

National planning policy makes it clear that when altering Green Belt boundaries consideration should be given as to whether land needs to be safeguarded to meet longer term development needs. Hence Plan X identifies safeguarded land at Keynsham removed from the Green Belt but not allocated for development in this Core Strategy.

There will be other consequent changes to Policy KE3 and KE4 by the deletion of the words 'by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the key diagram' in each policy and in relation to polices for Bath.

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC118 **Plan Reference:** Para 3.19A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

This proposed change is not justified by, nor is the prospect of this reflected in the introduction to, the Ove Arup's Stage One Green Belt Review. This Review only foreshadows a second stage that "will focus on the specific areas of land where Green Belt releases or additions are proposed, providing recommendations on detailed boundary changes."

The NPPF is unequivocal that LPAs should "satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period". This fundamental flaw to such a crucial element of the Plan is reinforced by what appears more of an after thought at SPC172: and proposed new para 6.63A i.e. that: "the issue of safeguarding land will be considered in the Placemaking Plan". This is a clear admission of there being an anticipated risk of ad hoc alterations being required during and

beyond the Core Strategy period; the very risk that Ove Arup indicated should be limited and we say should be avoided if at all possible through judicious identification now of safeguarded land. The Council's approach risks undermining confidence in Green Belt as a strategic long term planning tool.

There is simply no support whatsoever in the NPPF for relegating/postponing the consideration of safeguarded land, which is a long-term issue of strategic importance, to a subsequent DPD.

Change to the policy requested:

That the Council identifies sufficient safeguarded land in order to meet long-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period in accordance with Paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 18 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC118 **Plan Reference:** Para 3.19A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Pegasus supports the Proposed Changes to para 3.19A, but objects to the Placemaking Plan which will identify and allocate sites for development and will define the revised detailed Green Belt boundary. In order for the plan to be sound the sites should be allocated in the Core Strategy. (see reps 110,111,112, 114,115).

It should be noted that in Inspectors Report 2006 – land a SW Keysham was included in his recommendations having been included in the original deposit and removed at the revised deposit stage. Inspectors Report 2006 for the adopted Local Plan ref 5.121 – 5.121–stated that development east, west, or north west of Keynsham would contribute to coalescence of settlements, whereas development to the south would not undermine the separate identity of the town.

Change to the policy requested:

The paragraph should be read as follows:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

"In order to meet the need for additional development within the District during the Plan period, land needs to be removed from the Green Belt to provide for housing and employment floor space in two locations on the edge of Keynsham on the eastern and south western edge of the town. The Placemaking Plan will identify and allocate the sites for development and will define the revised detailed Green Belt boundary. areas to be released from the Green Belt are allocated in Policies KE3 and KE4.

National planning policy makes it clear that when altering Green Belt boundaries consideration should be given as to whether land needs to be safeguarded to meet longer term development needs. The Placemaking Plan will consider whether there is any scope to identify safeguarded land at Keynsham. Policies KE3 and KE4 outline the planning requirements for each of these locations which need to inform identification and allocation of the sites in the Placemaking Plan and delivery of the sites through a planning application. Land will be safeguarded to meet the longer term development needs at south west Keynsham or if housing delivery indicates a shortfall in provision the additional area should come forward to meet housing needs."

Change Ref. SPC119**Plan Ref.: Policy KE3****Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Respondent Number:** 93**Comment Number:** 9**Respondent Name:** Mrs Jacqui Ashman**Respondent Organisation:** Highways Agency**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119**Plan Reference:** Policy KE3**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions . These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements .

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Residential and Employment Extension to East Keynsham

In principle the Agency does not have any objection to residential and employment development forming an extension to East Keynsham as we recognise the potential economic benefits of such development. We note that the Council acknowledges that there are transport concerns relating to development in this location and that only a moderate level of development can be accommodated before substantial infrastructure upgrading is required. It is therefore imperative that the transport impacts are robustly assessed in order to understand what the network can accommodate before these infrastructure upgrades are required. The Agency would appreciate early involvement at the Masterplanning stage to assist in ensuring a satisfactory infrastructure support for development.

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 106 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Policy KE3: delete or edit criteria under “Planning Requirements”

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 106 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Other representations have been made by Pro Planning in relation to Proposed Changes to policies for housing and employment development in the Rural Areas and Somer Valley.

These representations raise concerns about the proposed number and extent of potential encroachments into the inner Green Belt boundary for Keynsham to accommodate housing and economic development within the period of the Core Strategy. The concerns arise for a number of reasons, as follows.

- 1.The Proposed Changes make provision for a large number of separate intrusions into the Green Belt with apparently, limited subsequent policy control to restrict the actual number or extent of encroachments to be allowed during this period. It is accepted that the detail boundary should be prepared though the Placemaking Plan, but the Proposed Changes appear to enable all of these encroachments to be made without the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Such erosion of this part of the Bristol/Bath Green Belt would seriously undermine its function.

- 2.Following from this point, the Green Belt is already under its severest pressure in the corridor between Bristol and Bath and particularly between Bristol at Whitchurch and Keynsham and between Keynsham and Saltford. Even where Green Belt land remains, the pressures upon it are in danger of undermining its ability to serve a meaningful Green Belt function. The

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

provision in the Core Strategy to allow further development in BANES at Whitchurch and on sites to the west, south and east of Keynsham cannot be considered to result in balanced or sustainable development in relation to BANES as a whole. 3.By contrast, the reduction in proposed housing and jobs at Midsomer Norton in the Somer Valley is not considered to be justified as other representations have shown. Furthermore, the growth at Somer Valley can be accommodated on land not within Green Belt, which enhances its sustainability credentials and where further growth and development should be encouraged and facilitated in preference to such extensive erosion of the Green Belt at Keynsham.

4.Keynsham and Norton Radstock are acknowledged to be major urban areas within BANES and, whilst Keynsham has the benefit of the railway line and easier access to the motorway, Somer Valley is better located to provide cheaper market housing and therefore greater choice, as well as a range of potential employment opportunities, thus delivering a better and more sustainable balance of major development sites across the district.

Change to the policy requested:

Re-evaluate the sites where the Core Strategy proposes to allow incursions into the Green Belt in the vicinity of Bristol and Keynsham and reduce the number to ensure longevity and validity of the remaining Green Belt between the settlements of Bristol, Keynsham and Saltford.

Revisit the potential for additional housing and employment in the Somer Valley to achieve a better balance of strategic housing employment development across the district.

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas

Respondent Organisation: Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support the need to release land from the Green Belt in East Keynsham, especially those development sites that provide a mix of employment floor space and housing. We believe that East Keynsham is an ideal location for mixed use sustainable development opportunities that meet identified housing and employment needs. We agree that "The new detailed boundary will be established through the Placemaking Plan." And that "The detailed inner and outer boundaries of the Green Belt will also be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan in order to address minor anomalies or other necessary adjustments." We believe that this review should also ensure that land being considered for release from the Green Belt is correctly classified using appropriate and up to date information.

We disagree with the Agricultural Land Classification adopted by B&NES from the Arup and Environ reports that were additionally commissioned for this consultation on the Schedule of Changes. Both Arup and Environ advised B&NES that land North of the railway line in East Keynsham was Grade 2 (Arup) and Class 2 (Environ), which are both incorrect. Land North of the railway line is mostly Grade 3b with some minor areas Grade 3a which are mostly in the flood plain (land in the flood plain at Avon Valley Farm has Recreational Use land use classification). Both Julie Holloway (Land Use Strategy & Environmental Specialist Unit at Natural England) and Sukhy Toora (Magic Support Unit, Defra) have corroborated this fact that a field survey in 1997 using the post-1988 Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Agricultural Land Classification procedure to classify land.

Most land North of the railway line is ALC Grade 3b, exactly the same classification of land being considered South of the railway line and A4. Please see the attached email and map provided by Natural England or use the Magic website at: <http://magic.defra.gov.uk/website/magic/viewer.htm?startTopic=maglandscape&chosenLayers=&activelayer=gazIndex&qz oom=OBJECTID%3d71657>

Change to the policy requested:

We request that B&NES ignore the classifications provided by Arup and Environ and adopt those of Defra, Natural England and use of the free Magic website so that land North of the railway line is given the relevant standing to that of land South of the railway line during the Placemaking Plan process.

We request that B&NES ignore the classifications provided by Arup and Environ and adopt those of Defra, Natural England and our use of the free Magic website so that land North of the railway line is given the relevant standing to that of land South of the railway line.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 233 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas**Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support the need to release land from the Green Belt in East Keynsham to build a minimum of 250 dwellings and 25,000 – 30,000 m2 employment floor space in 2011-2029, especially development sites that provide a mix of housing and employment floor space to mitigate the mismatch of resident workforce and available jobs. We believe that any mixed use sustainable development like that proposed by our project, must clearly account for local jobs alongside housing need. It should ideally include live/work opportunities and food production for households in allotments and/or market gardens. Our project plan includes a marina and associated boat and boating services, a water ecology park to diversify rural income to the farm and an early learning aquatic centre to increase the number of visitors and schools to the area. This will provide a definite increase in a diverse range of affordable and private housing, jobs and skills for local people and provide educational attainment for all.

Our proposals include an additional 8 full time (FT) park jobs, 30 FT craft and retail unit jobs, 30 FT live/work jobs, 30+ FT micro business jobs, 14 FT marina and boatyard jobs and 2 FT education jobs, in addition to around 25+ part time / summer vacation jobs in peak seasons.

Change to the policy requested:

None.

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas**Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support the whole of Policy KE3 and the need to remove land from the Green Belt in East Keynsham by the Placemaking Plan, especially the mix of planning requirements expected of development sites that contribute to meeting affordable and private housing need, employment opportunities and associated infrastructure. We believe that any mixed use sustainable development like that proposed by our project, must clearly account for local jobs alongside housing need. It should ideally include live/work opportunities and food production for households in allotments and/or market gardens. Our project plan includes a marina and associated boat and boating services, a water ecology park to diversify rural income to the farm and an early learning aquatic centre to increase the number of visitors (from 90,000 to 200,000 per annum) and school visits (from 126 to 170 per annum) to the site.

This will also provide a definite increase in a diverse range of affordable and private housing, jobs and skills for local people and provide educational attainment for all. Our proposals include an additional 8 full time (FT) park jobs, 30 FT craft and retail unit jobs, 30 FT live/work jobs, 30+ FT micro business jobs, 14 FT marina and boatyard jobs and 2 FT education jobs, in addition to around 25+ part time / summer vacation jobs in peak seasons.

Change to the policy requested:

None.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 279 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr Rohan Torkildsen **Respondent Organisation:** English Heritage

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC119 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

East Keynsham, Land adjoining South West Keynsham, Land at Whitchurch Again, there appears no specific assessment available that sets out the significance of heritage assets affected, including their settings, to demonstrate where development would be inappropriate. For example what contribution does the setting of the Lyons Court Farm (Grade II*) make to its significance? How does this significance affect the capacity of the site? Can that significance be conserved? It may well be that such evidence has been gathered but not made available.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 3107 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Anthony Orley **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC119 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

THE PROPOSED SPC119 CHANGE TO THE BANES CORE STRATEGY PLAN DRAFT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF GREEN BELT LAND AT KEYNSHAM EAST IS NOT A SOUND PROPOSAL.

The Council has failed to recognise that its envisaged SPC119 developments will introduce detrimental and irreversible consequences which will have a very serious impact on existing critical road infrastructure and a disastrous impact on irreplaceable wild life habitat on the South side of the A4.

The Council has based its evaluation of road infrastructure impact on the SPC119 supporting document 'BANES COUNCIL CORE STRATEGY TRANSPORT EVALUATION REPORT/037/13 ISSUE FEBRUARY 2013 (ISSUE 1.2).DOCX – APPENDIX E: LAND ADJOINING EAST KEYNSHAM EVALUATION. This document is unsound because in its quest to support the SPC119 proposal it ignores its own factual evidence by using reasoning, presumptions and mitigation which is based on wishful thinking rather than hard fact and sound reasoning. These factors do not stand up to logical scrutiny or realism.

The attached ANNEX A; ANNEX B; ANNEX C to this response provides the case to support the above statements.

Change to the policy requested:

It is appreciated Banes Council has to provide additional housing and other development within the Core Strategy Plan to satisfy the Government Planning Inspector. However any proposals to meet this objective must be balanced against the impact on existing infrastructure and environment. For reasons given in the above response section 7 the SPC119 proposal should be reconsidered and amended to take account of the following:

1. ALL EXISTING GREEN BELT LAND ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE A4 SHOULD REMAIN GREEN BELT. The SPC119 proposal should not apply to this land. The reasons are:

1.1. ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE IMPACT: To avoid serious impact and congestion on the critical A4 arterial road and on other local roads into Keynsham and Saltford. As recognised in the Banes Transport Evaluation Report Appendix E this stretch of A4 road between Keynsham East and Saltford is constrained and there is no scope for capacity improvement within the existing corridor. The SPC119 proposal just ignores this in its quest to find a plot of land to build houses on. It also ignores

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

the Transport Evaluation Report that road systems into Saltford and Keynsham to the North of any development on the South side of the A4 are basically inadequate and constrained AND traffic light controlled junctions onto the A4 from the proposed new development will be required. The latter would be disastrous for A4 traffic flow which already comes to a standstill during peak periods. This is the worst place on the A4 between Brislington and Bath to introduce new development because of its magnified impact on A4 traffic flow.

See attached ANNEX A, ANNEX B, ANNEX C to this response for the detail supporting this case.

Continued on next page

1.2. ENVIRONMENT AND WILDLIFE IMPACT: To protect an irreplaceable pesticide free traditional British pasture land of historic hedged fields which supports a vibrant and sustainable ecology for wildlife. Birds, bees, butterflies and bats thrive here and it helps support wildlife from the relatively new but maturing Manor Road Community Forest which borders these fields to the South.

See attached ANNEX A to this response for the detail supporting this case.

2. RECONSIDER SPC119 PROPOSALS ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE A4. The reasons are:

2.1. Reduce the intended 30000m2 of industrial development to a more manageable level so that it can be contained as a modest extension to the existing Ashmead Road Industrial site. This will be in keeping with the under usage of industrial units on the existing site where units are currently available for sale or let. There are currently thousands of square metres of vacant industrial unit capacity within a five mile radius of this site. Reducing the volume of new industrial unit development at the Ashmead Road Industrial site would also probably be commercially sensible to avoid over capacity on the market for such units. It would also make the unacceptable new traffic light controlled junctions on the A4 as proposed by Banes in the traffic evaluation report unnecessary. Having new traffic light junctions holding up the congested A4 traffic flow in this narrow constrained section of the A4 would be a disaster. Be a bit more adventurous there are other developments besides industrial units which can provide employment. See the suggestion below.

See attached ANNEX A, ANNEX B, ANNEX C to this response for the detail supporting this case.

2.2. It is assumed the Banes Council is satisfied the green belt land on the north side of the existing east/west railway line is flood free land. If this is so then consideration should be given to building the new housing development on the green belt land on the north side of the existing railway line. Leave land available along the River Avon corridor to allow for sympathetic river leisure development e.g. Marina complex with leisure facilities and other leisure development and river leisure support services which would complement the existing Country Park. This area could become a pleasant place to live and work and is more in keeping with what Banes Council are trying to achieve in their SPC119 proposal. As SPC119 already acknowledges the existing access points under and over the railway line will need to be improved. Increased traffic flow due to the leisure facilities (unlike industrial units) will by their very nature not impinge on A4 peak traffic periods. It will be more evening and week end traffic which the A4 can absorb. No new junctions onto the critical A4 will be necessary. See the attached ANNEX A to this response for the detail supporting this case.

Respondent Number: 4633 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Ms Louise Worlock

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: 155 **Agent Name:** Aspect360 Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We submit comments on behalf of the owners of land to the south of the A4 at Saltford.

Firstly we would comment that this process is fundamentally unsound. The Council is rushing through major proposals for extension to urban areas in the Green belt without adequate consultation with local residents. The Councils Members have agreed to put forward significant allocations on 5 sites before carrying out consultation with residents. These decisions have been taken before feedback has been received. This directly conflicts with the advice in the NPPF which requires that plans

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

“be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency;”

This process has been rushed through to prevent a more comprehensive process departure from previous established principles we would advocate that this process is fundamentally unfair and flawed.

In terms of commenting on the specific changes proposed, policy KE3 should be moderated. The scale of development to the east of Keynesham is excessive and will be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and the character of Keynesham which will be engulfed by urban extensions. Modest development would be better located elsewhere within the district where infilling is possible. No development should take place to north of the Great Western Railway.

The BANES Green Belt Review identifies that the development of all of these areas for urban extension would prejudice the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. We do not disagree with this summary but would contend that the approach of only providing the large urban extensions proposed would be more harmful to the character of the countryside and the openness of the Green Belt than the development of smaller parcels of land which adjoin and infill the fringe areas of towns and villages which would enable urban areas to be contained but the critical mass of residential units to be achieved.

In particular development to the east and south-west of Keynesham would result in a much larger urban area that would threaten the very character of the settlement and cause substantial urban sprawl. This proposed area of extension should be reduced with some development allocated on the land to the north-west of Saltford as shown on the attached plan.

The proposal to extend the urban area of Keynesham to the east should be reconsidered for the following reasons:-

- The extension into the land to the north of the railway line would extend the urban area into the Avon Valley which is largely undeveloped save for a sewage works, waste treatment site, farms and the Avon Valley Country Park.
- This proposed urban extension is a poorly conceived concept because it will extend development beyond the Great Western railway line which is a successful barrier to development into the area and has safeguarded the countryside.
- Any development in Keynesham should be restricted to the south of the railway line which is a major physical barrier that would threaten the success of any urban extension in communication and viability terms.
- Any development to the north of the railway line would be reliant upon vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists circulating via Saltford to the east or via Keynesham to the west (each adding an extra mile to any journey) or would be reliant upon new bridges constructed over the railway line. Connections between the new urban area and the existing settlement would be very poor as a result.
- The requirement to provide a bridge over the railway makes development in this location unviable and delivery unrealistic.
- Land to the north of the railway line is in the Green Belt and the majority of the land is in Flood Zone 2 and 3. There is no suggestion that climate change has been accounted for in the extent of the flood zone.
- Extending land to the north of the railway line will open the floodgates to further development to the north of Keynesham where at present there is no development for this reason.
- The town of Keynesham with two major urban extensions proposed will be disproportionately extended becoming effectively a third major urban area between Bristol and Bath – resulting in a Bristol/Bath conurbation.

A smaller amount of development would be more appropriately located in other urban areas including the settlements of the Somer Valley and the other major settlements in the Green Belt including the area to the west of Saltford.

Change to the policy requested:

As above. Clause 4 should be altered to include land to the north-west of Saltford as shown on the attached document (appendix 1).

Respondent Number: 4639 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Lands Improvement

Agent ID: 156 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Overview

Lands Improvement has significant concerns in respect of the level of growth now being proposed at Keynsham and considers that there are more appropriate and sustainable locations for growth including at Whitchurch. This representation should be read in conjunction with others submitted in respect of overall housing numbers and SPC 120 (land adjoining South West Keynsham).

Deliverability

The Proposed Changes advocate that 2,100 dwellings will be provided for at Keynsham during the plan period which represents a 600 dwelling increase from previous versions of the Core Strategy. This includes allocations in the existing Local Plan, notably the K2 allocation. We believe that the level of development being proposed for the Town is not proportionate, will significantly harm its character and is unlikely to be delivered in the timeframes relied upon in the Core Strategy.

We also note from the SHLAA that the new sites identified in the Proposed Changes (WSPC 119 and SPC120) are anticipated to bring forward completions in the period 2015/2016. Given the fact that the K2 allocation has yet to see meaningful completions over 6 years after the adoption of the Local Plan, we consider that the Core Strategy and the SHLAA is being wildly optimistic in its assumptions on the new allocations.

This belief is further strengthened by the fact that the sites will be allocated and identified in the Placemaking Plan including its removal from the Green Belt which is now significantly behind schedule not least because of the resource implications of resolving the on-going issues with the Core Strategy and the priority given to the former MoD sites in Bath. Whilst an updated Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) is anticipated shortly, the latest published version anticipates an Issues and Options consultation in the Autumn of 2012 but, given the continuing delays to the Core Strategy and the fundamental concerns on its soundness, we consider this to be unrealistic. Likewise, the complexity of the Placemaking Plan, which will include a detailed Green Belt review, means that its preparation will be time consuming and subject to much debate.

The text to proposed policy KE3 makes clear the level of issues that the Placemaking Plan will need to resolve in respect of this site. Lands Improvement considers that many of the issues raised in criteria (a) to (p) of the policy, including in respect of landscape and heritage, are fundamental to both the suitability of the site and the level of development that may ultimately be delivered on it. In addition, a comprehensive masterplan is required and, of course, a planning application(s) need to be prepared and approved by the LPA.

Given these facts, the SHLAA's suggestion that first completions on the East Keynsham site will occur in 2015/2016 are highly questionable. In addition, the Core Strategy's approach means that should this (or any other site) be delayed, there is no flexibility for the shortfall in supply to be made up elsewhere. Again, this confirms the need for an increased housing requirement including the recognition of the capacity that exists at Whitchurch.

Infrastructure

The two additional sites being proposed at Keynsham total approximately 450 dwellings plus other uses including up to 30,000sqm of employment land. This is in addition to the 700 dwellings identified on the Somerdale site and the existing Local Plan allocations including K2 (referred to above).

We consider that this is a disproportionate increase in development for the Town which is likely to place an unsustainable burden on its services and infrastructure. We note that this is, at least in part, acknowledged in the background papers including the SHLAA and the report to Council on 4th March including in terms of transportation issues and congestion on the A4. This will have significant impacts on existing and future residents.

Housing Market

The delivery of this number of houses within a town the size of Keynsham cannot be sustained by the market. This is evidenced in the latest SHLAA which shows that the majority of development on the allocations is anticipated to come forward in the period 2015 to 2022; that is to say the sites will be effectively competing against each other for sales. These

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

concerns are amplified by the fact that, for example, the Somerdale site and the K2 allocation are controlled by the same developer. Therefore, whilst development may ultimately and eventually be realised, this is unlikely to be within the timescales relied upon in the Core Strategy.

We also consider that this level of development at Keynsham fails to accord with the requirements of the NPPF. This includes the principle of providing a wide choice of quality homes including a range of locations

Finally, it is clearly acknowledged that Keynsham is not within the Bath Housing Market Area. The new residential allocations at the Town will not therefore be meeting the needs of Keynsham or Bath City but rather, in our view, be taken up by people working in Bristol. Other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement set out why we feel that the Core Strategy should identify a significantly increased residential requirement including to take account of the shortfall of provision in the Bristol Core Strategy. Consequently, and given the above, we firmly believe that Whitchurch offers a more sustainable and appropriate strategy for meeting this need.

Conclusions

For the reasons set out above, we consider that the Core Strategy is unsound on the basis that:

1. It is not positively prepared in that it does not seek to meet objectively assessed needs
2. It is not justified in that it does not promote the most appropriate strategy
3. It will not be effective in that it is unlikely to be deliverable as envisaged by the Council
4. It is not consistent with National Policy in the form of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Consequential changes as set out in other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement including:

- An increase in the quantum of residential development proposed to approximately 21,000 dwellings;
- The identification of additional development at Whitchurch, South East Bristol for approximately 3,500 dwellings, the potential for which is recognised in the SHLAA and the details of which will be confirmed through the Placemaking Plan.

Respondent Number: 4715 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Nick Ollis

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: 170 **Agent Name:** BBA Architects Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We regard the Core Strategy (including the proposed changes) as legally compliant and that the strategy has been positively prepared, clearly justified, effective and consistent with national policy. It is, therefore, sound.

For my clients, we are supporting the proposed changes, allocating the land east of Keynsham for both residential and commercial development.

Land east of Keynsham represents an excellent opportunity to provide for the further development needs of Keynsham. It is physically well related to the built area of the town and has the opportunity to reinforce sustainable transport links with the town centre and existing residential/employment areas. In releasing the land from the Green Belt, there is an excellent opportunity to improve the landscape setting of the east edge of the town, and to visually reinforce the open space between Keynsham and Saltford.

The allocation provides both houses and employment contributing to the self-contained characteristics of the town. The proposed changes are supported

Change to the policy requested:

No change

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 281 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy**Respondent Organisation:** Natural England**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Development on the edge of Keynsham

The Plan proposes two areas of greenfield land for development, located to the east of Keynsham and to the south west of Keynsham. We are content that the site selection process has been robust and that the justification for the preferred options appears reasonable. Furthermore, we are generally satisfied that the landscape and ecological sensitivities of the preferred sites have been identified and that effects on these from proposed development could be adequately mitigated if provided in accordance with relevant Plan policies.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: No comment on Development Locations****Respondent Number:** 248 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt**Respondent Organisation:** Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd**Agent ID:** 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- 1) RPS objects to this policy designation on the basis that the spatial strategy is flawed in the first instance and the contention that development at Keynsham is the next most sustainable location behind Bath.
- 2) The application of the Green Belt review in this particular location is flawed. In respect of the gap between Keynsham and Bristol the review concludes that the GB is of fundamental importance in preventing the unrestricted sprawl of Bristol and reflects on the original intention to prevent the merger of Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath. RPS does not accept that the carefully planned mixed use urban extension at Hicks Gate should be regarded as 'sprawl', a term as outdated as the Green Belt itself. The Review fails to properly assess the Hicks Gate area based on the extent of development proposed, rather a much wider area that is inevitably going to have greater impact on GB purposes.
- 3) The review goes onto justify development east of Keynsham as acceptable on the basis that Saltford is a village so in effect 'doesn't count'. The justification that the Green Belt gap between Keynsham and Bath is still greater than between Keynsham and Bristol is nonsensical. Apparently Saltford is provided no protection on the basis that it is a village, despite the fact that its protection from coalescence was one of the founding principles of the Bristol/Bath Green Belt. If this crude assessment that 'only towns count' were taken as literally as the Council suggests, then the coalescence of the 'cities' of Bristol and Bath is equally irrelevant, and the only settlement that 'counts' in the consideration of the Green Belt is the 'town' of Keynsham.
- 4) The messages in the evidence base are confused. The Annex to the 4 March Full Council meeting refers to 'extensive community forest planting could provide a good setting for new development.' Nevertheless the draft policy refers to development fronting onto open countryside. There is no question that this allocation will fundamentally compromise the GB in this location given the lack of any permanent boundaries to prevent further encroachment; the fact that the placemaking plan is looking to safeguard further land in this location ahead of looking at more reasonable alternatives only exacerbates the issue.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Deletion of policy KE3 in favour of more sustainable alternatives.

Respondent Number: 2671 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Reg Williams**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The level of pollution in Saltford from excessive vehicles on the A4 is already above permitted levels and the times for buses to get through Saltford at peak times is also a problem. Neither of these appear to of been addressed in the Core Strategy. As existing problems, they can only get worse with the substantial increase in housing on the A4 corridor.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4453 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Burnett Business Park Ltd**Agent ID:** 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policies KE1 and KE3 provide for Green Belt Land releases around Keynsham for both housing and employment development during the Plan period. These representations, on behalf of Burnett Business Park, are primarily concerned with the proposed alteration to the Green Belt boundary at Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate to provide 25,000-30,000 sqms of additional employment land.

There are a number of reasons why the Proposed Change to identify this as a site specific Green Belt amendment within the strategic Core Strategy through Proposed Changes 111, 112 and 119, amongst others, is considered to be unsound.

1. The proposed changes allow for a number of major encroachments into the Green Belt around Keynsham to the east and south east towards Saltford and to the west towards Bristol. The majority of these encroachments are to accommodate additional housing development and, whether the extent of such encroachment within the Bristol/Bath Green Belt can be considered sustainable within the terms of the Core Strategy, is examined in other representations. The proposed encroachment at Pixash Lane however, would reduce the extent of the Green Belt between Keynsham and Saltford to such an extent that the role and purpose of the Green Belt in terms of separating these two major settlements would be wholly compromised. It cannot be considered to be sustainable, therefore rendering the Core Strategy unsound in this respect.
2. The importance of providing further employment opportunities for the existing and large numbers of proposed new residents of Keynsham is acknowledged, particularly following the closure of the Cadbury factory. The Council does not however, appear to have considered other potential employment sites, such as Burnett Business Park, which have demonstrably had an important role to play in providing employment opportunities for the residents of Keynsham in recent years. The Business Park has a waiting list for occupiers.
3. The Core Strategy appears to anticipate limited interest in the further development of land to be allocated at Pixash Lane, questioning its deliverability in the Plan period. This lends all the more weight to considering other established

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

employment sites in the vicinity where demand throughout the recession has been strong and sustained.

4. Burnett Business Park was designated as a Major Existing Developed Site (MEDS) in the BANES Local Plan and has taken advantage of that designation to maximise employment opportunities within the established boundary. There is a very logical extension of the Business Park to bring it to the road frontage at Gypsy Lane. It would involve an amendment to the Green Belt boundary, but this part of the Green Belt does not lie between Keynsham and Saltford and does not therefore suffer the same disadvantage in terms of narrowing that already narrow and diminishing gap between these two currently distinct settlements. Furthermore, this area of Green Belt amounting to some 2.4 hectares (5.91 acres) does not fulfil any positive Green Belt use or purpose since it is relatively inaccessible agricultural land lying between the Business Park and the road.

These Proposed Changes were made in response to comments received from the Core Strategy Inspector in document ID/28. In his main conclusions at paragraph 4, bullet 6 he referred to the “general lack of flexibility to adapt to rapid change, including being able to accommodate more business growth, if opportunities arise.”

These representations have shown that, not only is proposed change unsound in relation to arguments relating to the sustainability of the Green Belt amendments proposed in the Core Strategy, but furthermore it shows that the proposed changes continue to fail to address this principal comment identified by the Core Strategy Inspector during the Examination.

For these reasons it is considered that the Council have been too site specific in identifying a Green Belt amendment at Pixash Lane for employment development. The Core Strategy should just identify the principle of the acceptability of Green Belt amendments to provide additional employment land where the development would be sustainably located in relation to the existing and expanded Keynsham. This would have allowed the “flexibility” sought by the previous Core Strategy Inspector and as accepted by the Council. It would also allow the most appropriate and sustainable amendment to the Green Belt to be made at the appropriate time during the life of the Core Strategy and in response to market demand.

Change to the policy requested:

All site specific references to “expansion to Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate” to be deleted where they refer to employment development.

Replace by, in all the appropriate references and sections:

“The Core Strategy provides for an amendment to the Green Belt boundary of Keynsham or to existing employment sites in the vicinity of Keynsham, where additional employment development can be sustainably located and will serve the existing and expanded population of Keynsham, to accommodate 25,000-30,000 sqms of employment land. Any Green Belt amendments required to accommodate this development will be defined in detail through a Placemaking or Neighbourhood Plan.”

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Withies Farm Landowners' Group,

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC119

Plan Reference: Policy KE3

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Amendment SPC119 is supported to the extent that it acknowledges land east of Keynsham to be a sustainable location for development and commits the Place-Making Plan to removing land from the Green Belt to allow for development in this location. The attachments to this document corroborate that the identification of land east of Keynsham as a sustainable development location, and its removal from the Green Belt accordingly, is sound. Moreover, to do so would be ‘effective’ since there is an agreement in place with an intending developer, the land is available for development, and development in this location is deliverable during the Plan period.

However, SPC119 has two predominant weaknesses. First, it leaves uncertain regarding the area of search within which

development may be contemplated by the Place-Making Plan east of Keynsham. Second, it is too prescriptive, and indeed restrictive, of the scale of development in this location, which does not seem to be justified based on proportionate evidence.

With regard to the area of search, the study area boundary contemplated in the Development Concept Options Report was confined to the area to the west of the gas pipeline, and extends to include land north of the Railway. There is little justification given for the definition of the study area, other than a reference back to individual components of the evidence base, such as the SHLAA and Green Belt review. However, neither are policy documents and in order to be sound, the provisions of the plan must, inter alia, be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence (NPPF, para. 182). Although alternative development scenarios are contemplated within the Concept Options Report, the consideration of options has not been undertaken at an appropriate strategic level, and would be better suited to informing the detailed development option selection in the future Place-Making Plan. There is an absence of consideration of reasonable alternative development scenarios based on proportionate evidence. That evidence would include the sensitivities of the Green Belt having regard to the findings of the Green Belt study, which would be one factor to be balanced against the wider sustainable development considerations.

Taking an overview at a strategic level, for reasons set out in representations to the SHLAA it is not considered that the land between Keynsham and Saltford is of fundamental importance in Green Belt terms having regard to the purposes of the Bristol-Bath designation. Were this to be the case, the Council would not be contemplating the release of land in this location, which indicates that there are wider sustainability considerations that should prevail. Having accepted that east of Keynsham is an appropriate direction for growth, for reasons also set out in representations to the SHLAA it is considered that a comprehensive approach to releasing land for development in the gap between the two settlements could positively enhance the objectives for land in the Green Belt.

There is a fundamental weakness in the approach undertaken by the Council in that, having identified a suitable growth direction, it then unjustifiably pre-selects a development scenario based on preliminary and high-level judgements made in the SHLAA without a proportionate evidence base. That is an inappropriate approach and should not be permitted to pre-judge decisions about development allocations and re-defining Green Belt boundaries that are properly made through more detailed and robust consideration in the Place-Making Plan.

The attached Concept Plan puts forward an alternative development scenario that is considered to be a more sustainable and deliverable option than the concept advanced by the Council. In particular:

- It deals with the entire gap between Keynsham and Saltford and provides a robust long-term solution that is capable of delivering the Green Infrastructure Spine and enhance the perception of separateness between the two settlements that are not at risk of coalescence owing to the physical constraint of the gas infrastructure.
- It will deal effectively and efficiently with residual land to the west of Saltford that will otherwise become dysfunctional and subject to urban encroachment (the whole area is already showing signs of such and in low-key agricultural use).
- It will provide an outward face to the urban edge of Saltford as well as Keynsham and facilitate new connectivity between the two settlements.
- It will enable a more comprehensive approach to the provision and delivery of green and other necessary infrastructure.
- It will achieve better integration with adjacent urban areas – land to the north of the railway is isolated.
- It is more likely to be deliverable – no new/ widened railway crossings are required and it has good accessibility / visibility from the principal transport corridor.
- Overall, it will deliver the vision for Keynsham set out in the emerging Plan.

Preliminary assessments have been undertaken relating to Landscape, Ecology, Flood Risk and Transportation, and the conclusions are summarised below:

- **Landscape:** based on a combination of desk study and site survey, the preliminary conclusions are that there are no overriding constraints in landscape terms. A key conclusion is that new development should focus on areas of land with substantial and strong relationships with existing urban areas, and avoid extending development into areas with a stronger link to the open landscape, especially that relating to the landscape of the River Avon. In this respect, the railway line is considered to provide a suitable and appropriate boundary.
- **Ecology:** a desk study and Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey have been undertaken. The site exhibits a range of habitats typical of agricultural land, woodland, hedgerows and wetlands in the urban fringe. The proposals are considered to be capable of accommodating any required habitat compensation, mitigation and creation to provide an overall enhancement

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

in biodiversity.

- **Flood Risk:** a preliminary Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken, the conclusions from which are that the flood risk ratings for the majority of the site are low or negligible. This means that there is no significant flood risk to the site in its current use, or associated with its development, as proposed. The inclusion of a sustainable strategy for surface water drainage is anticipated, in order to offset the potential increase in surface water runoff rates resulting from a change in land use.
- **Transportation:** the transportation evaluation undertaken by Arup for the Council clearly demonstrates that, from a transportation perspective, the East Keynsham site is the best site at Keynsham with excellent bus services along the A4 providing opportunities for bus use to be a significant travel mode to and from the site. The adjacent employment uses (existing and proposed) also provide opportunities for the containment of trips. The transport evaluation also demonstrates that a development of 500 dwellings, 25,000 square metres of employment uses and a new primary school at East Keynsham would not cause unacceptable conditions on the local highway network, subject to some potential mitigation at existing mini roundabout junctions on the route to Keynsham town centre. Work is continuing to investigate the implications of a greater quantum of development at East Keynsham.

The second issue is that the quantum of development is considered to be insufficiently justified and is not based on proportionate evidence. It does not seem to bear any relationship with the capacities identified in the concept development options. It appears to derive from a notional highway capacity, but one which does not consider options for alleviating the impact of traffic, or whether indeed it is desirable to plan to do so which could discourage the use of non car modes.

Having regard to the appropriateness of, and likely need to accommodate more, development at Keynsham, and the indications that land to the east is one of the most sustainable and deliverable options, not only at Keynsham but in the District as a whole, the capacity of development should not be restricted to 250 dwellings. Whilst supporting the allocation for 250 dwellings, the notional capacity is inconsistent with providing a Plan that is positively prepared and justified. A comprehensive approach will have more potential to deliver a comprehensive portfolio of infrastructure improvements, including the aspirations for significant green infrastructure in the cordon sanitaire provided by the gas pipeline, and which will ensure the separation between Keynsham and Saltford in perpetuity.

Change to the policy requested:

The policy needs to be amended to give greater strategic direction to the Place-Making Plan in terms of land east of Keynsham. In particular, it should make clear the need for the study area to consider the potential for the entirety of the area between Keynsham and Saltford.

Change Ref. SPC120

Plan Ref.: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 93

Comment Number: 10

Respondent Name: Mrs Jacqui Ashman

Respondent Organisation: Highways Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions. These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements.

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Whilst some distance from the SRN, there are transport limitations to the location of residential led mixed use development at South West Keynsham as acknowledged by the Council , in common with the East Keynsham location. For that reason the Agency would reiterate that a robust transport evidence base will be required to fully understand the impacts of development and early involvement of the Agency in the Masterplanning stage is sought.

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

These representations cover a general theme that the Proposed Changes in the Core Strategy in general are excessively detailed for development proposals relating to Bath and Keynsham and inadequately specific for policies relation to Somer Valley and the rural areas. In the former very little is left for the Placemaking Plan, whereas in the latter almost everything is left for the Placemaking Plan. This includes the need to demonstrate very special circumstances to make alterations to inner Green Belt boundaries of inset villages, even where those villages are acknowledged to be of a size and have a sufficient range of services and facilities to justify additional development.

It would be impractical to site all the site specific policies which are considered to be excessively detailed and those listed should be taken as examples of where, it is considered editing is required. The same principle also should be applied to all equivalent circumstances throughout the Proposed Changes under consideration.

Delete or radically edit the following parts of the policies listed below.

- Policy KE4: delete or edit criteria under "Planning Requirements"

For all these site specific policy proposals, it is understood that the Core Strategy should simply identify the principle of the locations for development. The criteria for development of each site should follow in the Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 106 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Kathy Curling **Respondent Organisation:** Pro Planning

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Other representations have been made by Pro Planning in relation to Proposed Changes to policies for housing and employment development in the Rural Areas and Somer Valley.

These representations raise concerns about the proposed number and extent of potential encroachments into the inner Green Belt boundary for Keynsham to accommodate housing and economic development within the period of the Core Strategy. The concerns arise for a number of reasons, as follows.

1.The Proposed Changes make provision for a large number of separate intrusions into the Green Belt with apparently, limited subsequent policy control to restrict the actual number or extent of encroachments to be allowed during this period. It is accepted that the detail boundary should be prepared though the Placemaking Plan, but the Proposed Changes appear to enable all of these encroachments to be made without the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Such erosion of this part of the Bristol/Bath Green Belt would seriously undermine its function.

2.Following from this point, the Green Belt is already under its severest pressure in the corridor between Bristol and Bath and particularly between Bristol at Whitchurch and Keynsham and between Keynsham and Saltford. Even where Green Belt land remains, the pressures upon it are in danger of undermining its ability to serve a meaningful Green Belt function. The provision in the Core Strategy to allow further development in BANES at Whitchurch and on sites to the west, south and east of Keynsham cannot be considered to result in balanced or sustainable development in relation to BANES as a whole.

3.By contrast, the reduction in proposed housing and jobs at Midsomer Norton in the Somer Valley is not considered to be justified as other representations have shown. Furthermore, the growth at Somer Valley can be accommodated on land not within Green Belt, which enhances its sustainability credentials and where further growth and development should be encouraged and facilitated in preference to such extensive erosion of the Green Belt at Keynsham.

4.Keynsham and Norton Radstock are acknowledged to be major urban areas within BANES and, whilst Keynsham has the benefit of the railway line and easier access to the motorway, Somer Valley is better located to provide cheaper market housing and therefore greater choice, as well as a range of potential employment opportunities, thus delivering a better and more sustainable balance of major development sites across the district.

Change to the policy requested:

Re-evaluate the sites where the Core Strategy proposes to allow incursions into the Green Belt in the vicinity of Bristol and Keynsham and reduce the number to ensure longevity and validity of the remaining Green Belt between the settlements of Bristol, Keynsham and Saltford.

Revisit the potential for additional housing and employment in the Somer Valley to achieve a better balance of strategic housing employment development across the district.

Respondent Number: 4639 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Lands Improvement**Agent ID:** 156 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Overview

Lands Improvement has significant concerns in respect of the level of growth now being proposed at Keynsham and considers that there are more appropriate and sustainable locations for growth including at Whitchurch. This representation should be read in conjunction with others submitted in respect of overall housing numbers and SPC 119 (land adjoining East Keynsham).

Deliverability

The Proposed Changes advocate that 2,100 dwellings will be provided for at Keynsham during the plan period which represents a 600 dwelling increase from previous versions of the Core Strategy. This includes allocations in the existing Local Plan, notably the K2 allocation. We believe that the level of development being proposed for the Town is excessive,

will significantly harm its character and is unlikely to be delivered in the timeframes relied upon in the Core Strategy.

We also note from the SHLAA that the new sites identified in the Proposed Changes (WSPC 119 and SPC120) are anticipated to bring forward completions in the period 2015/2016. Given the fact that the K2 allocation has yet to see meaningful completions over 6 years after the adoption of the Local Plan, we consider that the Core Strategy and the SHLAA is being overly optimistic in its assumptions on the new allocations.

This belief is further strengthened by the fact that the sites will be allocated and identified in the Placemaking Plan including its removal from the Green Belt which is now significantly behind schedule not least because of the resource implications of resolving the on-going issues with the Core Strategy and the priority given to the former MoD sites in Bath. Whilst an updated Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) is anticipated shortly, the latest published version anticipates an Issues and Options consultation in the Autumn of 2012 but, given the continuing delays to the Core Strategy and the fundamental concerns on its soundness, we consider this to be unrealistic. Likewise, the complexity of the Placemaking Plan, which will include a detailed Green Belt review, means that its preparation will be time consuming and subject to much debate.

The text to proposed policy KE4 makes clear the level of issues that the Placemaking Plan will need to resolve in respect of this site. Lands Improvement considers that many of the issues raised in criteria (a) to (p) of the policy, including in respect of landscape and heritage, are fundamental to both the suitability of the site and the level of development that may ultimately be delivered on it. In addition, a comprehensive masterplan is required and, of course, a planning application(s) need to be prepared and approved by the LPA.

Whilst the concerns set out above mirror those in respect of the land at East Keynsham (SPC119), we have an additional concern given the location of the site adjoining the existing Local Plan allocation (K2). As set out above, the Local Plan allocation has been much delayed and it would be illogical for the proposed new site to come forward for development prior to the K2 allocation being fully consented and significantly complete.

Given these facts, the SHLAA's suggestion that first completions on the South West Keynsham site will occur in 2015/2016 are highly questionable. In addition, the Core Strategy's approach means that should this (or any other site) be delayed, there is no flexibility for the shortfall in supply to be made up

elsewhere. Again, this confirms the need for an increased housing requirement including the recognition of the capacity that exists at Whitchurch.

Infrastructure

The two additional sites being proposed at Keynsham total approximately 450 dwellings plus other uses including up to 30,000sqm of employment land. This is in addition to the 700 dwellings identified on the Somerdale site and the existing Local Plan allocations including K2 (referred to above).

We consider that this is a disproportionate increase in development for the Town which is likely to place an unsustainable burden on its services and infrastructure. We note that this is, at least in part, acknowledged in the background papers including the SHLAA and the report to Council on 4th March including in terms of transportation issues and congestion on the A4. This will have significant impacts on existing and future residents.

Housing Market

We consider it unlikely that the delivery of this number of houses within a town the size of Keynsham can be sustained by the market. This is evidenced in the latest SHLAA which shows that the majority of development on the allocations is anticipated to come forward in the period 2015 to 2022; that is to say the sites will be effectively competing against each other for sales. These concerns are amplified by the fact that, for example, the Somerdale site and the K2 allocation are controlled by the same developer. Therefore, whilst development may ultimately and eventually be realised, this is unlikely to be within the timescales relied upon in the Core Strategy.

We also consider that this level of development at Keynsham fails to accord with the requirements of the NPPF. This includes the principle of providing a wide choice of quality homes including a range of locations

Finally, it is clearly acknowledged that Keynsham is not within the Bath Housing Market Area. The new residential allocations at the Town will not therefore be meeting the needs of Keynsham or Bath City but rather, in our view, be taken

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

up by people working in Bristol. Other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement set out why we feel that the Core Strategy should identify a significantly increased residential requirement including to take account of the shortfall of provision in the Bristol Core Strategy. Consequently, and given the above, we firmly believe that Whitchurch offers a more sustainable and appropriate strategy for meeting this need.

Conclusions

For the reasons set out above, we consider that the Core Strategy is unsound on the basis that:

1. It is not positively prepared in that it does not seek to meet objectively assessed needs
2. It is not justified in that it does not promote the most appropriate strategy
3. It will not be effective in that it is unlikely to be deliverable as envisaged by the Council
4. It is not consistent with National Policy in the form of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Consequential changes as set out in other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement including:

- An increase in the quantum of residential development proposed to approximately 21,000 dwellings;
- The identification of additional development at Whitchurch, South East Bristol for approximately 3,500 dwellings, the potential for which is recognised in the SHLAA and the details of which will be confirmed through the Placemaking Plan.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 19 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton

Respondent Organisation: J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whilst Pegasus welcome the recognition of the need to release land to the south west of Keynsham as set out in Policy KE4 it is nevertheless considered that this area has greater scope for development as set out in our original representations and submission of the Sustainability Appraisal for land of Charlton Road South West Keynsham.

Pegasus have submitted a detailed Sustainability Appraisal which included a Landscape and Visual Appraisal, Ecology Assessment, Archaeological and Heritage Appraisal, flood risk and Drainage and Traffic and Transport and Utilities along with a concept plan illustrating the layout for approximately between 900 dwellings at 30 dph to about 1,100 dwellings at 38 dph.

It is noted that the Development Concept Options Report has been produced for south of K2 ie south west Keynsham and this report concludes that a viable housing scheme could be delivered on this site. It is not clear whether this report is part of the Council's evidence base, whether it is the Stage 2 assessment of the Green Belt - it clearly has no planning status and is not Council policy and our clients do not agree with the assumptions about the level of housing provision that could be accommodated, no dialogue has taken place with our clients following the submission of the Sustainability Appraisal and SHLAA submissions.

It is considered that the Policy is unsound as it should not only remove land from the Green Belt (which is in principle supported) but is should be site specific and identify the site in the Core Strategy – this approach would be consistent with the NPPF para 47 which states that sites that are critical to the delivery of the housing provision in the plan period should be identified in the Core Strategy, coupled together with the NPPF approach to Green Belt ie para 83 – 85 it is considered that the approach to the release of land from the Green Belt is unsound. Land off Charlton Road South West Keynsham should be identified as a site, and not left to come forward through another assessment in the Placemaking Plan. The Placemaking Plan is not the appropriate document to identify a strategic allocation in the Green Belt; neither should any safeguarding of land in the area be considered in the Placemaking Plan. This is a strategic issue which should be addressed in the Core Strategy. The NPPF para 85 states that local planning authorities "...identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan Review which proposes the development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Policy KE4 sets out a detailed approach to the planning requirements which are more appropriate for the Placemaking Plan and would in any case accompany a planning application having regard to the Planning Checklist. However, we have suggested elsewhere in our representations that in order to be compliant with the NPPF para 153 the Core Strategy should include the issues that would be addressed in the Local Plan, this is particularly significant given the uncertainty that has arisen in respect of development needs and given the length of time that has been taken to prepare the Core Strategy (preparation commenced in 2007 and the Core Strategy has been suspended twice). Furthermore in order to implement the Government's growth agenda and to significantly boost housing supply as referred to in the NPPF there is a need to resolve the sites which are required to meet the housing provision - consequently land off Charlton Road, South West Keynsham should be allocated for development in the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy KE4 should be amended as follows: "Land adjoining South West Keynsham
Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 200 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary. The need to identify safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs will be considered by the Placemaking Plan. Land adjoining south West Keynsham is removed from the Green Belt in accordance with Policy KE1 and allocated for development of a minimum of 200 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the plan period. Further land should be identified in this location and safeguarded for development in the longer term and may be released in order to meet the 5 year housing land supply."

Planning requirements:

The planning requirements are not always site specific and represent the Planning Checklist, therefore where they are not site specific they should be deleted.

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

PHSV also consider the capacity set out in SPC120 is a pre-judgement and should be resolved through detailed work which will be necessary to meet Parts d, e, f, g and h of Proposed Policy KE4 .

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading **Respondent Organisation:** Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Environment Agency supports the wording of point d of Policy KE4 in general. This refers to the need for any development to have well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

However similar to the Weston extension we are aware of existing surface water flooding problems in this area of Keynsham. As part of proposals for the previous K2B allocation we have been made aware of surface water flooding down Parkhouse Lane and the surrounding area. We would refer the Council to their Lead Local Flood Authority function and

DEFRA 2011, p.26).

Change to the policy requested:

We therefore oppose land being removed from the Green Belt to the South West of Keynsham. In the event that such a proposal proceeds, thereby impinging on Abbots Wood, we would like to see additional conditions attached to Policy KE4 –

- In sub-paragraph e of Policy KE4, ‘significant aspects of landscape’ are mentioned. Although there is a reference to trees, we would like to see ‘Abbots Wood’ specifically included in this sentence.
- A developer obligation included to provide to secure boundary fencing, appropriate entrance ‘furniture’ to manage public access and provision of litter collection to Abbots Wood. Fencing and entrance furniture to be maintained by developer or development trust thereafter.
- Confirmation that there will be no requirement for cycle or road access through Abbots Wood – foot access only.
- We would like to see a 10m buffer strip of informal open land maintained between the edge of Abbots Wood and any development curtilages.
- All existing mature hedgerows and hedgerow trees on the Abbots Wood boundary to be protected and maintained
- Surface water issues from adjoining land onto Abbots Wood to be adequately addressed.
- These conditions above to be incorporated into appropriate development infrastructure obligations.

Respondent Number: 275 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd

Agent ID: 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The rejection of Redrow’s land at Lays Farm (See attached Site Location Plan and Site Analysis) on the grounds that a gas pipeline runs through the central southern part of the site and that the “HSE buffer zone severely limits development” or “effectively limits development to a very minor area to the north west of the site” is simply wrong and wholly misleading (Ref: BANES Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2013).

We are clear that an old high pressure (steel) gas main runs across the site at a depth of approximately 1.2m. However, the route of this pipeline as shown on the (unnumbered) plan attached to the SHLAA, does not accord with the records held by the company who own and operate the pipeline, namely Wales and West Utilities Ltd (see attached W&WU Pipeline Plan). Moreover, the existing easement is only 7m and Wales and West has confirmed that it would require a no-build zone of 16m although a highway may be constructed across the main.

The impact of the existing pipeline on the development potential of the site is consequently minimal and certainly not such that would warrant disregarding it completely as a sustainable option. Moreover, it is feasible to divert the main, and Redrow have recently done just that elsewhere in Bristol, and by using modern materials it would further reduce any no-build easement to 6m.

The site, south of Lays Farm (Ref: Area 10 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L) is bound on two side by development and forms a far more logical addition to the built-up area of Keynsham than that proposed to be released from the Green Belt to the south (Ref: Area 13 BANES Sustainability Appraisal Report Annex L). Development would project no further west than the existing Lays Farm Business Centre. Moreover, the submitted site analysis shows that the distance and the intervening topography ensure that the role of the remaining Green Belt separating Keynsham from Stockwood (identified as Stockwood Vale) would not be unacceptably eroded. In no sense would the release of this site result in the coalescence of Keynsham with Bristol.

It appears to us, from close examination of the SHLAA and the Green Belt Review, that the Council’s primary reason for not also identifying the land at Lays Farm for release from the Green Belt was based on incorrect information about the route and scale of any safeguarding associated with the gas pipeline.

Not sound, Not positively prepared, Not justified, Not effective.

Change to the policy requested:

Land at Lays Farm is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing (150 dwellings)

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 281 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy**Respondent Organisation:** Natural England**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Development on the edge of Keynsham

The Plan proposes two areas of greenfield land for development, located to the east of Keynsham and to the south west of Keynsham. We are content that the site selection process has been robust and that the justification for the preferred options appears reasonable. Furthermore, we are generally satisfied that the landscape and ecological sensitivities of the preferred sites have been identified and that effects on these from proposed development could be adequately mitigated if provided in accordance with relevant Plan policies.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 717 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Terrence Gerrish**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

First of all can we say that we appreciate the fact that some housing has to be accommodated and it must be difficult for the Council to decide where but we feel that Whitchurch village is being discriminated.

We are a small village and to have 200 houses more built in this village will make it even smaller. Whitchurch village are being asked to take more houses than any other RA1 village. Why? It should be the same in all villages. We only have one small school in Whitchurch village which is on the main road and it is at full capacity now. The roads leading to and going through Whitchurch village are already congested causing traffic jams especially during rush hour. The 200 houses will cause this to escalate and will be at an unacceptable level of traffic. The roads will just not be able to cope. The green belt land is only small and it should remain green belt.

Neighbouring authorities should work together to solve these situations. Bristol City Council have stated in its core strategy that they do not wish a development of this size to be built on its border. I hope common sense prevails.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 758 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Rosenthal**Respondent Organisation:** Orchard Park Residents Association**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The following is a summary of comments from a meeting of the membership of Orchard Park Residents Association.

Please consider the following when developing Core Strategy amendments.

In order to resolve the nationwide housing shortage It is understood that there is a necessity to build more houses throughout the whole of the UK, but to Build 200 or more houses in Whitchurch appears to be a very high percentage considering the total of 491 at present, an increase of 40%. Are other similar villages required to provide space at a similar scale? Any figure that is ultimately agreed should of course include those developments that have already been allowed i.e. 47 homes at Sleep Lane, it would be important to consider that one such proposal namely that by Messrs Hitchens space on its own vastly exceed 200 figure and if agreed would on its own increase the number of houses in Whitchurch by 50%,

In the past an important element of the core strategy has been to maintain separation between built-up areas to prevent urban sprawl if the green belt is reduced or taken away in order to build more houses in and around Whitchurch, would we be either swallowed up by Bristol or joined to Stockwood culminating in no separation at all. Incidentally Bristol City Council have indicated that they are strongly opposed to developments which would remove the small boundaries between Whitchurch and Bristol, one of their main objections appears to be the expected increase in traffic and the infrastructure issues that such increases would bring and they are opposed to any housing development to the Southeast of Bristol.

What plans do Banes have for maintaining or developing the green belt?

Before targeting green belt land have all other avenues been explored for example: have all vacant properties been examined to ensure that their usage is maximised: rather than build massive new developments in large green field plots has anybody looked at the possibility of adding say one or two properties only to existing roads or sites or estates? A couple of houses here a couple of houses there at the end of existing streets could have less environmental impact on the village but could ultimately achieve the required objective.

We already frequently experience traffic queues around the Staunton Lane area which can make it very difficult for some of our residents to enter and leave the Park at certain times of day.

Before any substantial increase in developments within our area there would need to be infrastructure improvements including doctors surgeries schools and bus services (there is in fact no bus service from Staunton Lane.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 1111 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Adrian Rogers **Respondent Organisation:** Compton Dando Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whilst recognising that the absence of an adopted core strategy leaves the whole of the BANES area more vulnerable to inappropriate development, this parish council has strong concerns about plans for additional housing on land adjoining South West Keynsham (south of local plan allocation K2). The exact boundaries of the proposed location are not clear, but it is clear that it partly lies within this parish's boundaries, or adjoins this parish. We would like to make the following points in support of our contention that this land should not be removed from the green belt:

1. The parish council is not against small increases in housing numbers within the villages, but as a rural parish wholly in the green belt, we feel that hundreds of additional houses in or adjoining the parish would fundamentally change the nature of the parish. In our 2010 Parish Plan (responded to by 82% of residents) the highest priorities of the parishioners were to

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

protect the green belt (94%) and to preserve the character of the 5 villages in the parish.

2. One of our villages, the conservation area of Queen Charlton, is 0.7 miles from the top of Parkhouse Lane, and will potentially be sandwiched between this development site, and the proposed Whitchurch site (1.5 miles away).

3. The proposed location of land adjoining South West Keynsham (depending on its final extent) will have an adverse visual impact on the landscape of the Chew Valley and the openness of the green belt to the south and west. Both K2 and land adjoining K2 are visible from the valley as it extends along the ridge. The Inspector of the 1992 Keynsham and Chew Valley Local Plan recommended that the character and charm of the views from the Wellsway should be safeguarded carefully and that development on the west side of the Wellsway (where this site is proposed) would erode that character.

4. Traffic from the new development of 200 houses, as new residents travel to jobs in Bristol or Bath, will either have to make its way through the bottleneck of Whitchurch onto the already-congested A37, or through the bottleneck of Keynsham onto the already-congested A4. The overall change ref SPC 24 shows an increase of 600 houses in Keynsham, with an increase of only 100 jobs, so it is clear that the inhabitants of the new homes are expected to commute. The proposals will therefore exacerbate rush hour rat runs through the villages of Queen Charlton, Compton Dando and Chewton Keynsham, as drivers from K2A, K2B, and land adjoining south west Keynsham seek to avoid the traffic jams as they travel to work. Redlynch Lane into Chewton connects to the B3116 to Bath through Burnett, or via Compton Dando to the A39 to Bath, and Queen Charlton bypasses the junction of Charlton Road and Woollard Lane to reach the A37 to Bristol.

5. The prospect of significant improvement to public transport services is small. In particular, the railway line between Bristol and Bath already operates effectively to full capacity; and it is unrealistic to think that rail operators will provide either additional carriages or additional trains. Nor is there any reason to expect significant improvements to the A37 or A4. The distances from Keynsham Town Centre and the railway station raise questions regarding the social and environmental sustainability of development of this site and the creation of an isolated and car-dominated environment.

6. November 2012 saw flooding caused by surface drainage issues across the area, including all 5 villages in Compton Dando Parish. The development adjoining South West Keynsham will require new sewage and drainage works, and is close to an area between Redlynch Lane and Charlton Road which already experiences surface drainage issues.

7. We oppose linear development or “town creep” into the Green Belt and the hamlets surrounding Keynsham. The land adjoining south west Keynsham is right on the edge of the town, potentially pushing beyond the town boundaries. The development would extend the southern boundary of Keynsham, to the prejudice of the adjacent greenbelt areas and it would extend Keynsham’s housing still further away from Keynsham centre and transport facilities (see attached photo – new devt.jpg)

Change to the policy requested:

We would request that this location be removed from the proposed change SPC120

Of the sites considered by Bath and North East Somerset Council under the heading “Keynsham/Edge of Bristol”, as illustrated at Map 2 in Annex 1 to the Council’s “Core Strategy Background” document, the land adjoining south west Keynsham is demonstrably the worst suited to new development.. As Map 2 shows, it is distant from central Keynsham and distant from all transport links; it is the most prominent in terms of disturbance to the Green Belt, including traffic implications in the immediately surrounding areas, and has the most detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the Chew Valley, The area already faces the task of absorbing 500+ new units in the K2 sites, and should not be expected to absorb more.

Respondent Number: 4444 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** David Hawkes

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120 **Plan Reference:** Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not agree with more houses being built in Keynsham in particular the South West site. There are already a great number of houses either being built or planned. The South West area would require residents to use a car for almost everything putting huge pressure on the already over crowded roads in Keynsham. The infrastructure of Keynsham is already at bursting point without this additional burden. I suggest that you look at smaller developments in the area e.g. Saltford ,specifically Manor Road, where there are no new houses proposed but has the advantage of many shops within walking distance and buses to Bath and Bristol every 12 minutes. I note there is a proposal for a railway station at Saltford surely this would be advanced if there were more residents in that town.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4455 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Beyer

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am not happy to see greenbelt land SW of Keynsham used for housing. If this cannot be avoided then transport infrastructure needs to be in place before any development proceeds. The only way of protecting Charlton Road, St Ladoc Road and the Town Centre from a massive increase in traffic levels would seem to be the provision of a continuation of the Ring Road westwards from Hicks Gate with a spur to development SW of Keynsham. Your transportation report states

"The South of Keynsham area is likely to result in a relatively high number of vehicular trips in comparison due to its distance from Keynsham town centre and a lack of established public transport sustainable transport services and infrastructure.

The majority of trips from this location will utilise Charlton Road to access Keynsham town centre or the A4/A4174 via St Ladoc Road/Durley Hill. The highway into Keynsham town centre is constrained and there is little scope for capacity improvement. Additional traffic is therefore likely to contribute to queues and delays. The Charlton Road-St Ladoc Road-Durley Hill route to the A4/A4174 has insufficient link capacity to accommodate all the trips forecast and the route is primarily residential in character and additional vehicular traffic would alter the feel of the area.

A significant proportion of trips from this location will use the A4 corridor to travel into Bristol. This is already operating close to maximum capacity with little scope for highway capacity improvements within the existing highway boundary. Overall the highways impact of development is largely along congested routes or residential streets and there is relatively little scope for encouraging sustainable transport from this location due to its location. Development at this location is likely to result in car dependant behaviour in comparison with some of the other locations evaluated in this study."

This report indicates that residents in Charlton Road and St Ladoc Road together with everyone using the town centre would suffer from a huge increase in the volume of traffic, with the resultant queues and pollution.

Change to the policy requested:

If this cannot be avoided then transport infrastructure needs to be in place before any development proceeds. The only way of protecting Charlton Road, St Ladoc Road and the Town Centre from a massive increase in traffic levels would seem to be the provision of a continuation of the Ring Road westwards from Hicks Gate with a spur to development SW of Keynsham.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4473 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Norman James**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Additional development in this location will place unsustainable pressure and demand on the existing overloaded road network. Vehicles leaving the site wishing to travel east are likely to use the country lane through Chewton Keynsham which is already used by a large number of vehicles, particularly during morning and evening commuter times. Further afield, the A4 and A37, which are already used to capacity and more, will have to cope will additional large volumes of traffic as there is no spare capacity in the public transport serving this area.

Change to the policy requested:

Further development to the south west of Keynsham should be considered to be removed from proposals.

Respondent Number: 4539 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Sally Davis**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

As Farmborough Ward Cllr I support the views expressed by Compton Dando Parish Council as they reflect very much comments made to me directly & those I have heard expressed at Parish meetings.

Compton Dando Parish Council has strong concerns about plans for additional housing on land adjoining South West Keynsham (south of local plan allocation K2) & although they realise the absence of an adopted core strategy leaves the whole of the BANES area more vulnerable to inappropriate development they do not feel this site is appropriate especially as the exact boundaries of the proposed location are not clear however it is clear that it either lies partly within the parish's boundaries, or adjoins Compton Dando parish.

The following points I believe give strength to the argument that that this land should not be removed from the green belt:

1. Compton Dando Parish Council is not against small increases in housing numbers within the villages, but as a rural parish wholly in the green belt, residents feel that hundreds of additional houses in or adjoining the parish would fundamentally change the nature of the parish. Evidence for this view is in the 2010 Parish Plan (responded to by 82% of residents) the highest priorities of the parishioners were to protect the green belt (94%) and to preserve the character of the 5 villages in the parish.
2. The conservation area of Queen Charlton, which is part of Compton Dando parish, is 0.7 miles from the top of Parkhouse Lane, and will potentially be sandwiched between this development site, and the proposed Whitchurch site (1.5 miles away).
3. The proposed location of land adjoining South West Keynsham (depending on its final extent) will have an adverse visual impact on the landscape of the Chew Valley and the openness of the green belt to the south and west. Both K2 and land adjoining K2 are visible from the valley as it extends along the ridge. The Inspector of the 1992 Keynsham and Chew Valley Local Plan recommended that the character and charm of the views from the Wellsway should be safeguarded carefully and that development on the west side of the Wellsway (where this site is proposed) would erode that character.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

4. Traffic from the new development of 200 houses, as new residents travel to jobs in Bristol or Bath, will either have to make its way through the bottleneck of Whitchurch onto the already-congested A37, or through the bottleneck of Keynsham onto the already-congested A4. The overall change ref SPC 24 shows an increase of 600 houses in Keynsham, with an increase of only 100 jobs, so it is clear that the inhabitants of the new homes are expected to commute. The proposals will therefore exacerbate rush hour rat runs through the villages of Queen Charlton, Compton Dando and Chewton Keynsham, as drivers from K2A, K2B, and land adjoining south west Keynsham seek to avoid the traffic jams as they travel to work. Redlynch Lane into Chewton connects to the B3116 to Bath through Burnett, or via Compton Dando to the A39 to Bath, and Queen Charlton bypasses the junction of Charlton Road and Woollard Lane to reach the A37 to Bristol.

5. The prospect of significant improvement to public transport services is small. In particular, the railway line between Bristol and Bath already operates effectively to full capacity; and it is unrealistic to think that rail operators will provide either additional carriages or additional trains. Nor is there any reason to expect significant improvements to the A37 or A4. The distances from Keynsham Town Centre and the railway station raise questions regarding the social and environmental sustainability of development of this site and the creation of an isolated and car-dominated environment.

6. The development adjoining South West Keynsham will require new sewage and drainage works, and is close to an area between Redlynch Lane and Charlton Road which already experiences surface drainage issues. In November 2012 flooding caused by surface drainage issues across the area, including all 5 villages in Compton Dando Parish.

7. The land adjoining south west Keynsham is right on the edge of the town, potentially pushing beyond the town boundaries. Compton Dando Parish is opposed to linear development or "town creep" into the Green Belt and the hamlets surrounding Keynsham. The southern boundary of Keynsham would be extended, to the prejudice of the adjacent greenbelt areas and it would extend Keynsham's housing still further away from Keynsham centre and transport facilities.

Change to the policy requested:

Of the sites considered by Bath and North East Somerset Council under the heading "Keynsham/Edge of Bristol", as illustrated at Map 2 in Annex 1 to the Council's "Core Strategy Background" document, the land adjoining south west Keynsham is demonstrably the worst suited to new development.. As Map 2 shows, it is distant from central Keynsham and distant from all transport links; it is the most prominent in terms of disturbance to the Green Belt, including traffic implications in the immediately surrounding areas, and has the most detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the Chew Valley, The area already faces the task of absorbing 500+ new units in the K2 sites, and should not be expected to absorb more.

Respondent Number: 4588 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Withies Farm Landowners' Group,

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Land adjoining South West Keynsham is considered to be an inappropriate development location, and of doubtful deliverability during the Plan period. The site is a further extension of an existing allocation in the adopted Local Plan, that has yet to be implemented. It cannot be developed unless and until the extant allocation is taken up. Moreover, there were sound reasons for not allocating a larger quantum of development in the adopted Plan on grounds of integration with the settlement and landscape character. The site in part occupies a plateau, before declining away from the settlement. It feels remote from the existing developed area, and will appear and feel as an isolated community that will not integrate well with the existing built fabric. The site therefore does not offer a sustainable development opportunity

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4603 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Adrian Palmer**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The present position

1. Keynsham is already a crowded place, with infrastructure and transport links loaded to capacity. Even now, the large majority of residents travel to work outside Keynsham, primarily to Bath or (Greater) Bristol.
 2. The roads (primarily the A4, but also including the A37 for access to central Bristol) are already chronically congested at peak times in both directions. The trains are infrequent, unreliable (albeit not as bad as a few years ago) and very crowded at peak times. The buses are infrequent, very unreliable and very slow. In addition to all of this, the transport links function only from the railway station; or the A4; or (for the slowest bus links) from central Keynsham. Travel to these points (in order to start any journey) is also chronically congested and public transport for this purpose is negligible.
 3. The Green Belt area around Keynsham is a vitally important amenity not only for the residents of Keynsham, but also for the residents of Bristol as they travel out to the east and the residents of Bath as they travel out to the west. The areas in question are increasingly used and are relied upon for recreational purposes.
 4. Keynsham already faces the prospect of large developments at Somerdale (700 units) and the K2 site at South West Keynsham (500 + units) – source: SPC 112. These developments alone will impose great strain on the Keynsham area.
- The concept of still further development sites
5. The addition of still further development sites will impose enormous and potentially intolerable additional strain. There is an appearance of the Council using the Keynsham area as a “dumping ground” for the location of additional sites.
 6. The overwhelming majority of still further residents will travel to work in either Bristol or Bath; the concept that new jobs will be created locally for more than a very few is wholly unrealistic.
 7. The prospect of significant improvement to public transport services is small. In particular as to Keynsham railway station and the railway line between Bristol and Bath:
 - It already operates effectively to full capacity; and it is unrealistic to think that rail operators will provide either additional carriages or additional trains for the use of passengers over such a short distance on such a major line;
 - Off-peak services are very infrequent (about one per hour);
 - There are no facilities at all at Keynsham station, in particular no bus or taxi connections. The arriving passenger is stranded, if without a car;
 - Access to Keynsham train station is inherently difficult;
 - Car parking is very limited and carries a very high risk of vandalism.

Other proposed sites

8. The Council considered a significant number of sites before arriving at the small selection of sites now being advanced in its “Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy (March 2013)”. The writer has not sought to consider the sites distant from Keynsham. But there were six sites considered by the Council under the heading “Keynsham/Edge of Bristol”, as illustrated at Map 2 in Annex 1 to the Council’s “Core Strategy Background” document. Of these sites, it is submitted that South West Keynsham is demonstrably the worst suited. As Map 2 shows, it is distant from central Keynsham and distant from all transport links; it is the most prominent in terms of disturbance to the Green Belt, including (as the result of the absence of transport links) traffic implications in the immediately surrounding areas. Nor can it be justified simply on the basis that it is a mere addition to the imminent K2 site. To the contrary, the area already faces the task of absorbing 500+ new units and cannot be expected to absorb more.
9. For the above (outline) reasons, it is submitted that other sites considered and rejected by the Council are better suited – whether within the Keynsham area or (probably) beyond.

Specific objections to the South West Keynsham site

10. The following table is extracted from Annex 1 to the core strategy background document considered by the Council when assessing the various proposed sites and then selecting the particular sites now the subject of consultation. This Annex 1 sets out “the Council’s response to the concerns raised by the Inspector’s concerns regarding the approach to growth and housing in the Core Strategy” (see para.1.1 of the Annex).

11. The entries in the table relate exclusively to the additional South West Keynsham site, as now being proposed. The writer has highlighted a substantial number of the entries, which (it is submitted) well demonstrate the un-suitability of the site. Nor can the Council gainsay any of these points, which originate from its own document.

12. The writer has added additional observations, in italics.

13. Accordingly:

Social/Economic

- Avon Cycle Way provides a link to Saltford/Compton Dando to the south west of the site accessed via Redlynch Lane. Existing footpaths to the east of the site along the River Chew connect to Keynsham Health centre and on to the Town Centre.

The Avon Cycle Way is a recreational Sustrans route which offers a semi-rural route to join the Bristol/Bath cycleway at Saltford. It is not and never will be a "cycle to work" route. The same applies to the footpaths (which anyway connect from the proposed site to the River Chew only via the most circuitous route, if at all). These factors cannot be "economic" matters.

- Site could incorporate an extension to the Community Woodland

Transport

- Has detractors on transport grounds because would bring traffic into already congested town centre, particularly travelling to Bath and north fringe of Bristol, with limited scope for mitigation.

The words "limited scope" are not accepted; there would be no scope. And this point relates only to traffic into the town centre, without adding that the same traffic will then inevitably pass out of the town centre, to go to Bristol/Bath.

- Will lead to use of unsuitable minor roads to access Bristol by car, specific localised improvements may be necessary.

Also the use of unsuitable minor roads to access Bath by car. There would be no significant scope for localised improvements. Nor is any outline (still less, detail) offered.

- Bristol bound traffic may also use the already congested A37 route.

Agreed. It will do so in order to avoid the already congested A4 route.

- Poorly located for travel to Bath.

Agreed: very poorly located. Exactly the same applies for travel to Bristol.

- Potential accessibility by public transport from the location is poor.

Agreed. As stated earlier in this document, bus services are infrequent, very unreliable and very slow. No timetable is ever followed (presumably because of the traffic congestion on the A4 road)

- Not well linked to Keynsham station

Agreed. And see para.7 above in this document for the severe limitations following arrival at Keynsham station.

- Over 500m from the nearest local centre, 2km from the town centre and 3km from the railway station (all distances further than the recommended reasonable walking distance in the developers transport assessment)

Agreed.

- This poses issues regarding the social and environmental sustainability of development of this site and could lead to the creation of an isolated and car-dominated environment.

The above factors would lead to the creation of an isolated and car-dominated environment. Even at this point, non-suitability is demonstrated on the face of the Council's own assessment.

Education

- Additional development of this scale may not be sufficient to support a new primary school, Castle Primary School is already being extended to its full capacity address additional demand from K2. It may be possible to expand existing primary school facilities.

The writer detects no provision (and no space) for a new school – which would anyway be purely conjectural. Accepting then that Castle Primary School will already be extended to its full capacity, the Council's assessment offers nothing beyond "a possibility to expand existing school facilities". Where? Presumably in the centre of Keynsham, distant from the development site.

Environmental

- The Green Belt in this location has an important role in protecting the countryside from encroachment, although not of great importance in preventing the merger of Bristol and Keynsham.

Agreed that the Green Belt in this location has a (very) important role. But the suggestion that this location is not important for the prevention of the merger of Bristol and Keynsham misses the point. The area to the south of Keynsham is the only area of countryside adjacent to Keynsham; the open areas to the East north and west are not countryside as such.

- Records suggest the site supports limited features of ecological importance, with the exception of the presence of Great Crested newts, and Brown Hare, both are UK Priority Species. If confirmed through detailed surveys, measure to protect and sustain these species would be required.
- There is a degree of topographic continuity between the existing urban edge of Keynsham, the future K2 development sites and the northern part of this site.
- Good scope for structure planting to be moderately to highly effective in softening the impact on landscape and views north of Parkhouse Lane.
- Development of this site would not extend the southern limits of Keynsham any further south than that which already exists on the east side of Keynsham, or any further westwards than that which already exists.

It is not accepted that this is either accurate or a significant point. The development would extend the southern boundary of Keynsham by the entire extent of the development, to the prejudice of the adjacent greenbelt areas. And it would extend Keynsham's housing still further away from Keynsham centre and transport facilities: see the (imprecise) plan attached to Annex 1.

- Physical separation would remain between Keynsham, Queen Charlton and Chewton Keynsham, although distances between them would inevitably be narrowed.
- Possible impact on Queen Charlton Conservation Area and Parkhouse Farm (Grade II listed)
- Prehistoric and medieval finds have been recovered from the central part of the area and could suggest early settlement and/or occupation.
- Overall capacity of the landscape to absorb development is low – area is deemed to be of high importance in landscape terms and development would have a high impact. Structure planting to the south of Parkhouse Lane would have some effect locally but largely ineffective from wider views.

Agreed and important. The landscape would not absorb the proposed development. And the Council's earlier comment that there would be "good scope for structure planting to be moderately to highly effective in softening the impact on landscape and views north of Parkhouse Lane" is seen to be of small if any significance.

- Inspector of 1992 Keynsham and Chew Valley Local Plan recommended that the character and charm of the views from the Wellsway should be safeguarded carefully and that development on the west side of the Wellsway (i.e. including this site) would erode that character.

Agreed and important.

- Within Flood Zone 1 and passes the sequential test. It also provides flexibility to respond potential brownfield delivery issues.

Delivery

- Landowners promoting land in this area for development at higher capacity than proposed.
- Could help to improve access difficulties with existing K2B allocation. However, there is no provision in the planning permission for K2B to allow for a vehicle connection to this site.

This is an especially dangerous suggestion and is certainly not to be regarded as a factor in favour of the proposed development. To the contrary, such linkage would draw effectively the entire K2B traffic, which would then exit at Charlton Road, in addition to the traffic (a) already created by K2A and (b) (ex hypothesi) to be created by the still further site now being proposed. The traffic implications would be unacceptable.

- Capacity depends on how far south the site extends.
- Would require fairly significant sewerage infrastructure.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Conclusions

14. The proposed additional South West Keynsham site is not appropriate for development, in addition to the K2 development. Non-suitability is demonstrated on the face of the Council's own assessment.

15. In order to be suitable, development sites should be within reach of the likely workplaces (viz. Bristol/Bath) and should be supported by transport links and local facilities.

16. Finally, it is questioned whether the Council's figures add up: the proposed Core Strategy seeks 12,700 units, being an increase of 1,200 units above the total of 11,500 units previously proposed. The sites now under consultation would produce a total of 1,870 units. This total suggests an excess of 670 units over requirements.

Change to the policy requested:

17. The South West Keynsham site should be deleted.

The deletion of the South West Keynsham site (SPC 120) and all related changes

Respondent Number: 4654 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Professor Sir Michael Gregory **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: 157 **Agent Name:** Origin3

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

On behalf of my client Professor Sir Michael Gregory, this letter serves as formal representations to Bath and North East Somerset Council's public consultation on the proposed changes to the submitted core strategy. The representations have been prepared in the context of my clients land located to the southeast of Whitchurch (see attached site location plan) and; with regard to the proposed Green Belt review and allocation of strategic development growth at Whitchurch.

The Site

The land in question comprises two grassed paddocks totalling approximately 1.4 hectares. The paddocks are contained by mature hedgerow boundaries. The site is located in the open countryside. Horseworld rescue centre and a commercial yard are located to the immediate north of the site. Existing residential properties and associated curtilages largely contain the site to the east and west. Open countryside lies to the south of the south, albeit the site is contained to the north of Queen Charlotte Lane.

Access to the site is gained via a track off Queen Charlotte Lane which leads directly onto the nearby Bristol Road (A37). At present, the site is contained within the designated Bath and North East Somerset Green Belt. The site is located in the general search area for additional development growth at Whitchurch, as indicated in the emerging core strategy proposed changes.

Change Ref: SPC 18

The proposed insertion of the new paragraph (1.30A) which proposed the release of land from the Green Belt in order to accommodate development growth in the Whitchurch area is supported. Land at Whitchurch is considered a sustainable location for strategic development growth given its accessibility to the Bristol urban area. In this context, my clients land is within a suitable area which should be released from the Green Belt to enable the delivery of development growth in a sustainable location.

Change Ref: SPC 24

The amendment of Policy DW1 with regard to the identification of new locations for growth including Whitchurch is supported.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4703 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Victoria Moore**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC120

Plan Reference: Policy KE4

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I have already commented on some points regarding the proposed increase in the K2 development via our local council representative, but in addition:

The Green Belt is a vital resource for people from both Keynsham and Bristol and is used for recreation.

Of the 6 sites considered by the Council under the “Keynsham/Edge of Bristol” heading (see Map 2 in Annex 1 to the Core Strategy Background) – South West Keynsham is the least viable option. Looking at Map 2, it is distant from both Keynsham centre and transport links. It is also the most prominent with regard to disturbance of the Green Belt. Expanding K2 would massively increase road traffic for surrounding areas (both semi-rural and built-up areas), in part because bus services are unreliable and expensive and the railway station is not reasonable walking distance from the new development. It's likely that for each house built another car will be on the road.

Keynsham is already facing the prospect of large developments at Somerdale (700 houses) and the K2 site at South West Keynsham (500+ houses) (see SPC112). It seems as if Keynsham development sites are being chosen simply because it's convenient for the Council, rather than finding more suitable locations (i.e. not Green Belt and/or with no potential flooding risks).

Change to the policy requested:

To remove the additional 200 additional houses from the K2 plan.

Change Ref. SPC124**Plan Ref.: Table 6****Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Respondent Number:** 233 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas**Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC124

Plan Reference: Table 6

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support changes to IDP K1.1, IDP K1.2 and IDP K1.4 in Table 6. We especially support the need to take collective account of other infrastructure requirements so that overall investment adds value to projects and community that may not have been viable without collective development contributions. We also support the need for ‘Necessary enabling works to precede development at Somerdale’ and ‘Necessary enabling works to precede development in the Green Belt’ as well as ‘On site works necessary to obtain planning permission’. This should necessitate a joined-up strategy for the connectivity of these sites so that a more strategic approach to infrastructure and development is achieved.

Our project North of the railway line in East Keynsham has similar access and infrastructure needs to those of:

1. Somerdale (second access),
2. Broadmead Lane Sewage Works (climate change flood defence and HGV access),
3. B&NES Broadmead Lane Environment Park, Site BA19 in the West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy, Site K3 in the Adopted B&NES Local Plan 2007 and Site Saved in this Core Strategy (climate change flood defence and HGV access),
4. Broadmead Lane (climate change flood defence and HGV access), and
5. Extension of the Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

We support the need for collective accountability to resolve the infrastructure and access needs of Somerdale, Broadmead Peninsula and Avon Valley in order that wider benefits to the community can be achieved. This is one of four clear requirements of the current Town Plan for Keynsham: 'Ensuring all necessary services and infrastructure are maintained and enhanced'. This is why we clearly support this change to meet the immediate and sustainable needs of Keynsham's infrastructure. The map attached to this response shows that there is definitive need for a joined-up solution that we would welcome.

However, we disagree with presumption made of Arup in their 'Transport Evaluation Report East Keynsham' that "It has been assumed that development north of the A4 will be light industry, with development south of the A4 residential." Arup should not be making presumptions that are subjective and not following due process in such an important consideration of releasing land from the Green Belt.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC128

Plan Ref.: Para 4.14

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC128

Plan Reference: Para 4.14

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We note that B&NES now appears to be content with the idea that only 900 jobs (previously 1,000) are likely to be forthcoming over the period of the plan – a period that is now longer than originally intended. The authority must show a firm, practical and strategic commitment to increasing job opportunities, this includes addressing infrastructure challenges.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Change Ref. SPC129

Plan Ref.: Para 4.15

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 219 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Edward Ware Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 22 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC129

Plan Reference: Para 4.15

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Para 4.15 now states that housing should be 'restrained' in the Somer Valley due to the limited capacity to create new jobs. However, the Inspector has confirmed (ID/28, para 3.63) that the Place Making Plan should positively provide means for identifying sites for employment so that this issue need not restrict the provision of housing. To restrict housing and not meet needs within the Somer Valley is not compliant with the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 821 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Porter**Respondent Organisation:** Cam Valley Wildlife Group**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC129

Plan Reference: Para 4.15

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support: **Change to the policy requested:**

SPC129 seeks not to worsen balance between homes and jobs or exacerbate out- commuting, so seeks economic benefit from new housing. I would like to see this changed to seeking to improve the balance between homes and jobs and decrease out- commuting and seeking economic and other community and environmental benefits from new housing.

Respondent Number: 4664 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Constrat Limited**Agent ID:** 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC129

Plan Reference: Para 4.15

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The broad principles underpinning the proposed change are supported, particularly the omission of proposals to limit development in Paulton.

However our client strongly objects to new references to 'restraining new housing in the Somer Valley' and considers this to be inconsistent with the provisions of the NPPF. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is clear in advocating the presumption in favour of sustainable development and requires LPAs to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area. Therefore instead of restraining new housing in the Somer Valley, the Core Strategy should be proactively seeking to create a better balance between housing and jobs in the area by facilitating more economic growth. Similarly, new housing development has the potential to create critical mass for existing and new services in service centres such as Paulton, thereby increasing employment and maintaining existing jobs where relevant.

The Core Strategy is a long-term strategic plan that extends to 2029. Accordingly it should adopt a long-term view as opposed to becoming overly concerned with the high level of housing commitments in the Somer Valley in 2013 when there is an economic recession. It should adopt a more flexible approach to ensure that the plan is capable of accommodating changes in market trends, economic conditions and social demands. One cannot simply seek to ensure that the settlements in the Somer Valley, particularly Paulton which is identified in paragraph 4.07a of the Composite Core Strategy as one of the largest villages in the area, are self-contained and out-commuting is minimised by limiting the delivery of housing.

Our comments are supported by the written response of Baroness Hanham to the House of Lords on 26 March 2013 (appended to these representations) where she outlined the Government's commitment to delivering rural housing:

"Affordable and accessible rural housing for young people is essential for a vibrant rural economy.

We want to see successful rural businesses and thriving rural communities in a living, working countryside, and housing is an essential part of that vision. We disagree with the suggestion that the children of rural families should be excluded from the countryside."

In addition to our concerns outlined above, we also have the following observations:

- We would like to draw to the Council's and the Inspector's attention minor discrepancies between the wording of the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

proposed change in the schedule of proposed changes (March 2013) and the Composite Core Strategy with the track-changes (March 2013).

•How does the Council intend to 'ensure an economic benefit from new housing' as suggested in the proposed change?

Change to the policy requested:

It is recommended that the change be amended as follows to address our aforementioned concerns:

There is already a significant number of housing commitments (over 2,000) in the Somer Valley and a limited capacity to generate new jobs. The Council will seek to ensure that new housing in the Somer Valley is sustainably located in respect of employment opportunities or employment proposals will therefore be restrained in the interest of sustainability but some additional housing will be needed to meet the District Housing land requirement. The Core Strategy plans for an at least another 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments, estimated capacity on large brownfield sites and windfall sites. And The HDB will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan to facilitate this. However in light of the objective of economic led revitalisation, it is important that the additional housing this does not significantly worsen the balance between homes and jobs and the out-commuting problems and the council may therefore seek to ensure an economic benefit from new housing

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC129

Plan Reference: Para 4.15

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The principle of new housing having to be conditional on additional economic, employment and community benefits again has been deleted. B&NES may argue that the paragraph that replaces it is adequate, but the principle has been lost with a watered down 'the council may therefore seek to ensure an economic benefit from new housing'.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 320 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Jolliffe **Respondent Organisation:** Ammerdown Estate

Agent ID: 45 **Agent Name:** Savills Planning and Regeneration

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC129

Plan Reference: Para 4.15

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support this change as it reflects the overall increase in housing targets, which is needed to meet identified needs.

However, the wording of the plan would benefit from being phrased more positively in order to reflect the NPPF and sustainability considerations.

Change to the policy requested:

We suggest the following modifications to the policy:

1. Make the following deletion in paragraph 4.15 to reflect that, in contrast to what the proposed text implies, housing development is not inherently unsustainable.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

"There is already a significant number of housing commitments in the Somer Valley and a limited capacity to generate new jobs. New housing in the Somer Valley will therefore be restrained in the interest of sustainability but However, some additional housing will be needed to meet the District Housing land requirement. The Core Strategy plans for an 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments, estimated capacity on large brownfield sites and windfall sites.

2. Make the following deletion in paragraph 4.15 because the text is phrased quite negatively, and is unclear as to the meaning of 'economic benefit' associated with housing development.

The HDB will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan to facilitate this. However in light of the objective of economic led revitalisation, it is important that the additional housing this does not significantly worsen the result in an imbalance between homes and jobs. And the out-commuting problems and the council may therefore seek to ensure an economic benefit from new housing.

Respondent Number: 2564 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins **Respondent Organisation:** Strategic Land Partnerships
Agent ID: 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC129 **Plan Reference:** Para 4.15

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We offer our qualified support for the Council's revised Core Strategy approach which seeks to deliver the additional housing that is required to meet the needs of the population and also the affordable housing needs that exist across BANES and particularly within the Somer Valley. However, we object to the housing provision figure that has been chosen because it does not represent a robust assessment of objective need and at the very least should be set out as a minimum requirement on which the five year land supply should be calculated. The inclusion of additional sites within the Core Strategy as identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Housing Trajectory is essential to ensure the delivery of the five year land supply which the Council need to provide. Sites without planning permission cannot be included within the five year land supply. Consequently, without this additional land being provided for within the Core Strategy the Council would not have a robust five year land supply and would be vulnerable to planning applications coming forward, possibly contrary to their preferred strategy.

While we support the Core Strategy plans for 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments, estimated capacity on large brownfield sites and windfall sites, however, this should be expressed as a minimum figure. Policy SV1 (4a) makes a provision for 2,400 homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John. The SHLAA identified 2,100 homes taking into account the existing commitments, likely development on large vacant brownfield sites and an allowance for small windfall developments. Some of these been around for a long time and were allocated to meet the requirements of the previous plan. Therefore in order to provide choice and competition at least 300 dwellings need to be identified to meet the housing requirements. There is no need for this figure to be the upper limit and we consider that it should be a minimum figure to ensure adequate flexibility within the plan.

The Inspector in his note ID28 was highly critical of the SHLAA and the inconsistent treatment of sites outside the development boundaries. He identified at paragraph 3.50 that its assessment of sites "has been heavily influenced by the chosen strategy. Hence a number of sites outside the existing HDB (eg MSN27 and 28) are defined, apparently, as unsuitable primarily for this reason, in the absence of other serious constraints identified in the SHLAA". The SHLAA has therefore been shown to be wrong and the Council now recognise in their consultation leaflet and set out in SPC130 that there is a need to identify sites for 300 additional units for the housing land supply and that "these would all be greenfield sites because brownfield sites have already been exhausted".

It is noted that the housing trajectory identifies only three sites that could provide these houses and we support the inclusion of the site at Fosseyway, Midsomer Norton as one of them. The planning application (12/05546/OUT) for 164 dwellings is being considered by Committee on 8th May, together with the Monger Lane site which is also included within the SHLAA trajectory. The Land at Fosseyway provides a suitable site to meet the needs that exist and makes an essential contribution to the delivery of the five year land supply, which depends on the early release of such sites. It would provide

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

housing which would help to meet the identified shortfall within the district, including the provision of affordable housing and a 60-bed care home, for which there is also an identified acute need.

This approach of providing more deliverable sites is necessary to ensure the adequate provision of a robust five year land supply and is required by the NPPF, which states at paragraph 49 that "housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development" and that "relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year land supply of deliverable

Change to the policy requested:

In order to provide flexibility over the plan period and choice and competition at least 300 dwellings need to be identified to meet the housing requirements. There is no need for this figure to be the upper limit and we consider that it should be a minimum figure to ensure adequate flexibility within the plan.

The Core Strategy should ensure that any reference to development boundaries and their future review in a placemaking plan takes full account of all existing and committed housing sites, as well as those identified in the SHLAA, that offer the potential to meet the housing needs required to deliver a five year land supply.

Respondent Number: 3095 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans

Respondent Organisation: CPRE Avonside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC129

Plan Reference: Para 4.15

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The revised Core Strategy states at 4.15:

"There is already a significant number of housing commitments (over 2,000) in the Somer Valley and a limited capacity to generate new jobs. New housing in the Somer Valley will therefore be restrained in the interest of sustainability but some additional housing will be needed to meet the District housing land requirement. The Core Strategy plans for an 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments and the HDB will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan to facilitate this. However in light of the objective of economic led revitalisation, it is important that the additional housing this does not significantly worsen the balance between homes and jobs and the out-commuting problems and the council may therefore seek to ensure an economic benefit from new housing."

It subsequently states in Policy SV1:

"c: Protect land in existing business use and only allow alternative uses where there is employment benefit or which contributes to improvements to the town centres, consider alternative use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose and does not lead to an unacceptable loss of employment land."

We object to the absence of any clause that would ensure that new greenfield sites are not developed before sites that have already been approved within the current housing boundary are completed.

The Somer Valley currently has an imbalance between housing and employment, as recognised in the Core Strategy:

"4.08 Recent incremental housing development and a decline in the manufacturing sector has led to an imbalance between jobs and homes."

The Vision for the Core Strategy states:

"The southern part of the District will become more self-reliant, facilitated by economic-led revitalisation alongside local energy generation, building on its industrial expertise and improving skill levels."

We see a threat to the delivery of this vision. Sites have already been identified for over 2000 new homes in the area.

These sites are largely brownfield, ex-industrial sites. However, these sites have in large part not yet been developed, because of a combination of factors including the lack of demand for housing locally; static house prices; and the cost of preparing ex-industrial sites for housing development.

The revised Core Strategy states that the Placemaking Plan will review housing boundaries in the Somer Valley to enable the identification of sites for 300 new homes. By necessity, these sites will be green field sites on the edge of towns and villages. Our concern is that these sites will be attractive to developers seeking to build larger detached houses, whose purchasers are likely to commute by car to urban centres. This will not meet local housing needs; it will not aid economic recovery; and it will not deliver the Vision of a more self-reliant area. If green field sites were developed while the

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

brownfield sites that have already been approved lie undeveloped awaiting house price rises, a pattern of 'hollowing out' is likely to emerge, with little regeneration within towns and a car-driven rural commuter culture developing on the periphery of towns and villages.

Change to the policy requested:

We request a change to 4.15 and we suggest wording as follows (our addition in bold):

"There is already a significant number of housing commitments (over 2,000) in the Somer Valley and a limited capacity to generate new jobs. New housing in the Somer Valley will therefore be restrained in the interest of sustainability but some additional housing will be needed to meet the District housing land requirement. The Core Strategy plans for an 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period once the housing sites that have already been committed to have been developed and completed. The HDB will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan to identify safeguarded land for these 300 homes, which will be released for development as part of the Core Strategy review process. However in light of the objective of economic led revitalisation, it is important that the additional housing this does not significantly worsen the balance between homes and jobs and the out-commuting problems and the council may therefore seek to ensure an economic benefit from new housing."

Change Ref. SPC130

Plan Ref.: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 93

Comment Number: 6

Respondent Name: Mrs Jacqui Ashman

Respondent Organisation: Highways Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions . These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements .

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Whilst the Agency would agree that the Somer Valley is relatively unsustainable for new housing we acknowledge the local need to provide it. We note that no specific locations for the additional 300 homes have yet been identified but that it will inevitably increase the amount of out commuting from the area potentially using either the A36 to the east or the M5 to the west. The Agency would welcome the opportunity to comment when specific locations are being identified but would reiterate that any planning applications will need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base to understand the specific impacts of development .

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 219	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: 22 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Edward Ware Homes object to proposed change SPC130 which changes the housing target for the Somer Valley to 2,400 from 2,700. This decrease in the housing target for the Somer Valley appears to be driven entirely by the level of supply now available within the Somer Valley (as identified by the SHLAA 2013) rather than a reflection of need or sustainability. Previously, the Council's SHLAA dated 3rd May 2012 (CD4/H18) identified a supply of 2,744 in the Somer Valley against the target of 2,700 . The latest SHLAA dated March 2013 identifies a supply of 2,395 against the proposed target of 2,400, including 300 units on greenfield land.

The SHLAA supply for the Somer Valley has been reduced as a result of the Inspectors' concern (raised in ID/28) that many sites relied upon by the Council in the Somer Valley were brownfield sites which have complex issues to resolve before they can be delivered.

Given that the Council previously considered the delivery of 2,700 dwellings across the plan period to be a sustainable level of new housing for the Somer Valley there is no reason why the target should be reduced due to a loss of deliverable supply on brownfield sites. The NPPF does not support a sequential preference for brownfield over greenfield sites and the deficit in supply against the 2,700 target can be made up by greenfield sites adjacent to the Housing Development Boundary, as demonstrated by the Council's SHLAA Site Assessments 2013.

The BANES Sustainability Appraisal considers two options for the Somer Valley (300 homes on greenfield sites and 500 homes on greenfield sites) however, this is done as part of a wider scenario in which housing delivery across the whole district is increased. No individual assessment of the capacity and sustainability of the Somer Valley is undertaken. Furthermore, as no up-to-date assessment of housing need within the Somer Valley exists, it is not therefore possible for BANES to fully appraise the sustainability of different rates of delivery within the Somer Valley.

The level of housing proposed for the Somer Valley is therefore unjustified and unsound. To be made sound, a full assessment of housing need and capacity within the Somer Valley must be undertaken. Based upon the submitted Core Strategy, delivery of a minimum of 2,700 homes in the Somer Valley is considered sustainable.

Proposed Change SPC130 also deletes paragraph 4b of Policy SV1 which sought to prevent development outside of the Housing Development Boundary in the Somer Valley. Whilst the removal of this restriction is welcomed, it is considered that a stronger line must be taken by BANES on this matter so as to provide decision makers with a clear indication of how to react to a development proposal (as required by NPPF paragraph 154).

At the Full Council meeting held on 4th March 2013 to discuss the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Members requested that lines 6 and 8 of the Officers Covering Report (Appendix 1) be deleted so as to remove reference to the fact that all new housing sites within the Somer Valley are "highly likely to be greenfield/f. Despite the available evidence, Members are therefore still clearly reluctant to accept development outside of the Housing Development Boundary. In order to provide decision makers with certainty ahead of the Placemaking Plan and be consistent with national policy, Policy SV1 must therefore clearly state that suitable greenfield sites adjacent to the settlement boundary will be acceptable in principle to meet the target for the Somer Valley.

Whilst the SHLAA supply has been revised to remove reliance upon complex brownfield sites, the SHLAA 2013 continues to rely upon a number of outdated and Outline planning permissions which are by no means certain to come forward within the next five years. It is not therefore appropriate to restrain development in the Somer Valley which is genuinely deliverable within next five years on this basis.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 219 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group **Respondent Organisation:** Edward Ware Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 22 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130 **Plan Reference:** Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Proposed Changes SPC129 and SPC130 relate to the housing requirement for the Somer Valley. While we support the decision to allow a review of the Housing Delivery Boundaries (HDBs) of the settlements we are concerned that only 300 dwellings in total are proposed for the higher tier settlements of Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John. This concern relates specifically to our general concern (set out in our response to Proposed Changes SPC14, SPC20 and SPC23) that the overall housing requirement for BANES is not sufficient to meet housing needs.

Change to the policy requested:

In order to meet housing needs in BANES we request that the housing requirement for the higher tier settlements in the Somer Valley (Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John) is increased.

Respondent Number: 821 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Porter **Respondent Organisation:** Cam Valley Wildlife Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130 **Plan Reference:** Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Change to the policy requested:

SPC130 has removal of the reference to contributions to the Midsomer Norton town Park. I would like to see it replaced with contributions to a Town Park/heritage/nature reserve to be set up on the former railway land in Radstock central .

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130 **Plan Reference:** Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

We believe that Radstock Midsomer Norton can take housing growth because they have been allocated housing growth within the Mendip Core Strategy and the rail link has been mothballed between Frome and Radstock and at present is a National Freight Route to Whatley Quarry . It could be reopened to passenger traffic between Radstock, Frome, Westbury, Trowbridge, Melksham and Swindon and Bath to Bristol. There are also good bus links between Bristol and Bath.

Change to the policy requested:

With improved public transport in Radstock and Midsomer Norton by both bus and rail this area could take housing growth and employment as per the Mendip Core Strategy and the West of England such as region policies.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4664 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Constrat Limited**Agent ID:** 158 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The broad principles underpinning the proposed change are supported, particularly the omission of proposals to limit development in Paulton.

However our client strongly objects to new references to ‘restraining new housing in the Somer Valley’ and considers this to be inconsistent with the provisions of the NPPF. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF is clear in advocating the presumption in favour of sustainable development and requires LPAs to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area. Therefore instead of restraining new housing in the Somer Valley, the Core Strategy should be proactively seeking to create a better balance between housing and jobs in the area by facilitating more economic growth. Similarly, new housing development has the potential to create critical mass for existing and new services in service centres such as Paulton, thereby increasing employment and maintaining existing jobs where relevant.

The Core Strategy is a long-term strategic plan that extends to 2029. Accordingly it should adopt a long-term view as opposed to becoming overly concerned with the high level of housing commitments in the Somer Valley in 2013 when there is an economic recession. It should adopt a more flexible approach to ensure that the plan is capable of accommodating changes in market trends, economic conditions and social demands. One cannot simply seek to ensure that the settlements in the Somer Valley, particularly Paulton which is identified in paragraph 4.07a of the Composite Core Strategy as one of the largest villages in the area, are self-contained and out-commuting is minimised by limiting the delivery of housing.

Our comments are supported by the written response of Baroness Hanham to the House of Lords on 26 March 2013 (appended to these representations) where she outlined the Government’s commitment to delivering rural housing:

“Affordable and accessible rural housing for young people is essential for a vibrant rural economy.

We want to see successful rural businesses and thriving rural communities in a living, working countryside, and housing is an essential part of that vision. We disagree with the suggestion that the children of rural families should be excluded from the countryside.”

In addition to our concerns outlined above, we also have the following observations:

- We would like to draw to the Council’s and the Inspector’s attention minor discrepancies between the wording of the proposed change in the schedule of proposed changes (March 2013) and the Composite Core Strategy with the track-changes (March 2013).
- How does the Council intend to ‘ensure an economic benefit from new housing’ as suggested in the proposed change?

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on new development locations**Respondent Number:** 234 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd**Agent ID:** 27 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Housing Requirement

Other representations submitted on behalf of Taylor Wimpey demonstrate that the Core Strategy continues to fail to meet the full, objectively assessed residential needs of the area. Taylor Wimpey instructed consultants to review this need using PopGroup modelling. This concluded that the current approach of the Core Strategy would result in a substantial un-met need of up to 6,500 dwellings in the period to 2031 and that the true need for BANES was up to 1,030 dwellings per annum. Taylor Wimpey therefore considers that there is a need to substantially increase the level of new housing identified in the Core Strategy and that the Somer Valley represents an opportunity for doing so. This includes the land at Monger Lane, Midsomer Norton which lies outside of the Green Belt and has been demonstrated by both the SHLAA and the planning application to be an appropriate and sustainable site for development.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 226**Comment Number:** 1**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Radstock Action Group had hoped that the Core Strategy would provide a vision for the economic, social and cultural development of the area covered by Bath and North East Somerset. However, the amendments and modifications to the Core Strategy reveal even further the weakness of the authority's commitment to anything other than preserving Bath, no matter what the cost to the whole area. Whilst we entirely recognize and are proud of the history of the city, we want to underline the fact that it developed through the creative and industrious efforts of many generations, the earliest visible remains of which were left by the Romans and earlier communities. The surrounding areas bear witness to the extensive prehistoric and historic heritage which the area enjoys and which should certainly contribute to the ongoing prosperity of the area. It is a matter of considerable concern that plans to preserve Bath point to a lack of joined up thinking about how the city relates to its 'hinterland'. It should also be noted that since the start of the Core Strategy hearings, English Heritage has delivered another damning report through the latest Heritage At Risk Register (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/heritage-at-risk/>) which details much of the local heritage, including Radstock, as in very bad condition and deteriorating. This is not reassuring for an authority charged with the care of so many important heritage sites, including a WHS.

A reading of the amendments, whilst apparently addressing the housing concerns of the Inspector, reveals the addition of many phrases suggestive of a plan which meets the economic, environmental and cultural requirements placed on any responsible local authority. Nothing could be further from the truth. The authority has failed to present any evidence that it is aware of and addressing the overall needs of the whole area for which they are responsible. Much of the area is in serious and urgent need of regeneration which the Authority appears to be unable to back up with an imaginative and coherent set of strategic proposals.

Persistent references to lack of infrastructure display the authority's apparent incapacity to understand that its role must improve the strategic management of development at a strategic level. Overwhelming complacency and Bath-centric thinking in the strategy as amended makes depressing reading, with a lack of ideas about how the authority can address key economic, social and cultural issues.

Whilst an apparent decrease in the number of homes (2,700 down to 2,400) would suggest less pressure on the area of Radstock and the whole Somer Valley, it is matched by a decline in the number of jobs (1,000 to 900) keeping the number of homes for each job created at between 2.6 and 3 – a manifestly unsatisfactory proposal for an area already suffering from poor housing and an urgent need for regeneration. This should not be a matter of concern solely for those who live

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

in the area but for the whole authority which requires an integrated and constructive plan which pulls together the strengths and needs of all the communities involved. This strategy cannot work without serious attempts to revitalize business and industry.

Time does not permit the close examination of all the amendments but Radstock Action Group wishes to highlight some of the concerns which are uppermost in our minds as people who care about the whole area and wish to be part of a comprehensive and integrated plan for the overall development of all the communities for the next 15 – 20 years. All page references in the following table are to the amendments document as published by B&NES on its website [http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core Strategy/ProposedChanges/scspc_schedule.pdf](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Core%20Strategy/ProposedChanges/scspc_schedule.pdf).

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Deletion of 'only allow alternative uses where there is employment benefit or which contributes to improvements to the town centres' replaced with a much weaker statement which diminishes the responsibility of the authority to actually DO anything.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 234 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Agent ID: 27 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC130

Notwithstanding the issues raised above, SPC 130 appears to show a reduction of 300 dwellings (from 2,700 to 2,400) rather than the claimed increase. This is confusing and needs clarification.

It is, therefore far from clear that the Core Strategy is actually promoting addition growth in real terms for the Somer Valley. Likewise, there is little justification as to why 300 dwellings has been chosen as the appropriate figure rather than, say 500 dwellings, given the findings of the SHLAA. This lack of detail is especially concerning given the acknowledgement in the SPC that development here can assist in meeting the District Housing Requirement.

Finally, the Core Strategy takes an inconsistent approach to the Somer Valley when compared to, for example, Keynsham. In the latter, the Core Strategy identifies those locations where development is anticipated to come forward subject to confirmation in the Placemaking Plan. No such guidance is present for the Somer Valley meaning that there is no certainty where the "additional" 300 dwellings will be found. It should be noted that sites such as the land at Monger Lane are not subject to the same level of constraint, especially in terms of Green belt as those at Keynsham.

We there suggest that a consistent approach be applied and that specific sites are identified in the Somer Valley including the land at monger Lane, Midsomer Norton.

For the reasons set out above, we do not consider that the Core Strategy for the following reasons:

1. It is not positively prepare in that it does not seek to meet objectively assessed needs

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

2. It is not justified in that it does not promote the most appropriate strategy
3. It will not be effective in that it is unlikely to be deliverable as envisaged by the Council
4. It is not consistent with National Policy in the form of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson

Respondent Organisation: Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Curo support the identification of new houses within the Somer Valley area. However, the strategy appears to be over reliant on the release of large brownfield sites to facilitate the total growth projections.

Curo consider that the over reliance of large brownfield sites in the Somer Valley has to be questioned in terms of future delivery rates. There is no mechanism in the Core Strategy to review this if delivery rates do not materialise.

Change to the policy requested:

Curo suggest that either the delivery rates are reviewed in the preparation of the Place Making DPD or greenfield Reserve Sites are identified in the Somer Valley area in the event that insufficient new housing is delivered from these large brownfield sites. The formal identification of Reserve Sites can take place in the preparation of the Place Making DPD. However, an acceptance of this principle should be established with the Core Strategy under Policy SV1. The housing delivery strategy to be sufficiently flexible needs to have a robust implementation mechanism to deal with future situations. Ultimately this will assist with the increased provision of affordable housing.

Respondent Number: 320 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Jolliffe

Respondent Organisation: Ammerdown Estate

Agent ID: 45 **Agent Name:** Savills Planning and Regeneration

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We support this change as it reflects the overall increase in housing targets, which is needed to meet identified needs. However, the wording would benefit from a slight modification in order to provide consistency with the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Make the following change to policy SV1:

a: Review the HDBs to enable around at least 2,400 new homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John. This will include affordable housing, providing more choices of housing to meet the needs of the local communities.

This is consistent with the approach of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy, where the Inspector concluded that targets should represent “a floor, not a ceiling”, to accord with the NPPF.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 2564 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Simon Steel-Perkins**Respondent Organisation:** Strategic Land Partnerships**Agent ID:** 159 **Agent Name:** Peter Brett Associates**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

While we support the Core Strategy plans for 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments, estimated capacity on large brownfield sites and windfall sites, however, this should be expressed as a minimum figure. Policy SV1 (4a) makes a provision for 2,400 homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John. The SHLAA identified 2,100 homes taking into account the existing commitments, likely development on large vacant brownfield sites and an allowance for small windfall developments. Some of these been around for a long time and were allocated to meet the requirements of the previous plan. Therefore in order to provide choice and competition at least 300 dwellings need to be identified to meet the housing requirements. There is no need for this figure to be the upper limit and we consider that it should be a minimum figure to ensure adequate flexibility within the plan.

The Inspector in his note ID28 was highly critical of the SHLAA and the inconsistent treatment of sites outside the development boundaries. He identified at paragraph 3.50 that its assessment of sites "has been heavily influenced by the chosen strategy. Hence a number of sites outside the existing HDB (eg MSN27 and 28) are defined, apparently, as unsuitable primarily for this reason, in the absence of other serious constraints identified in the SHLAA". The SHLAA has therefore been shown to be wrong and the Council now recognise in their consultation leaflet and set out in SPC130 that there is a need to identify sites for 300 additional units for the housing land supply and that "these would all be greenfield sites because brownfield sites have already been exhausted".

It is noted that the housing trajectory identifies only three sites that could provide these houses and we support the inclusion of the site at Fosseyway, Midsomer Norton as one of them. The planning application (12/05546/OUT) for 164 dwellings is being considered by Committee on 8th May, together with the Monger Lane site which is also included within the SHLAA trajectory. The Land at Fosseyway provides a suitable site to meet the needs that exist and makes an essential contribution to the delivery of the five year land supply, which depends on the early release of such sites. It would provide housing which would help to meet the identified shortfall within the district, including the provision of affordable housing and a 60-bed care home, for which there is also an identified acute need.

This approach of providing more deliverable sites is necessary to ensure the adequate provision of a robust five year land supply and is required by the NPPF, which states at paragraph 49 that "housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development" and that "relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year land supply of deliverable housing".

Change to the policy requested:

In order to provide flexibility over the plan period and choice and competition at least 300 dwellings need to be identified to meet the housing requirements. There is no need for this figure to be the upper limit and we consider that it should be a minimum figure to ensure adequate flexibility within the plan.

The Core Strategy should ensure that any reference to development boundaries and their future review in a placemaking plan takes full account of all existing and committed housing sites, as well as those identified in the SHLAA, that offer the potential to meet the housing needs required to deliver a five year land supply.

Respondent Number: 4452 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Property Development Company**Agent ID:** 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The representations on behalf of the Property Development Company to SPC 129 and 130 are primarily concerned with the Proposed Change:

“The Core Strategy plans for 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments and the HBD will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan to facilitate this.”

Paragraph 4.15 also has a reference to the:

“significant number of housing commitments (over 2,000) in the Somer Valley and the limited capacity to create new jobs.” It is considered that these Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy have failed to address the Inspector’s issues raised in ID/28 at paragraphs 3.48-3.64 particularly. In addition, the Proposed Changes are considered to be unsound for the following reasons.

1. It is believed the Council’s statement that there is a commitment for 2,000 dwellings in the Somer Valley is an overestimate in that some of the sites included do not meet the tests for “deliverable” as set out in the NPPF at footnote 11. They have been carried forward as BANES Local Plan allocations from 2007 which, given that they have not been brought forward during the Local Plan period, cannot be considered as either available or ongoing commitments.
2. It is believed that this portrayal of the level of existing commitments serves to illustrate the inadequate focus given by the Council in general to this part of the district in their responses to the Inspector’s concerns and in drafting the Proposed Changes. Whilst it is accepted that careful attention had to be given to the major growth areas at Bath and Keynsham, doing this at the expense of proper consideration of Somer Valley and the rural areas is not justified. It has resulted in an inadequate assessment of the respective sustainability of locating further housing and employment development in the Somer Valley.
3. Housing development in the Somer Valley has the advantage of not requiring any Green Belt amendments, compared with the major incursions proposed at Keynsham and Bath where the Green Belt is at its narrowest and most vulnerable in terms of seeking to maintain the separate identities of the settlements of Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath. With the March 2013 Proposed Changes there will be virtually wholesale erosion and convergence of Bristol with Keynsham and Keynsham with Saltford.
4. On the other hand the remarkably low number of proposed additional sites in the Somer Valley to yield just 300 units over an 18 year period, a rate of just 16 additional units per year, is a particularly low level of housing development, especially considering the number of potential sites identified in the SHLAA study. In addition, it is believed that the Midsomer Norton/Radstock urban area is as large as Keynsham so that more careful consideration should have been given to promoting a greater level of growth in these areas.
5. It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy should not be concerned with site specifics, although it does do so for many sites in Bath. Taking RAD17 as an example however, it has been identified in the SHLAA as available, achievable and without any constraints. It has an identified housing potential of about 40, which would in itself represent more than the two year housing development figure for the whole of the Somer Valley, including Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Paulton and Peasedown St John. The proposed low level of additional growth is not a sound or sustainable strategic policy for this part of the district.
6. The Proposed Changes and the original Core Strategy argue that additional housing in the Somer Valley would not be appropriate because of the low potential for job creation and the effect on out-commuting. Nowhere however, in the Core Strategy is the respective level of out-commuting from Bath, which is currently 30% of all employment for Bath’s residents, raised as a reason not to provide significant additional housing in Bath (Bath Strategic Issue 7). This level of out-commuting is a higher actual number than from Midsomer Norton given their respective sizes. The fact that there are a significant number of jobs attracting in-commuting to Bath should not be used as a balancing argument, quite the opposite in fact, since sustainability is concerned with reducing overall journey distances not cancelling them out. In this regard also therefore, the very low level of additional housing development proposed in the Somer Valley compared with that for Bath

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

and Keynsham, is considered to be unsound and unsustainable.

7. The Council has also used the argument of absence of infrastructure serving the Somer Valley, particularly in terms of sustainable transport (para 1.29). However the Council have been happy to rely upon improved bus, cycle and pedestrian links to enable the proposed major development at the MOD sites to be rendered sustainable development in relation to Bath city centre. There is similarly no reason why the already good bus service linking Radstock with Peasedown St John and Bath could not be similarly extended. In addition there is the Park & Ride at Odd Down and the ongoing opening up of off-road cycle routes, including most recently the opening of the Two Tunnels between Monkton Combe and Bath city centre. The Core Strategy is therefore deemed to be inconsistent and unsound in relation to how improved bus and cycle links can and should be used to ensure the sustainability of location of development.

8. The Council's Core Strategy paints a very bleak picture for the prospects of employment development in the Somer Valley. It makes no reference to the scale of job creation of Bath Business Park during the period of the Bath Local Plan, or to the success of numerous other small scale business parks in recent years. The numbers employed in the rural areas and the Somer Valley continue to make a significant contribution towards the overall local economy of BANES and appropriate credit should be given. These jobs are not generally in the traditional manufacturing sector, but they offer a wider range of job opportunities which should be acknowledged and more expressly supported. The Core Strategy instead, by playing down this job creation, uses it as an argument further to reduce the appropriate level of housing development in the Somer Valley, in my view quite incorrectly, especially given the resultant scale of development which then needs to be accommodated elsewhere and less sustainably in the district.

9. It is an economic fact that housing development in itself is a major job creator with a very effective job multiplier effect. This should be factored in especially when considering a community such as Midsomer Norton with its established manufacturing and technical skills base which is more readily adapted to the construction industry than in other parts of the district where jobs have been lost in more in the service and public sector areas.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4452	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Property Development Company
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The representations on behalf of the Property Development Company to SPC 129 and 130 are primarily concerned with the Proposed Change:

“The Core Strategy plans for 300 homes to come forward in the Plan period in addition to existing commitments and the HBD will be reviewed in the Placemaking Plan to facilitate this.”

Paragraph 4.15 also has a reference to the:

“significant number of housing commitments (over 2,000) in the Somer Valley and the limited capacity to create new jobs.” It is considered that these Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy have failed to address the Inspector's issues raised in ID/28 at paragraphs 3.48-3.64 particularly. In addition, the Proposed Changes are considered to be unsound for the following reasons.

1. It is believed the Council's statement that there is a commitment for 2,000 dwellings in the Somer Valley is an overestimate in that some of the sites included do not meet the tests for “deliverable” as set out in the NPPF at footnote 11. They have been carried forward as BANES Local Plan allocations from 2007 which, given that they have not been brought forward during the Local Plan period, cannot be considered as either available or ongoing commitments.

2. It is believed that this portrayal of the level of existing commitments serves to illustrate the inadequate focus given by the Council in general to this part of the district in their responses to the Inspector's concerns and in drafting the Proposed Changes. Whilst it is accepted that careful attention had to be given to the major growth areas at Bath and Keynsham, doing this at the expense of proper consideration of Somer Valley and the rural areas is not justified. It has resulted in an inadequate assessment of the respective sustainability of locating further housing and employment development in the Somer Valley.
3. Housing development in the Somer Valley has the advantage of not requiring any Green Belt amendments, compared with the major incursions proposed at Keynsham and Bath where the Green Belt is at its narrowest and most vulnerable in terms of seeking to maintain the separate identities of the settlements of Bristol, Keynsham, Saltford and Bath. With the March 2013 Proposed Changes there will be virtually wholesale erosion and convergence of Bristol with Keynsham and Keynsham with Saltford.
4. On the other hand the remarkably low number of proposed additional sites in the Somer Valley to yield just 300 units over an 18 year period, a rate of just 16 additional units per year, is a particularly low level of housing development, especially considering the number of potential sites identified in the SHLAA study. In addition, it is believed that the Midsomer Norton/Radstock urban area is as large as Keynsham so that more careful consideration should have been given to promoting a greater level of growth in these areas.
5. It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy should not be concerned with site specifics, although it does do so for many sites in Bath. Taking RAD17 as an example however, it has been identified in the SHLAA as available, achievable and without any constraints. It has an identified housing potential of about 40, which would in itself represent more than the two year housing development figure for the whole of the Somer Valley, including Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Paulton and Peasedown St John. The proposed low level of additional growth is not a sound or sustainable strategic policy for this part of the district.
6. The Proposed Changes and the original Core Strategy argue that additional housing in the Somer Valley would not be appropriate because of the low potential for job creation and the effect on out-commuting. Nowhere however, in the Core Strategy is the respective level of out-commuting from Bath, which is currently 30% of all employment for Bath's residents, raised as a reason not to provide significant additional housing in Bath (Bath Strategic Issue 7). This level of out-commuting is a higher actual number than from Midsomer Norton given their respective sizes. The fact that there are a significant number of jobs attracting in-commuting to Bath should not be used as a balancing argument, quite the opposite in fact, since sustainability is concerned with reducing overall journey distances not cancelling them out. In this regard also therefore, the very low level of additional housing development proposed in the Somer Valley compared with that for Bath and Keynsham, is considered to be unsound and unsustainable.
7. The Council has also used the argument of absence of infrastructure serving the Somer Valley, particularly in terms of sustainable transport (para 1.29). However the Council have been happy to rely upon improved bus, cycle and pedestrian links to enable the proposed major development at the MOD sites to be rendered sustainable development in relation to Bath city centre. There is similarly no reason why the already good bus service linking Radstock with Peasedown St John and Bath could not be similarly extended. In addition there is the Park & Ride at Odd Down and the ongoing opening up of off-road cycle routes, including most recently the opening of the Two Tunnels between Monkton Combe and Bath city centre. The Core Strategy is therefore deemed to be inconsistent and unsound in relation to how improved bus and cycle links can and should be used to ensure the sustainability of location of development.
8. The Council's Core Strategy paints a very bleak picture for the prospects of employment development in the Somer Valley. It makes no reference to the scale of job creation of Bath Business Park during the period of the Bath Local Plan, or to the success of numerous other small scale business parks in recent years. The numbers employed in the rural areas and the Somer Valley continue to make a significant contribution towards the overall local economy of BANES and appropriate credit should be given. These jobs are not generally in the traditional manufacturing sector, but they offer a wider range of job opportunities which should be acknowledged and more expressly supported. The Core Strategy instead, by playing down this job creation, uses it as an argument further to reduce the appropriate level of housing development in the Somer Valley, in my view quite incorrectly, especially given the resultant scale of development which then needs to be accommodated elsewhere and less sustainably in the district.
9. It is an economic fact that housing development in itself is a major job creator with a very effective job multiplier effect.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

This should be factored in especially when considering a community such as Midsomer Norton with its established manufacturing and technical skills base which is more readily adapted to the construction industry than in other parts of the district where jobs have been lost in more in the service and public sector areas.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy SC1 (3) – (4) should be amended to increase the net additional jobs in the Somer Valley during the Core Strategy period.

The capacity for housing development should be re-visited and the figure of 300 homes in addition to existing commitments should be increased. A better balance of housing should be achieved between the major urban areas of Bath, Keynsham and Norton Radstock.

There should be a fuller and more careful examination of the “existing commitments”, only including those which can properly be classified as deliverable.

For the avoidance of doubt, the representations welcome the proposed change to review Housing Development Boundaries to accommodate the additional homes in accordance with the Inspector’s concerns recorded in ID/28.

Respondent Number: 4746	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Terrace Hill (Midsomer) Limited
--------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: 154 **Agent Name:** Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC130

Plan Reference: Policy SV1 (3) – (4)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

On the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy 2013

We write on behalf of our client, Terrace Hill (Midsomer) Ltd, to submit representations to the above document. In mid 2012 Terrace Hill contracted to purchase the Welton Bibby and Baron factory (the WBB site) within Midsomer Norton and are progressing proposals for a mixed use development encompassing a foodstore and residential development. A planning application for this development will be submitted within the next few months.

Scope of Representations

We note at the outset that comments are only sought on the proposed changes "which have not all ready been the subject of consultation" and we have limited our comments to these parts of the document (Terrace Hill were not involved in earlier iterations of the Core Strategy given their relatively recent contractual position on the WBB site).

Furthermore we note that Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) will be preparing the Placemaking Plan "(part 2) of the Local Plan" (para 1.05) which will cover site allocations, detailed development management policies as well as local designations. Subject to the timing of the preparation of the Placemaking Plan our clients anticipate submitting representations to this in respect of the WBB site.

Whilst we comment below on elements of the planning policy framework relating to the Somer Valley our main concern relates to the conclusions drawn by BANES in relation to the WBB site within the BANES SHLAA Finding Report 2013 and the implications that these have for the Local Plan housing strategy (including the assertion at para 1.19- see below). The requirement for BANES "to establish realistic assumptions" (NPPF para 159) about housing land deliverability is of particular importance as a key reason that the Core Strategy Inquiry was suspended in 2012 was the Inspectors conclusion that the "plan should be amended to facilitate more housing than currently planned and/or to enable some of the planned housing to be delivered sooner" (ID/29 para 5).

Bath and North East Somerset SHLAA Findings Report 2013

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Whilst the SHLAA is not subject to public consultation we are concerned that its analysis of the WBB site (no. MSN 9) is insufficiently robust to reach the conclusion that the site is capable of accommodating 150 dwellings and accordingly brings into doubt the assertion within the draft Core Strategy (para 1.19) that "a detailed assessment [that] has been undertaken of the capacity of the District's settlements for delivery of new housing jobs and community facilities." A brief chronology of the sites assessment within the SHLAA is that;

- The site is allocated within the 2007 Local Plan (Policy GDS.1/NR15) for mixed use residential and business uses to include about 100 dwellings
- NLP submitted representations to the updated SHLAA in late 2012 highlighting the scope for the WBB site to accommodate between 60 - 100 residential units. This figure was on the basis of masterplanning work that our client has undertaken as well the need for a mix of uses to maximise the economic and employment benefits arising and the need, in replacing an existing employment use, to create a sustainable balance between housing and employment within the town.
- The SHLAA 2013 does not appear to have had regard to our representations but conversely has increased the forecast residential yield from 100 to 150. The sole explanation for a potential increase in yield is that "if the present occupier were to relocate the housing potential would increase to c.150." However this conclusion both fails to have regard to both the masterplanning work undertaken by our client and risks prejudging the subsequent recognition within the SHLAA that there will be a need for an "employment land assessment to ascertain mix of uses for redevelopment of site" (and we expand upon this below).

Whilst we recognise that the appropriate mix of residential and other employment generating uses (including retail development) will be a matter for the planning application process (and depending on timing potentially the forthcoming Placemaking Plan) we are concerned that the analysis within the 2013 SHLAA is not underpinned by any evidence that the housing yield from the site can increase by 50 %from 100 units to 150 units.

Furthermore, and as acknowledged within the SHLAA analysis itself, a key consideration to the appropriate housing yield will be the need to balance additional residential development with other uses both on the WBB site and within the Somer Valley generally. The need for such a balance is consistent with a raft of policy including:

- The recognition within the NPPF (para 37) that "planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths;" and at a more local level
- Other elements of the emerging Core Strategy including Objective 5 "enabling the delivery of new homes needed to respond to expected demographic and social changes and as far as possible to support the labour supply to meet our economic development objectives ; " and
- The recognition (para 1.29) that "there is significant net out-commuting from the Somer Valley due to lack of available jobs ...[the strategy] seeks to facilitate economic-led regeneration enabling job growth in the area." Specifically, in relation to Midsomer Norton, the Core Strategy recognises (para 4.15) that "it is important that the additional housing this [sic] does not significantly worsen the balance between homes and jobs and the out-commuting problems"

Conclusions

In essence therefore we do not consider that the assertion within the Core Strategy (para 1.19) that a detailed assessment of the capacity for housing delivery is consistent with our concerns relating to the assessment of the WBB site within the 2013 SHLAA. Whilst we recognise that our concerns in relation to this will need to be addressed within the development management context (and potentially through the evolution of the Placemaking Plan) it will be important that the wider SHLAA

is considered robust to ensure that the Core Strategy incorporates appropriate assumptions about the delivery of housing sites for it to be considered "sound."

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC132

Plan Ref.: Policy SV3

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 821 Comment Number: 1 Respondent Name: Mrs Deborah Porter Respondent Organisation: Cam Valley Wildlife Group

Agent ID: Agent Name:

Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment?

Change Reference: SPC132

Plan Reference: Policy SV3

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Placemaking Plans, and Neighbourhood Plans that sit within them, should be fundamentally sustainable in nature and should embrace the aspirations and local knowledge of local people about the place where they live. The Government and B&NES Planning Policy department recognises that it is important that they are developed by the community and based on local evidence. B&NES says that the Core Strategy and the Placemaking Plans are two parts of the one thing (Change ref SPC0) and yet the Core Strategy is fundamentally undermining the Placemaking and local planning element of this planning process before it even gets off the ground.

It has not been shown how sustainability can be achieved. B&NES is now seeking not to exacerbate the jobs/homes balance and out-commuting in the Somer Valley area, (SPC 129), but has removed the specified number from policy SV3 and stipulated that housing must be part of mixed use developments in Radstock centre (SPC 132). This has worrying implications for the level of out-commuting from Radstock itself and suggests a strategic approach that requires an even higher number of houses than originally proposed for the Radstock area through changes to the HDB. One of these mixed use sites is RAD.1. There is no local evidence or aspiration that points to the best use of Radstock Railway Land as a site where the majority of the land that has alternative value than residential is targeted for housing. Past evidence shows the opposite to be true. The essential elements of place-making are delivery of the right kind of development in the right places to suit local needs, protection of valued assets, and delivery of a high level of certainty to developers. It cannot be shown how these can be adequately incorporated and the history of the pivotal RAD.1 site does not inspire confidence about delivery. Delivery of RAD 1 (which B&NES is promoting) as a mixed use development site with 210 dwellings in Radstock central runs contrary to the addition made to to policy DW1 (SPC25), to the changes set out in SPC 149 and SPC 168, and to NPPF policies 17, 109, 110, 111, 114, 117 and 118. NPPF policies 6 & 7 make it plain that sustainable development is not just about the economy and carbon emissions.

B&NES takes the view that the Placemaking plan and the Core Strategy are two parts of a whole (SPC0). The approach B&NES sets out through the changes specified in SPC 17 (economic-led regeneration) and SPC 132 seeks to undermine the one by putting in place the other first in a way that rules out Radstock development outside a hackneyed development scenario that has failed again and again. It rules out best value and sensible application of NPPF policy in a sustainable framework in the interests of the existing population and the District. Development in Radstock remains concentrated in the centre, retained in the changed text set out in SPC 17. In retaining "The focus for change will be in the town centres and on vacant and under-used sites but some development on new green field locations will be required to meet housing needs" and emphasising the economy-led nature of development, the Core Strategy seeks to direct economy-orientated development to RAD.1, which could be viewed as site-specific. The imposition this rigid development framework without sufficient safeguards constrains future neighbourhood planning within a predetermined B&NES vision for Radstock that is based substantially on non-planning criteria - i.e. the corporate and political interests of B&NES.

If there was a presumption by B&NES that best use of Radstock Railway Land is to utilise its high community and biodiversity value and transport potential, including provision of a Town Park of distinction and quality, instead of providing housing, the Local Authority may argue that the 'lost' housing allocation would have to be accommodated elsewhere, which could affect the housing boundary, but given the scale of the present imbalance between homes and jobs, loss of the allocation to Radstock centre could be said to have a beneficial effect in this respect.

The proposed focus on Town Centre development in Radstock, in the light of the limited land availability envisaged over the Core Strategy in the centre and in conjunction with the proposal to expand the housing boundary, suggests maximising

housing delivery in central Radstock and includes dependence on the delivery of 210 houses on RAD.1. This causes the loss of the potential alternative valuable contribution that the site could make in the context of places and spaces to deliver B&NES' Core Strategy in the Somer Valley area. NPPF policy 73 emphasises the importance of access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for recreation to support the health and wellbeing of communities. The changes to the plan suggest that Radstock will see a substantial percentage rise in housing numbers through mixed developments - the retention of high quality green space is even more important in this context.

B&NES has now dropped the pretence of independent community-led development on the former railway land and adjacent greenfield land. The Leader of B&NES Council, Cllr Crossley, is now Chair of NRR and a B&NES officer informed Radstock Town Council on 25th April 2013 that there would be 210 houses on the RAD.1 site with a stronger emphasis on family homes. This emphasis seems misplaced in a time when people are being encouraged to downsize and the need for housing for single people and couples is so high. The plan to deliver a larger number of family homes within the same approximate dwelling total (B&NES presentation to Town Council of 25th April 2103) suggests even greater nature conservation losses and impact. Cllr Crossley, in that presentation to Radstock Town Council, suggested that B&NES, NRR and Linden Homes had no intention to use the alternative use scenario as a comparator for planning purposes (only the do-nothing scenario in the context of biodiversity value/loss over time was used last time as a comparator to determine the benefit/disbenefit calculation). This was subsequently confirmed by Cllr Dando, long-term board member of NRR, at the Radstock Town Council meeting of 7th May. Cllr Dando stated categorically that Cllr Crossley's answer to the question of whether the community value associated with alternative use would be assessed and used as a comparator was, "No". As a board member, Cllr Dando would be expected to know the intentions of the developer and its partners.

The policy to focus on Town Centre development in Radstock without specified housing numbers and without any caveats regarding safeguarding biodiversity value and Town Centre green space in Policy SV1 undermines the Placemaking and Neighbourhood Planning processes. It does this by sending the message out to local people that alternative use of the site than that envisaged by B&NES is not an option, which has the effect of skewing the community's aspirations away from that use. This is in B&NES corporate interests, as it wants to claw back money used in the past to promote the scheme, but does not support community-led sustainable planning objectives or promote localism, the principle of which is enshrined in the Localism Bill and supported in Government Departmental planning publications.

The Department of Communities and Local Government publication, Supporting Communities and Neighbourhoods in Planning - Prospectus, Jan 2011, page 17 sets out what policies in a Neighbourhood Development Plan could cover, and refers to the role of the neighbourhood plan in planning decisions as documents against which traditional planning applications could be judged. The government anticipated that development plan documents prepared by local authorities would be strongly informed by neighbourhood planning initiatives within their areas and this remains the same today.

Policies within a neighbourhood development plan could cover:

- planning objectives for the neighbourhood
- the broad planning context (e.g. transport connections), local facilities, services
- key neighbourhood projects and infrastructure priorities
- development management policies on housing, economic development, environment
- site-specific policies on housing, economic development and environmental issues
- changes in the coverage of some planning designations.

At the B&NES Neighbourhood Planning workshop for councillors on 2nd February 2013, we were told the following:

The Placemaking Plan

The Placemaking Plan is a land use plan that responds pro-actively to the localism agenda, enabling collaboration to provide a range of benefits and opportunities and investing in the future by enabling protection and enhancement of the District; the Localism Act gives new powers to local communities. The Placemaking Plan will be used to determine planning applications. It must be in line with sub-regional policies and plans such as the Local Economic Plan. It must conform with the National Planning Policy Framework and the B&NES strategy. Its focus is on making better places, but in a different way than before. It adds necessary detail to the Core Strategy

The process is about listening to Parish Councils and organisations with an interest. Justification for the plan, for the provision, protection and enhancement of things we value, is an absolute necessity. Development that can also deliver infrastructure is an element. B&NES needs to make sure it has ticked all the boxes and does not slip up. The Planning Inspectorate (the plan Inspector) must find it convincing. Developers are looking for certainty that they can develop what

we say can be developed and that they can deliver the right type and quality of development to suit needs. The certainty that the Placemaking Plan will give to land-use planning will promote progress through providing clarity for communities, B&NES and developers. The delivery of the plan will be linked to funding levels received by B&NES through the CIL and the National Homes Bonus, reflecting the Government's new emphasis of a greater level of funding on the back of development than was previously the case.

The Placemaking Plan provides an opportunity for communities to influence a key policy document. It provides an opportunity to harness B&NES resources, but also to provide resources to B&NES, to aid it in plan creation - it is a two-way street. B&NES recognises that it is difficult to say the right things without good information about our individual areas and that local people know their local communities better than anyone. The better the information B&NES has, the faster the process will go and the more effective it will be in providing good development management and protecting valued assets.

In the context of the Placemaking Plan and Neighbourhood Plans, it is undesirable to have valuable assets or development scenarios removed from the mix ahead of this part of the planning process. The proposals for Midsomer Norton include provision of a substantive Town Park to add to its heritage rail feature and its Nature Reserve. I see no reason why the people of Radstock should not have the opportunity to benefit from similar assets using the former railway land in Radstock and the adjacent greenfield Foxhills field. I believe that Radstock people would welcome the opportunity to work together on creating such a valuable resource.

B&NES is proposing to further increase the population in the Radstock area whilst removing a potential rail link and a community green space resource of importance to any expanding population; further, the land could be developed into an attractive high value resource quite cheaply with the enthusiastic involvement of that population. This lopsided constricting approach makes a mockery of the idea that local people can actually influence development in their area. It attempts to micro-manage the form of the development of Radstock at broad-brush level. B&NES has told the Councillors of the District that that justification for the Neighbourhood Plan is a necessity and that this justification flows from the provision, protection and enhancement of things we value. B&NES stresses the need to provide certainty to developers about what can and cannot be developed, yet is proposing to impose the same Town Centre Development-orientated framework that has failed to be delivered since the outline permission for mixed development granted in 1995. It is time to change tack.

Deliverability and Developer certainty

Deliverability and developer certainty are key elements of strategic planning.

RAD.1 has the hallmarks of an undevelopable site and so should be removed from the built development framework. It is important to note that no developer so far has shown

how adequate mitigation can be delivered for nature conservation losses, or with regard

to the impact on commuting bats between SACs, local roosts and the only known mixing site for bats from the Bath & Bradford on Avon SAC and the Mells Valley SAC.

The Planning Inspectorate in 2002 justified limited development on this site only; the assumption of developability hinged entirely on the fact that there was a development partner in place, the Inspector concluding that this fact indicated that development was, therefore, viable. No development has taken place; the application by this new development partner, to extend the time that the outline permission ran for, was backed up with only the most cursory and inadequate amount of supporting documentation and was not progressed, indicating that this was merely a mechanism to keep the application 'live' rather than an indication that the development was deliverable.

This mechanism allowed the Council to justify passing road orders to allow it to independently pursue the building of the road to serve the development, serving to bring down the cost to the developer. However, despite funding being secured from the HCA and B&NES' contribution budgeted for, and the removal of the Queen Victoria Jubilee Oak to allow the works to take place, the road was not built. No analysis of the impact of the road lighting on bat commuting was undertaken and a road safety audit was not done. Again, this does not suggest any level of certainty over delivery. Neither did the new development partner apply for modification of the conditions of the outline consent to support extension of the outline consent and the two reserved matters consents. Neither did the new developer submit a further application for development.

It was not shown how delivery of the third phase of development could be achieved within the constraints necessary to ensure dark conditions in the flight lines for commuting bats to SACs and to the key mixing area for bats from the two SACs kilometres from the site (for flight lines, see mapping below). It was not shown how the three tests for a licence from Natural England can be met; the information provided with the planning applications so far have not established a level of

public interest that could override the interests of bats in this case. The flight lines for Greater horseshoe and Lesser horseshoe bats within the site are shown on the mapping below (please note that the UK BAP Priority hHbitat mapping has since been updated).

The above account indicates a struggling attempt to develop this land, in which those involved do not have real confidence regarding deliverability. Whilst it is difficult to see how the corporate and political interests of B&NES would be deemed to equate with high public interest for the purposes of grant of a licence to harm protected species (bats), it is easy to see why the Authority and the company given the task of driving delivery of this project and securing the value of council-owned assets in the interests of the Authority, NRR, would press forward. Linden Homes has obviously minimised input into the process so far and appears to have only a speculative interest. The failure to progress the application to extend the outline consent, the failure to put forward a new application, the failure to address the matter of impact of lighting on bats from lighting and traffic on the permitted road across the site, the failure to produce any light contour mapping, the failure to undertake a road safety audit for either of the two different road schemes permitted since 2008, and the failure to uphold the conditions of the outline consent regarding pre-development habitat management strongly suggest that neither the Council, the landowner nor the developer are able to deliver a development upon this site. The Council would not want to admit that it was wrong to pursue development in this location, but the benefits have been largely theoretical. The losses are actual. The failure of successive proposals to deliver adequate mitigation or compensation suggests that applying NPPF policy 118 to any further application (there are no current applications) would result in refusal. The evidence that satisfaction of other NPPF policies would lead on balance to a decision in favour is thin at best.

Conflict with the Green Infrastructure Strategy

The GIS had not been worked up when the Core Strategy went to Inquiry, so is new information. The GIS and GSS point to low quality publicly accessible natural green space provision in the Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton area.

The former railway land in Radstock is identified within the Ecosystem Services mapping (Map 5) in the new B&NES Green Infrastructure Strategy as an area of significant valuable habitat. Its value is important in a national context and is augmented by the high value further attributed to it through the species it supports. It clearly falls into the category of a protected valued asset which B&NES has told Parish councillors it wants to be effective in protecting, yet the threat to it from development is preventing its use as a valuable part of the ecological network and strategy to protect and restore ecosystem, an essential element of the UK strategy regarding biodiversity conservation, restoration and enhancement, and the benefits that are associated with it. A look at the mapping will reveal its strategic importance at the hub of a network of habitats and its importance in the development of cross-boundary ecological strategies, particularly with Mendip to the South-east, which is supported by NPPF policy 117.

Figure: GIS Ecosystem services mapping

It is important that the Ecosystem services priorities, "Work with key partners to agree an "ecosystem position statement" for the district to set out key issues, threats and opportunities", "Promote wiser use and management of natural resources" and "Prioritise green solutions for estimated worth £680m/year development infrastructure" are not compromised by a strategy that encourages the loss of brownfield sites in Radstock, particularly central Radstock. The loss of valuable green infrastructure in and around Radstock will compromise the wealth of benefits to be realised by 2026 in the GIS vision in Section 3 of the GIS. The loss of value caused by development of the former rail land in Radstock guarantees failure to deliver in the Somer Valley area the first element in the list of what the strategy is about, conserving and enhancing the natural environment. This will also apply to B&NES because of loss of such high District value, including local extinctions. It is likely to cause extinction(s) in the South West and potentially in the UK.

The GIS endorsed by B&NES supports the retention and utilisation of land of this quality. The GIS sets out the policy context on page 17:

Policy priorities

- Put the value of nature at the heart of decision making
- Deliver through the planning process by integrating green infrastructure principles into the Placemaking Plan and other Local Plan documents
- Influence related Council strategies and work streams
- Deliver the biodiversity requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework

The Core Strategy's policies, and policy SV3 in particular, prevents these priorities from being delivered in Radstock, in the Somer Valley area, and in B&NES. The biodiversity requirements set out in the NPPF cannot be met unless the Core

Strategy is changed. The GIS feeds into the Placemaking Plan and the Core Strategy feeds into the GIS (Diagram 1, page 18, GIS). The strategic development approach in Radstock is out of step with the GIS and the basic tenets set out in the GIS and Government policy regarding the value of green spaces and biodiversity and the central role it is now expected to play in local policy development.

Figure: NRR/Bellway illustrative mapping for 2005 planning application

The former rail/industrial area (above) comprises largely UK BAP priority habitat, Open Mosaic on Post-industrial Land (see mapping below). Other important habitats are the waterway, its corridor, and dense scrub for birds, with the Foxhills field of lesser value beyond the borders of the former railway land, but making a valuable contribution to the resources of the site and hosting a vital commuting and foraging resource for a very impressive number of bat species including both horseshoe species. This Foxhills area is a greenfield site.

The value of the ecological resource is high at local and regional levels. The very high percentage of UK BAP Priority habitat combined with the unusually high percentage of rare and scarce invertebrates, and the presence of a number of UK BAP Priority species of mammal, invertebrate, bird and plant also speak for its significance in a national context. The suite of species that the site supports is important in at least a Regional context and a significant number of individual species are important in a national context. This is all the more remarkable because of the size of the site, which is small in wildlife site terms.

It can be seen by the habitat mapping and the overhead views below that site changes have not diminished this high value. The site was considered as valuable in 2005 as it had been in 1999, at borderline SSSI level.

Figure: Radstock Railway Land - advance of overly-thick alder scrub (blue stripes 2005; black stripes 2011) and removal of scrub by Bellway Homes (orange stripes) superimposed on 2009 UK Biodiversity Action Plan Open Mosaic Priority Habitat mapping (green striped).

Until year 2000 or so, the activities of the North Somerset Railway Company resulted in varying levels of vegetation cover, which effectively managed the nature conservation resource in tandem with heritage railway activities. By 2005, some areas had developed into better habitat than in 1999, whilst some had degraded. The areas that have degraded due to succession between 2005 and 2009 have been compensated for by gains in habitat elsewhere on the site - some through succession and some through pre- development site preparation and works. 2005 is the year of the last comprehensive surveys, which were for the planning application given outline permission in 2008.

There was an increase in the area that qualifies as UK BAP Priority Habitat, Open Mosaic on Post-industrial land, between 2005 and 2011 (see mapping below). There will have been some decrease since 2011 due to further scrub spread. Since 1999 some structures have been removed and areas that were formerly paths and hard standing have been gradually subsumed by the development of thin soil and colonisation by ruderal vegetation, which comprises the development of a valuable ecological resource; on the other hand, some areas have become less valuable due to soil formation and succession of a different nature. The primary site changes that have resulted in degradation are invasion of alder and other scrub, and nutrient enrichment in some of the grassland. However, the loss of woodland edge type habitat seen when the scrub was removed from the triangular areas in the north to prepared for development has effectively been replaced elsewhere on the site through this process of succession. One area in the north has quite recently been stripped completely and dressed with scalplings (not on the overhead views). This area is already regenerating and will form an increasingly valuable ecological resource if allowed to develop.

The changes to the site since 2005 have provided for the continued value of the site in the short, medium and long term. The overhead views also reveal at a glance how different the former railway land habitat on the site is to the much greener looking fields surrounding it, including the Foxhills field outside the rectangular former railway/industrial area at its base, which is of higher biodiversity and nature conservation value.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC132 has removal from SV3 of the specified housing number and has added the stipulation of housing as part of mixed use schemes. I would like to see a caveat that safeguards sites of high environmental and biodiversity value by the addition of "where this does not conflict with delivery of the biodiversity requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework".

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 3006 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Dr Chris Ree**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC134

Plan Reference: Para 5.12

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The wording of the policy is imprecise (e.g 'adequate' and 'urgent' which mitigates against real delivery.

The broadband performance in our area is for most users appalling (0.5-3mb for most) with frequent loss of signal.

Fast, reliable broadband access has become essential for many residents and businesses and is needed for study, work and leisure. An Internet connection enables those with limited access to transport, to shop for food, goods and services. Use of the Internet allows people work remotely from home or to run businesses, which contributes to economic growth, sustainability and rural diversification, and reduces the need to commute into Bristol and Bath on a daily basis

To avoid becoming trapped on the wrong side of the digital divide, it is essential that Superfast broadband is provided to all rural homes and businesses in the same timescale as it being rolled out in the cities of Bristol and Bath, and with comparable performance, both in terms of upload/download speed and reliability.

The Connecting Devon and Somerset Project, part funded by BaNES, will not confirm the timescales for Superfast roll-out to our Parish and will not even confirm whether or not we will ever receive it. For many residents and business it will offer little improvement to the current poor service and our rural communities will become digital backwaters and increasingly shunned as modern life becomes increasingly contingent upon modern effective telecommunications.

Change to the policy requested:

Change from:

The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business

Change to:

Ensuring that all homes and businesses in the rural areas of BaNES are able to access reliable 24 Mbps "Superfast" broadband services by the end of 2014, with an upgrade path to 100 Mbps or higher by the end of 2016.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Respondent Number:** 246 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE**Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC134

Plan Reference: Para 5.12

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The change proposed in section 8 would make the Submitted Core Strategy more effective.

Change to the policy requested:

The wording of the paragraph should be strengthened to read –

"The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with superfast and symmetric access speed, to every home and business."

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 151 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Dunkerton Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

DPC is concerned that the Strategy underplays the vital economic and social enabling roles of high speed broadband in rural communities, and we note with disappointment the poor progress so far reported via BANES on the Connecting Devon and Somerset initiative – an initiative that promises at best moderate improvements to rural broadband provision over an extended, vapid and unambitious timeframe. Dunkerton Parish Council strongly believes that a superfast broadband strategy should be provided by a variety of means including community led initiatives.

Change to the policy requested:

The urgent strategic need to provide reliable superfast rural broadband (i.e. in line with the speed provided in urban areas) through a variety of means including rural community led initiatives resulting in superfast broadband to every home and business.

Respondent Number: 1166 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Kathryn Manchee **Respondent Organisation:** Englishcombe Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

The proposed additional wording in SPC134 – “The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business” is far too generic and contains no statement of the strategic importance of rural broadband nor provides for any measurement metrics. We believe therefore that the Submitted Core Strategy is unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

“That effective broadband access and services are of strategic importance to all households and businesses in the rural communities in North East Somerset. The policy requirement is that of ensuring the ongoing provision of reliable and affordable next generation fibre access at speeds, prices and availability which match those from time to time available in the neighbouring urban centres of both Bristol and Bath.

Respondent Number: 1549 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr J A Harvey **Respondent Organisation:** Stanton Drew Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Concerning SPC 134 Broadband issues;
The community has been asked to comment on changes to the core strategy not just specific development locations, although this has not been made clear in the consultation newspaper.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Stanton Drew Parish Council wishes to object to the usage of the word 'adequate' as its usage lacks clarity and does not specify a connection speed.

Stanton Drew Parish Council also objects on the grounds that 'urgent', whilst implying time-pressure, does not identify a timescale.

To avoid becoming trapped on the wrong side of the digital divide, it is essential that Superfast broadband is provided to all rural homes and businesses in the same timescale as it being rolled out in the cities of Bristol and Bath, and with comparable performance, both in terms of upload/download speed and reliability.

Fast, reliable broadband access has become essential for many parishioners and businesses and is needed for study, work and leisure. Use of the Internet allows people work remotely from home or to run businesses, which contributes to economic growth and reduces the need to commute into Bristol and Bath on a daily basis.

The Connecting Devon and Somerset Project, part funded by BaNES, will not confirm the timescales for Superfast roll-out to our Parish and will not even confirm whether or not we will ever receive it. For residents and business with long cable runs or Exchange Only connections, even if there is a roll-out, this would offer little or no speed improvement and would not resolve the reliability issues. Whilst the cities are heading towards 1 Gbps connectivity, many users in our Parish will be stuck with 2 Mbps. Given the ageing nature of BT's copper network and, in many cases, the long cable runs to the cabinets and exchanges, it may be necessary to consider alternatives, such as wireless or fibre to the home.

Change to the policy requested:

Stanton Drew Parish Council requests that wording to the changes SPC134 be altered and the words 'adequate' and 'urgent' be removed and quantifiable figures be added instead.

Respondent Number: 2990 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Matthew Pierce

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134

Plan Reference: Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The wording of the current policy is too vague to ensure the levels of improvement needed in rural locations where broadband speed and quality is very poor.

Without specific metrics or any timeline, it will prove impossible to measure delivery, and the current Strategy's use of the word 'adequately' is too subjective, given the differing needs of individuals in these communities according to their lifestyle and circumstances. Some residents may only ever need to send emails, requiring only low levels of service, while others' businesses are being held back by woeful connections and speeds which mean rural residents are not able to work from home some or all of the time.

In the parish of Stanton Drew where I live, speeds below 2 Mbps are routine, and dropouts are common, making it impossible, for instance, to stream any video or radio broadcast online, as well as rendering the simplest task online very difficult indeed. Performing routine online tasks that would reduce the reliance on a car, is often impossible and for the economic growth of the area it is imperative that these essential provisions are made. It is more important to prioritise remote communities' broadband speeds since they do not have access to shops, services, public transport, etc. It's unsurprising though that BANES appears unwilling to commit real improvements to rural communities for whom infrastructure improvements are typically rare.

I understand that a local project (Connecting Devon and Somerset) will not confirm a timeline for Superfast broadband for our community, while urban areas will likely achieve 1 Gbps speeds in the near future. The Core Strategy wording currently means that rural, ageing, remote communities could be stuck on 2 Mbps or upgraded only slightly. It should be reworded to commit to material improvements that bring these areas up to superfast speed with Bath.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Change from:

The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business

Change to:

Ensuring that all homes and businesses in the rural areas of BaNES are able to access reliable 24 Mbps "Superfast" broadband services by the end of 2014, with an upgrade path to 100 Mbps or higher by the end of 2016.

Respondent Number: 3000 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Karen Abolkheir

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134

Plan Reference: Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The wording of the current policy is imprecise and, since it has no metrics or timeline, makes measurement of successful delivery impossible. "Adequately" will be interpreted as different things by different people, depending on their requirements from sending the odd email to working from home on an internet-based business. The word "urgent" implies that a solution must be implemented soon but a date should be added.

The broadband performance in Stanton Drew parish can range from 8 Mbps down to sub-0.5 Mbps with the experience of fluctuating connection speeds and disconnections.

Fast, reliable broadband access has become essential for many residents and especially businesses. Good internet connection allows people work remotely from home or to run businesses, which in turn contributes to economic growth, sustainability and rural diversification, and reduces the need to commute on a daily basis

It is essential that Superfast broadband is provided to all rural homes and businesses in the same timescale as it being rolled out in the cities of Bristol and Bath, and with comparable performance, both in terms of upload/download speed and reliability.

Change to the policy requested:

Change from:

The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business

Change to:

Ensuring that all homes and businesses in the rural areas of BaNES are able to access reliable 24 Mbps "Superfast" broadband services by the end of 2014, with an upgrade path to 100 Mbps or higher by the end of 2016.

Respondent Number: 3025 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Simon Whittle

Respondent Organisation: Wansdyke Telecom
Chew Valley Broadband

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134

Plan Reference: Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst I am an advocate of improved broadband in rural areas, the wording of the current policy is imprecise and, since it has no metrics or timeline, makes measurement of successful delivery impossible. Specifically, the word “adequately” can be interpreted in different ways by different people, depending on their requirements, which could range from sending a few e-mails, through to running a “Cloud”-based Internet business. The word “urgent” implies that a solution must be implemented in the short term, but does this mean 2013, 2014, 2020 or even 2029?

The broadband performance experienced by users in my Parish (Stanton Drew), which has connections both to the Chew Magna and Compton Dando (Pensford) exchanges varies from 8 Mbps down to sub-0.5 Mbps. Additionally, many people including myself, experience fluctuating connection speeds and occasional disconnections.

Fast, reliable broadband access has become essential for many residents and businesses and is needed for study, work and leisure. An Internet connection enables those with limited access to transport, to shop for food, goods and services. Use of the Internet allows people work remotely from home or to run businesses, which contributes to economic growth, sustainability and rural diversification, and reduces the need to commute into Bristol and Bath on a daily basis. I know several business people who are having to give up attempts at working from rural parishes and are setting up in central Bristol (not Bath) to obtain a suitably fast and reliable connection for data download, upload and video conferencing (for which satellite systems are unsuitable). Additionally multiple people, myself included, who could work at home on one or more days per week, are having to commute into Bristol or Bath on a daily basis.

To avoid becoming trapped on the wrong side of the digital divide, it is essential that Superfast broadband is provided to all rural homes and businesses in the same timescale as it being rolled out in the cities of Bristol and Bath, and with comparable performance, both in terms of upload/download speed and reliability.

The Connecting Devon and Somerset Project, part funded by BaNES, will not confirm the timescales for Superfast roll-out to our Parish and will not even confirm whether or not we will ever receive it. For residents and business with long cable runs or Exchange Only connections, even if there is a roll-out, this would offer little or no speed improvement and would not resolve the reliability issues. Whilst the cities are heading towards 1 Gbps connectivity, many users in our Parish will be stuck with 2 Mbps or less. Given the ageing nature of BT's copper network and, in many cases, the long cable runs to the cabinets and exchanges, it may be necessary to consider alternatives, such as wireless or fibre to the home.

Change to the policy requested:

Change from:

The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business

Change to:

Ensuring that all homes and businesses in the rural areas of BaNES are able to access reliable 24 Mbps “Superfast” broadband services by the end of 2014, with an upgrade path to 100 Mbps or higher by the end of 2016.

Respondent Number: 3368 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Clarke Osborne

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134

Plan Reference: Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The wording of the current policy is imprecise and, since it has no metrics or timeline, makes measurement of successful delivery impossible.

The broadband performance experienced by users in many rural Communities varies from 8 Mbps down to sub-0.5 Mbps. This is clearly not an acceptable service.

Fast, reliable broadband access is needed for study, work and leisure. An Internet connection enables those with limited access to transport, to shop for food, goods and services. Use of the Internet allows people work remotely from home or to

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

run businesses, which contributes to economic growth, sustainability and rural diversification ,and reduces the need to commute into Bristol and Bath on a daily basis.

It is essential that Superfast broadband is provided to all rural homes and businesses in the same timescale as it being rolled out in the cities of Bristol and Bath, and with comparable performance, both in terms of upload/download speed and reliability.

There is no acceptable and supported roll-out of Superfast Broadband for the rural communities of BaNES and this needs to be addressed as a defined statement within the Core Strategy to provide the common goal fully supported by BaNES Council.

Change to the policy requested:

Change from:

The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business

Change to:

Ensuring that all homes and businesses in the rural areas of BaNES are able to access reliable 24 Mbps "Superfast" broadband services by the end of 2014, with an upgrade path to 100 Mbps or higher by the end of 2016.

Respondent Number: 3554 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms SE Osborne

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC134

Plan Reference: Para 5.12

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The wording of the current policy is imprecise and, since it has no metrics or timeline, makes measurement of successful delivery impossible.

The broadband performance experienced by users in many rural communities varies from 8 Mbps down to sub-0.5Mbps. This is unacceptable.

Outlying areas are not sustainable without access to adequate broadband to allow work, study and leisure. Those with poor public transport (large swathes of BANES area), need to rely on broadband for food and service shopping.

A robust broadband is imperative to accommodate the working from home, rural businesses etc to thrive.

Housing development in rural locations are wholly unsustainable without a technology service.

Indeed, a commercial unit within my locality has failed to secure a technology company tenant recently due to inadequate broadband service. This is lost employment to the community. There are real consequences to communities unable to access reliable broadband, and this issue should be a BANES priority.

So, any development plan should seek to provide Superfast broadband to all rural businesses and homes at the same pace as the cities of Bristol and Bath, and with comparable performance both in terms of upload/download speed and reliability.

There is no acceptable and supported roll-out of Superfast broadband for the rural communities of BANES and this needs to be addressed as a defined statement within the Core Strategy to provide the common goal fully supported by the Council

Change to the policy requested:

Change from:

The urgent need to provide reliable broadband, with adequately fast access speed, to every home and business

Change to:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Ensuring that all homes and businesses in the rural areas of BANES are able to access reliable 24Mbps "Superfast" broadband services by the end of 2014, with an upgrade path to 100 Mbps or higher by the end of 2016.

Change Ref. SPC137**Plan Ref.: Para 5.18****Development Location:** Comment on new development locations**Respondent Number:** 4503 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Nicola Stone**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC137**Plan Reference:** Para 5.18**Development Location:** Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

My comments on this as follows

para 96 SPC137 para 5.21 -- 50 dwellings is not a small scale development in Farmborough. The Council has already agreed to a development of 38 homes, a significant increase in the number of dwellings, in a village with no shop or Post Office.

Whys has the proviso "local community support for the principle of development can be demonstrated" been removed with regards to Farmborough at SPC14B.

The Parish Council have overwhelmingly supported the residents' widely held views that the village does not need any more developments - they are our elected representatives, in addition to our ward Councillor. Their views are important.

Please add these to the consultation notes - Farmborough simply does not need any more development and removing yet more land from the Green Belt and surrounding areas destroys more of our village.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref. SPC139****Plan Ref.: Para 5.20****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 4679 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Martyn Stutchbury**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC139**Plan Reference:** Para 5.20**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

This comment is submitted to request greater clarity and consistency.

Para 5.20 states that development in the Green Belt is not acceptable and so requires justification against the test of 'very special circumstances'. Elsewhere, the Proposed Changes refer to the provisions of the NPPF, for example SPC142. This paragraph should be amended to better reflect the NPPF and in particular, para 89 of the NPPF which sets out exceptions to development being 'inappropriate'

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

This amendment would give greater consistency within the CS and also better reflect the NPPF

Change to the policy requested:

Amend para 5.20 to include reference to the NPPF that in certain circumstances development within the Green Belt is not to be considered as inappropriate.

Change Ref. SPC140

Plan Ref.: Para 5.21

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 270 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Blue Cedar Homes

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140

Plan Reference: Para 5.21

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Support is given in principle to the provision of new residential and employment development in the Rural Areas. However, objections are lodged on the basis that the level of new housing provision in the Rural Areas is too low. Paragraph 5.13 states that there will be "around 800 houses and 500 jobs in the rural areas including an additional 250 dwellings in excess of existing commitments".

Given the clearly identified need both for open market, affordable dwellings and housing for the elderly in the Rural Areas it is considered that 250 new dwellings in the period up to 2026 is totally insignificant and will not assist in meeting the high need for housing development in the Rural Areas. It is considered that the level of new housing development in the rural areas should be increased up to 2,000 new dwellings (above existing commitments). Objections have already been made in respect of the Policy DW1 District Wide Spatial Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Objection is made to the fact that East Harptree has not been identified on Diagram 18 as a RA1 settlement which can accommodate additional residential development. East Harptree has a reasonable level of local services and facilities including a shop, a public house, village hall and a primary school which is currently under capacity. It also had a reasonable level of public transport provision.

Furthermore, East Harptree is one of the few rural settlements which has services and facilities but is not restricted by Green Belt. Whilst it is washed over by the AONB land exists within the settlement limits e.g. at Church Lane which is suitable for residential development.

New housing in the village would generate new pupils for the schools and help sustain the local services. It would also provide land which is safeguarded for a school playing field as well as much needed housing to meet the needs of elderly persons in the settlement who wish to downsize.

It would therefore appear that the only reason why East Harptree is not identified as a settlement capable of accommodating additional development is due to the lack of local support.

Objections are also lodged against paragraph 5.21 which states that the scale of development in villages identified in Policy RA1 will be up to and around 50 dwellings. It is unclear from the submitted evidence base where this figure has been derived. The previous version of the Core Strategy identified up to 30 dwellings. There are clearly some rural settlements which could and should accommodate additional development especially where there has been limited development in recent years. One such settlement is East Harptree. It is therefore recommended that the figure be identified as a minimum and that the individual circumstances of each settlement will be considered. The figure however is likely to be above 50 dwellings but will depend on the availability of suitable sites and capacity of local services and facilities.

Changes Required

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- i) Identify East Harptree as an RA1 settlement.
- ii) Increase scale of development permitted based on local circumstances.
- iii) Identify land at Church Lane for elderly person accommodation together with a school playing field.

Respondent Number: 4604 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Bristol

Agent ID: 152 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.21

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The reference to housing developments in the RA1 settlements being limited to "around 50" dwellings is not justified and places an artificial constraint on potential development in these locations. The quantum of development will need to be judged against a number of factors; such as:

- Presence of local facilities and public transport
- Impact on the highway network
- landscape and Visual impact

Sites coming forward for development in the RA1 settlements may be able to accommodate significantly more than 50 dwellings without having unacceptable impacts upon the character of the area. Therefore, the Core Strategy should not be prescriptive with regard to the number of dwellings that can be located in RA1 settlements. By their very nature, the RA1 settlements should be regarded as sustainable and capable of growth over the Plan period.

The level of development for any promoted sites should be assessed through the Placemaking Plan and the development management process.

Change to the policy requested:

Paragraph 5.21 should state- Allocations for residential development on the edge of villages that meet the criteria referred to in Para 5.17 (see Policy RA1}, will be decided through the Placemaking Plan. The overall quantum of development will be considered through this process, depending on such factors as impact on the highway network; impact on the character of the settlement; and access to local facilities and public transport.

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Respondent Number: 4693 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Shirley Summers **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.21

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Where is the demonstrated need or justification for an additional 200 homes at Whitchurch. The village has recently been forced to take 47 new homes by the planning inspectorate, which mean it will have to accept five times more new houses than all of the other 'RA1' villages, why?

Apparently, Villagers must look to Bristol for jobs, facilities and services, even though Bristol City Council do not want to provide these. (See Planning application 12/04597OUT)

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

247 homes does not seem sustainable in one single "RA1" village and should be shared between the more sustainable and larger villages.

Whitchurch village needs a bypass before homes are built.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC140 increase the housing numbers and include Whitchurch as an RA1 village.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 110 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Mr Robert Sawyer **Respondent Organisation:** Wedco Limited

Agent ID: 163 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140

Plan Reference: Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The NPPF does not preclude or seek to restrict development in rural areas; it instead seeks to promote sustainable development in such areas and housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities (Paragraph 55, NPPF). This position has been consistently emphasised by the Coalition Government as reflected in the written response of Baroness Hanham to the House of Lords on 26 March 2013 (appended to these representations) where she outlined the Government's commitment to delivering rural housing:

"Affordable and accessible rural housing for young people is essential for a vibrant rural economy. We want to see successful rural businesses and thriving rural communities in a living, working countryside, and housing is an essential part of that vision. We disagree with the suggestion that the children of rural families should be excluded from the countryside." Having regard to the above and our other representations on the Council's SHMA and overall housing target, it is submitted that the Core Strategy should incorporate a greater level of flexibility to ensure that the housing need of rural areas is met. It is not sufficient to rely on an arbitrary housing target of 1,110 dwellings as set out in policies RA1 and RA2 where it is unclear how this level of growth was apportioned to the rural areas.

Wedco Limited has commissioned Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants to prepare an independent Housing Requirements Assessment in respect of BANES and its Rural Areas. This report is appended to our representations and shall be discussed in length in the paragraphs below. Based on the information contained in the attached report, we outline our concerns relating to these proposed changes below:

- Policies RA1 and RA2 provide for the delivery of up to approximately 320 additional homes in the Rural Areas in addition to the 784 commitments. Even if the impact of these policies is to achieve and even exceed the housing target for the Rural Areas, this quantum of housing is too low to help sustain rural communities or support the Council's expectations of employment growth creating an additional 700 jobs in the Plan period target.

- In rural areas subject to high values, additional affordability pressures which act to exclude households (and particularly younger working age households). Such conditions will reduce the opportunity for maintaining employment / encouraging employment growth and are likely to impact adversely upon opportunities for economic growth and the maintenance of facilities and amenities.

- Of additional concern is the lack of assessment of sub-area level housing requirements. The West of England Local Enterprise Partnership does not review the 18 / 20 year projected level of employment required at a sub-area level within the local authorities to support economic growth in line with wider economic growth aspirations across the sub-region. The draft SHMA does not assess the projected employment / housing requirements in each of the 5 sub-locations set out in Table 8 of Annex 1 to the 4th March 2013 Committee Report (which includes 'rural areas' as a distinct location) necessary to maintain / improve economic growth in the communities within those locations.

- It is not apparent that an assessment of community level employment growth and the associated housing requirements over the next 18 to 20 years that will be necessary to support economic growth across the Unitary Authority sub-areas has been undertaken by BANES to inform the overall aggregated proposed housing delivery target.

- The Council's 'expectations' regarding employment project an increase of 700 jobs in the BANES rural area to 2029. However, it is unclear how this level of employment then informs the Council's overall housing recommendations in Table 9 in Annex 1 of the 4th March 2013 Committee Report - the validity of this process is extremely important and the likely housing requirements has therefore been independently modelled in the independent report by Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants and the findings are set out in section 5 of this Report on pages 20-26 and in Appendix 1 in pages

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

31-57.

- As such, it is unclear that an overarching aggregated housing requirements target can be robustly determined without first reviewing local sub-area level requirements, and then reviewing the benefits / significant and demonstrable adverse impacts on sustainable development of providing the full objectively assessed requirement within the community concerned. This approach is in keeping with the NPPF objectives of ensuring sustainable development and facilitating economic growth at both a local community and Housing Market Area level. Where the outputs of this bottom up approach suggest significantly different overall housing requirements to the top down assessment provided in the draft SHMA then a view will need to be taken on the most appropriate overall housing delivery target and the most appropriate distribution of this target in line with the objectives of the NPPF.
- However, the evidential basis for the locational distribution proposed by the Council of the overall housing requirement within the Unitary Authority area (and which proposes a total delivery of 984 dwellings in rural areas during the Plan period comprised of an existing supply of 784 plus an additional 200 dwellings) remains unclear.
- Independent analysis undertaken by Pioneer (attached report) suggests that to align with the Council's economic aspirations in Rural Areas an additional 2,882 homes would be appropriate over 18 years (exclusive of any backlog). This is significantly in excess of the 984 level of planned delivery proposed by the Council for the Rural Area.

Change to the policy requested:

As per our concerns above, the Core Strategy and its associated evidence base needs to attribute greater importance to rural areas to ensure that the economic and housing requirements of such areas can be met. This can be attained by increasing flexibility within the plan for sustainable growth in the rural areas and by increasing the overall housing target for such areas.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1.72 An objection is made to the proposed changes to Policy RA1 and its supporting text.

1.73 Paragraph 5.21 as amended by SPC140 states that "the 200 additional dwellings to be accommodated within the rural areas under the district- wide spatial strategy will be distributed as appropriate with small scale housing developments of around 50 dwellings at each of the villages which meet the criteria of Policy RA1".

1.74 The Key Diagram identifies 1,110 homes to be delivered within the rural areas, however nowhere within this diagram or Policy DW1 (District Wide Spatial Strategy) is a figure of 200 dwellings to be delivered in the rural villages set out. In fact at no point in the document does the Core Strategy include a table which sets out the overall housing requirement for the plan period by each area.

1.75 The evidence base behind the strategy for the rural areas is contained at page 55 of Annex 1 to the Report to Council on the 4th March. BANES identify that the SHLAA currently identifies a supply of around 860 dwellings in the rural areas, but does not distinguish how many of these are at the RA1 villages, which are considered to be more sustainable. Without such a breakdown it is impossible to know the amount of development that could be supported by RA1 village without policy restriction.

1.76 The draft Core Strategy identified that there were 6 villages outside of the Green Belt which met the RA1 criteria (Batheaston, Bishop Sutton, Farmborough, Temple Cloud, Timsbury and Whitchurch). Although no longer specifically identified within the Core Strategy, Annex 1 to the Report to Council on the 4th March and the SHLAA trajectory now identify that there are only four villages outside of the Green Belt which meet the criteria (Bishop Sutton, Clutton, Temple Cloud, and Timsbury).

1.77 BANES considered three options for housing delivery in villages meeting the criteria of RA1: 50 dwellings at each village, 70 dwellings at each village; or 100 dwellings at each village. The Annex 1 report notes that the delivery of 50

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

dwelling at each RA1 settlement over the next 5 years would “boost the housing land supply and provide some flexibility without encouraging unsustainable patterns of development”. This would indicate that BANES assessment of sustainability only relates to the first five years of the plan, in which case further development over the 50 dwellings target is in fact considered sustainable over the whole plan period.

1.78 It is noted that the reference to delivering 50 dwellings over ‘5 years’ was changed by Councillor Vic Pritchard (Elected Member for Bishop Sutton) to ‘18 years’ on the basis of no evidence at the Council meeting on the 4th March 2013.

1.79 The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by BANES considers rural growth in general, rather than considering growth at the RA1 and RA2 villages separately. The delivery of 50, 70 and 100 homes at each RA1 village as considered by Appendix 1 of the Councils report to Committee has not been appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal and there is no settlement by settlement assessment of capacity/sustainability.

1.80 Until a thorough SA has been undertaken which considers the capacity and sustainability of the RA1 villages BANES cannot set an upper limit for development within them.

1.81 Clearly Some RA1 villages will be more sustainable than others and therefore able to accommodate more than the 50 dwellings identified. The target of 50 must not therefore be applied as maximum development threshold as it is currently being applied by Parish Council’s and Committee Members.

1.82 In order to be justified and therefore sound the approach to RA1 villages must be properly evidenced and thoroughly tested in the SA. An assessment of capacity and sustainability of each RA1 village must therefore be undertaken and the different options for growth at RA1 villages must be properly appraised by the SA.

Change to the policy requested:

The housing target for the RA1 villages must be based on a robust evidence base on a settlement by settlement basis. All options for growth at RA1 villages considered by BANES must have been appraised thoroughly by the SA.

Respondent Number: 1555 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sue Heatherman **Respondent Organisation:** Stowey Sutton Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

This Parish Council accepts the amended target for RA1 villages of 50 new houses between 2011 and 2029. However, the document still does not contain the amendment which was agreed at the meeting of full council on 4th March 2013, and minuted, in respect of the number of years for the 50 houses to be built. This was agreed to be 18 years and not 5 years and we would like the 18 years to be stated clearly. We feel that in the interim weight should be given to the emerging Draft Core Strategy when determining planning applications and we believe the affordable housing aspect should be for social housing and should be for people with a local connection.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 3095 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans **Respondent Organisation:** CPRE Avonside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140 **Plan Reference:** Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Vision and Policy Framework for rural areas states:

“5.21 The 250 200 additional dwellings to be accommodated within the rural areas under the District-wide spatial strategy will be distributed as appropriate with small scale housing developments of up to and around 30 50 dwellings at each of the villages which meet the criteria referred to in paragraph 5.17 (see of Policy RA1). This will be considered in more detail through the Placemaking Plan in conjunction with Parish Councils as the locally elected representatives of their communities. The Housing Development Boundaries shown on the Proposals Map (saved from the existing Local Plan) will also be reviewed as part of the Placemaking Plan to incorporate the sites identified and /or enable new sites to come forward. Sites identified in adopted Neighbourhood Plans that adjoin the housing development boundary of villages meeting the criteria of Policy RA1 will also be appropriate and these may come forward for inclusion as a part of the Placemaking Plan or subsequent to it.”

We object to the absence of a specific requirement for the Placemaking Plan to attend to key details of village character and identity.

The rural villages across B&NES have highly individual characters and identities, which rely heavily on certain key aspects of spacial arrangements. In particular, the separation between settlements is crucial to maintaining the character and identity of each settlement and to avoid ‘ribbon development’ along main roads, for example along the A37 around Clutton and Temple Cloud. We feel that the Vision and Policy Framework needs to recognise this aspect of village identity.

The separation between villages was recognised in the 2007 Local Plan in Policy BH16, which has been carried forward to the current Core Strategy. It will therefore be a policy requirement for the Placemaking Plan to address this issue.

Similarly, the rural character of many settlements depends on key visually important open spaces. This was recognised in Policy BH15 in the previous Local Plan but has now been dropped from planning policy.

Change to the policy requested:

We therefore request the following addition at 5.21 (our addition in bold):

“5.21 The 250 200 additional dwellings to be accommodated within the rural areas under the District-wide spatial strategy will be distributed as appropriate with small scale housing developments of up to and around 30 50 dwellings at each of the villages which meet the criteria referred to in paragraph 5.17 (see of Policy RA1). This will be considered in more detail through the Placemaking Plan in conjunction with Parish Councils as the locally elected representatives of their communities. The Housing Development Boundaries shown on the Proposals Map (saved from the existing Local Plan) will also be reviewed as part of the Placemaking Plan to incorporate the sites identified and /or enable new sites to come forward. The Placemaking Plan, in identifying sites for development, will have regard to the character and identity of settlements, including the separation of neighbouring settlements and the visually important open spaces within and adjacent to settlements.”

Respondent Number: 4434 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ian Wheaton

Respondent Organisation: Network Rail

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC140

Plan Reference: Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposed change to include sites that adjoin the housing development boundary will allow greater flexibility and more land to be considered for housing.

Change to the policy requested:

We wish to support the proposed change to the submitted Core Strategy as detailed in the proposed changes document dated March 2013.

Respondent Number: 4663 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Peter Murphy

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC140

Plan Reference: Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I don't understand how the number of houses to be built in rural area has gone up to such a high amount. All the villages on the A37 are unsustainable, where are all these jobs for houses. In Temple Cloud we have had 26 new social houses and flats built, they had to advertise outside the village to fill them, that's how sustainable our village is. Nearly everyone who lives on the A37 commutes to either Bristol or Bath for work. Also it wasn't long ago BANES had to step in to subsidise the local bus into Bristol, which they were going to stop, that's how sustainable Temple Cloud is for lots of new houses.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd**Agent ID:** 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC140

Plan Reference: Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC140

1.78 An objection is made to the proposed changes to Policy RA1 and its supporting text.

1.79 The revised wording of the policy relates to villages outside of the Green Belt. Arguably this policy therefore applies to Saltford but only to land inside the Housing Development Boundary which does not lie within the Green Belt. The policy further confirms that proposals for residential development will be acceptable within the Housing Development Boundary provided that the village meets the spatial strategy (i.e. has 3 key facilities and daily public transport service).

1.80 On the basis of the above, given that Saltford is tightly bound by the Green Belt, and there are no suitable and available sites within the settlement boundary (as confirmed by the SHLAA 2013), there is no opportunity for Saltford to deliver any housing within this plan period. As worded, the Core Strategy is not meeting the needs of Saltford, nor is meeting the District's housing needs overall.

1.81 As explained previously through these representations and in the critique of the Green Belt Review prepared by Pegasus (see Appendix 2), Saltford is one of the most sustainable settlements in BANES, located directly on the A4 between Bristol and Bath, and is well served by shopping and community facilities. It is also well served by public transport. And there is also a campaign to re-open Saltford railway station. Saltford is therefore more sustainable than the other RA1 villages which are expected to accommodate 1,100 dwelling across the plan period.

1.82 Whilst not identified as proposed changes, for reasons discussed previously, the Council are totally ignoring the needs of Saltford, which given its location in commuting distance to Bristol and Bath has a distinct role to play in delivering sustainable development.

1.83 The council should therefore consider introducing an additional settlement classification for built up areas lying within the Green Belt, and allow for the Green Belt boundary to be reviewed in very special circumstances.

Change to the policy requested:

This policy only deals with settlements outside of the Green Belt. Separate provision needs to be made for Settlements boundary by the Green Belt, as otherwise their needs will not be met by the Core Strategy.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4712 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd**Agent ID:** 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC140

Plan Reference: Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Support in principle of Change reference SPC140 (Page No. 96 of the Draft Core Strategy) to provide... 'The 200 additional dwellings within rural areas under the District-wide spatial strategy will be distributed as appropriate with small scale housing developments of around 50 dwellings at each of the villages which meet the criteria (of Policy RA1). The Housing Development Boundaries shown on the Proposals Map (saved from the existing Local Plan) to incorporate the sites identified and/or enable new sites to come forward. Sites identified in adopted Neighbourhood Plans that adjoin the housing development boundary of villages meeting the criteria of Policy RAW will also be appropriate and these may come forward for inclusion as part of the Placemaking Plan or subsequent to it' – RC34 (amends FM9).

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Respondent Number: 4743 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Wedco Limited**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:** GL Hearn**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC140

Plan Reference: Para 5.21

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The NPPF does not preclude or seek to restrict development in rural areas; it instead seeks to promote sustainable development in such areas and housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities (Paragraph 55, NPPF). This position has been consistently emphasised by the Coalition Government as reflected in the written response of Baroness Hanham to the House of Lords on 26 March 2013 (appended to these representations) where she outlined the Government's commitment to delivering rural housing:

"Affordable and accessible rural housing for young people is essential for a vibrant rural economy. We want to see successful rural businesses and thriving rural communities in a living, working countryside, and housing is an essential part of that vision. We disagree with the suggestion that the children of rural families should be excluded from the countryside." Having regard to the above and our other representations on the Council's SHMA and overall housing target, it is submitted that the Core Strategy should incorporate a greater level of flexibility to ensure that the housing need of rural areas is met. It is not sufficient to rely on an arbitrary housing target of 1,110 dwellings as set out in policies RA1 and RA2 where it is unclear how this level of growth was apportioned to the rural areas.

Wedco Limited has commissioned Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants to prepare an independent Housing Requirements Assessment in respect of BANES and its Rural Areas. This report is appended to our representations and shall be discussed in length in the paragraphs below. Based on the information contained in the attached report, we outline our concerns relating to these proposed changes below:

- Policies RA1 and RA2 provide for the delivery of up to approximately 320 additional homes in the Rural Areas in addition to the 784 commitments. Even if the impact of these policies is to achieve and even exceed the housing target for the Rural Areas, this quantum of housing is too low to help sustain rural communities or support the Council's expectations of employment growth creating an additional 700 jobs in the Plan period target.
- In rural areas subject to high values, additional affordability pressures which act to exclude households (and particularly younger working age households). Such conditions will reduce the opportunity for maintaining employment / encouraging employment growth and are likely to impact adversely upon opportunities for economic growth and the maintenance of facilities and amenities.
- Of additional concern is the lack of assessment of sub-area level housing requirements. The West of England Local

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Enterprise Partnership does not review the 18 / 20 year projected level of employment required at a sub-area level within the local authorities to support economic growth in line with wider economic growth aspirations across the sub-region. The draft SHMA does not assess the projected employment / housing requirements in each of the 5 sub-locations set out in Table 8 of Annex 1 to the 4th March 2013 Committee Report (which includes 'rural areas' as a distinct location) necessary to maintain / improve economic growth in the communities within those locations.

- It is not apparent that an assessment of community level employment growth and the associated housing requirements over the next 18 to 20 years that will be necessary to support economic growth across the Unitary Authority sub-areas has been undertaken by BANES to inform the overall aggregated proposed housing delivery target.
- The Council's 'expectations' regarding employment project an increase of 700 jobs in the BANES rural area to 2029. However, it is unclear how this level of employment then informs the Council's overall housing recommendations in Table 9 in Annex 1 of the 4th March 2013 Committee Report - the validity of this process is extremely important and the likely housing requirements has therefore been independently modelled in the independent report by Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants and the findings are set out in section 5 of this Report on pages 20-26 and in Appendix 1 in pages 31-57.
- As such, it is unclear that an overarching aggregated housing requirements target can be robustly determined without first reviewing local sub-area level requirements, and then reviewing the benefits / significant and demonstrable adverse impacts on sustainable development of providing the full objectively assessed requirement within the community concerned. This approach is in keeping with the NPPF objectives of ensuring sustainable development and facilitating economic growth at both a local community and Housing Market Area level. Where the outputs of this bottom up approach suggest significantly different overall housing requirements to the top down assessment provided in the draft SHMA then a view will need to be taken on the most appropriate overall housing delivery target and the most appropriate distribution of this target in line with the objectives of the NPPF.
- However, the evidential basis for the locational distribution proposed by the Council of the overall housing requirement within the Unitary Authority area (and which proposes a total delivery of 984 dwellings in rural areas during the Plan period comprised of an existing supply of 784 plus an additional 200 dwellings) remains unclear.
- Independent analysis undertaken by Pioneer (attached report) suggests that to align with the Council's economic aspirations in Rural Areas an additional 2,882 homes would be appropriate over 18 years (exclusive of any backlog). This is significantly in excess of the 984 level of planned delivery proposed by the Council for the Rural Area.

Change to the policy requested:

As per our concerns above, the Core Strategy and its associated evidence base needs to attribute greater importance to rural areas to ensure that the economic and housing requirements of such areas can be met. This can be attained by increasing flexibility within the plan for sustainable growth in the rural areas and by increasing the overall housing target for such areas.

Change Ref. SPC143

Plan Ref.: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 93

Comment Number: 7

Respondent Name: Mrs Jacqui Ashman

Respondent Organisation: Highways Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions . These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements .

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Rural Areas

The Agency recognises the potential to accommodate new residential development in villages that are assessed as being the most sustainable. As specific locations and proposals have not yet been identified it is difficult for the Agency to make any further comment , suffice to say that any planning application should be accompanied by a robust transport evidence base so that the impacts can be fully understood .

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC143 and Changes to Diagram 4

PHSV note that SPC143 identifies a capacity of 1,110 dwellings within the rural areas, whereas the Changes to Diagram 4 show 1,000 houses within the rural areas. This inconsistency should be rectified.

SPC143

The Inspector considered RA1 was too restrictive, as some development at RA1 villages is needed as part of housing delivery. However, the proposed changes make the Policy even more restrictive by limiting development to within village boundaries and by excluding Green Belt villages. There is nothing in ID/7 and BNES/9 to justify this approach and both amendments should be deleted.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 219 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Edward Ware Homes Ltd **Respondent Organisation:** Edward Ware Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 22 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Proposed Changes SPC140 and SPC143 relate to the proposed housing requirement for the Rural Areas. While we support the decision to review the Housing Delivery Boundaries (HDBs) of the settlements, we are concerned that the size of the small scale housing developments that will be permitted at RA1 Villages remains too small (50 dwellings). This concern relates specifically to our general concern (set out in our response to Proposed Changes SPC14, SPC20 and SPC23) that the overall housing requirement for BANES is not sufficient to meet housing needs.

Change to the policy requested:

In order to meet housing needs in BANES we request that the size of the small scale housing developments that will be permitted at RA1 Villages is increased.

Respondent Number: 269**Comment Number:** 2**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:**

Barratt Homes Bristol

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst the principle of the District Wide Spatial Strategy is supported, objections are lodged to a number of criteria namely 1(d), 2 and the monitoring timescales.

With regards criterion 1d, support is given to the principle of development being located in the rural areas at settlements with a good range of local facilities. This is in line with the advice in NPPF Paragraph 55 which states:

“To promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities. For example where there are groups of smaller settlements development in one village may support services in villages nearby...”

Objections are lodged on the basis that there is no definition of ‘good access to public transport’, neither is there any acknowledgement that development will sustain and improve existing services, facilities and public transport. The criterion needs to be amended to recognise that new development can sustain and improve public transport and other facilities within settlements in the Rural Areas.

With regards to criterion 2, objections are lodged to the proposed net housing increase of 12,700 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029

The NPPF makes it clear in paragraph 47 that Local Plan should meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Even if it cannot do so because of the exception in NPPF unmet needs must be objectively assessed so as to identify any unmet needs that should be sought in adjoining areas.

One of the main reasons for RSS abolition was to remove top down imposition of housing requirements. However, this needs to be considered in the context of a clear parallel message for Government that it expects to see an acceleration in house building through a planning system which proactively supports growth and views housing development positively as set out in the NPPF. Increasing house building is a frequently stated Government priority and the Ministerial Statement dated 6th September 2012 on “Housing and Growth” which stated:

“The Localism Act has put the power back in the hands of communities but with this power comes responsibilities: a responsibility to meet their needs for development and growth and to deal quickly and effectively with proposals that will deliver homes, jobs and facilities.”

The move towards abolition of the RSS has not been made to facilitate reduced housing provision solely on the basis of community consultation which is what this Local Plan is seeking to do.

Indeed it should be remembered that in June 2012 the Core Strategy inspector published his preliminary conclusions on strategic matters in respect of the submitted Core Strategy. With specific regard to housing land the inspector concluded that: -

“There is a lack of National Planning Policy Framework compliant assessment of the housing requirements given the unsuitability of the Council’s methodology.”

The inspector concluded that there was a: -

- i. Need to make up the shortfall of 850 dwellings and 2,006 under the existing adopted Local Plan;
- ii. Need for a 20% buffer to be applied to the 5 year housing land supply and calculation;
- iii. Lack of flexibility to accommodate any delay in bringing forward proposals.
- iv. Student accommodation should not form part of the Council’s supply or completion figures unless the future requirement for such accommodation is also taken into account.

Indeed the issue of housing land provision in the District together with a 5 year land supply position was the subject of considerable debate at the Sleep Lane, Whitchurch appeal in October 2012. Of particular relevance are the following conclusions of the appeal inspector:-

“There are a series of other considerations that require analysis. The first is that as that, as it readily accepts, the Council is nowhere near being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Moreover, there is an acknowledgement that there has been a record of persistent under- delivery of housing. All this is laid bare in the preliminary conclusions of the inspector dealing with the draft Core Strategy Examination, which have led to the suspension of proceedings. It is evident that the failure in terms of the delivery of affordable housing is especially acute with 565 units having been supplied between 2001 and the latest Annual Monitoring Report, against a requirement of 5,047 units between 2002 and 2009.

The inspector went on to conclude in Paragraph 24 that: -

“... it is very clear that the draft CS will have been subject to radical changes. In particular, there may be a need to identify land for up to 16,000 houses. According to the Council, this will require a number of major urban extensions and Whitchurch is a likely option that, it is suggested, could be prejudiced if planning permission was given for housing on the appeal site.”

At the Whitchurch appeal the Council led with evidence that the housing provision would be increased to some 16,000 new dwellings. This however is clearly not what has resulted in the now published Core Strategy with a suggested new housing provision of 12,700 new dwellings between 2011 and 2029. It is considered that the Council’s methodology is still significantly flawed. They have not adequately addressed the failings identified by the Core Strategy inspector. In view of the above, the Core Strategy is not sound in that it is not backed up by evidence rather the actual evidence indicates that a substantially higher housing provision should be adopted in excess of 16,000 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029. It is considered that the actual housing provision is in the region of 21,500 new dwellings.

Turning to the delivery of housing, objections are lodged to the lack of identified housing sites in the Local Plan. It appears that the identification of potential sites for housing and employment is being left to either the Site Allocations DPD or the production of Neighbourhood Plans. It is considered that the lack of site identification is contrary to guidance in NPPF which seeks to boost the supply of housing and provide certainty to developers and landowner on the release of land for housing. This is especially important in this District where the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing has been evident for a number of years and recognised at appeals in Farmborough and Whitchurch where both inspectors recognised the chronic shortfall in the Council’s 5 year supply of housing. The preparation of Site Allocations DPD or Neighbourhood Plan will take some time to complete which consequently will produce a “lag” in the delivery of housing sites. Indeed there is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will be produced in a realistic timescale. It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan be amended to specifically identify a number of strategic sites for both housing and employment. The objectors control land at Clutton the site is immediately available and suitable for development. Furthermore there are no technical or environmental constraints which would prohibit their release. Accordingly, this land

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

should be identified within the Local Plan.

It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan specifically identify a number of strategic housing and employment sites which includes amongst others land at Clutton.

Finally we object to the suggested monitoring timetable level the Core Strategy will be reviewed around five yearly intervals. We consider that this timetable is too long in that given the consistent poor delivery performance of housing in the area. Accordingly we consider that a more realistic period would be say 2 years.

It is therefore recommended that: -

a)Additional growth in rural areas can help sustain existing services and facilities;

b)Clarify certain terminology such as good access to public transport.

C)The level of housing provision is too low and should be increased to at least 23,500 new dwellings and take account of the actual need for development and the poor historic performance.

D)That the monitoring period be amended to say 2 years;

e)That additional sites be identified for housing in the rural areas e.g. land at Clutton.

Rural Areas

Paragraph 5.21 Policy Framework

Support is given in principle to the provision of new residential and employment development in the Rural Areas. However, objections are lodged on the basis that the level of new housing provision in the Rural Areas is too low. Paragraph 5.13 states that there will be “around 800 houses and 500 jobs in the rural areas including an additional 250 dwellings in excess of existing commitments”.

Given the clearly identified need both for open market, affordable dwellings and housing for the elderly in the Rural Areas it is considered that 250 new dwellings in the period up to 2026 is totally insignificant and will not assist in meeting the high need for housing development in the Rural Areas. It is considered that the level of new housing development in the rural areas should be increased up to 2,000 new dwellings (above existing commitments). Objections have already been made in respect of the Policy DW1 District Wide Spatial Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4515 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ms Sue Walker

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I would hope that houses are built on brownfield sites. Whenever possible, and not on greenfield/greenbelt areas. It seems common-sense to preserve areas of natural beauty for as long as possible.

If/when houses are built in Temple Cloud, I hope that vehicular access and how extra traffic is going to impact, will be carefully considered. Also, whether there are places available in the local primary school for newcomers.

My concern with the Placemaking Plan is that there are members of the Cameley Parish council who have a vested interest in building houses, and their connections with a landowner(s) has coloured their views on where new houses should be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

built. Applications have been turned down when villagers have voiced their concerns about suitability (I am thinking of land adjoining Temple Inn Lane) of additional houses and I hope other sites would be considered in the future.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4532 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Silverwood Partnership Ltd / JE Sheppard & Sons

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Rural Areas

Paragraph 5.21 Policy Framework

Support is given in principle to the provision of new residential and employment development in the Rural Areas. However, objections are lodged on the basis that the level of new housing provision in the Rural Areas is too low. Paragraph 5.13 states that there will be “around 800 houses and 500 jobs in the rural areas including an additional 250 dwellings in excess of existing commitments”.

Given the clearly identified need both for open market, affordable dwellings and housing for the elderly in the Rural Areas it is considered that 250 new dwellings in the period up to 2026 is totally insignificant and will not assist in meeting the high need for housing development in the Rural Areas. It is considered that the level of new housing development in the rural areas should be increased up to 2,000 new dwellings (above existing commitments). Objections have already been made in respect of the Policy DW1 District Wide Spatial Strategy.

Meeting Local Need for Housing and Employment Paragraphs 5.17 – 5.23, Policy RA1 and Diagram 18

Objection is made to the fact that High Littleton has not been identified as a RA1 settlement which can accommodate additional residential development. High Littleton has a reasonable level of local services and facilities including a post office, shop, three public houses, village hall, butcher, hairdresser and a primary school. It also has a reasonable level of public transport provision.

Furthermore, High Littleton is one of the few rural settlements which has services and facilities but is not restricted by Green Belt or AONB designations. It is therefore a suitable location for new development. New housing in the village would generate new pupils for the schools and help sustain the local services. It is also understood that the Parish Council support the principle of additional residential development in the village.

Objections are also lodged against paragraph 5.21 which states that the scale of development in villages identified in Policy RA1 will be up to and around 50 dwellings. It is unclear from the submitted evidence base where this figure has been derived. The previous version of the Core Strategy identified up to 30 dwellings. There are clearly some rural settlements which could and should accommodate additional development especially where there has been limited development in recent years. One such settlement is High Littleton. It is therefore recommended that the figure be identified as a minimum and that the individual circumstances of each settlement will be considered. The figure however is likely to be above 50 dwellings but will depend on the availability of suitable sites and capacity of local services and facilities.

Change to the policy requested:

Changes Required

i) Identify High Littleton as an RA1 settlement.

ii) Increase scale of development permitted based on local circumstances.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4604 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Bristol**Agent ID:** 152 **Agent Name:** GL Hearn**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We do not understand the reference to sites being identified within the Placemaking Plan, also having to be identified within an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. In our view, there is no need for both. The Placemaking Plan can set out detailed criteria for the development of allocated sites in RAI settlements, which will be subject to adequate public consultation. The development control process will also provide additional opportunity for local residents to comment on emerging proposals.

Change to the policy requested:

Remove sentence -Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan -from Policy RA1.

Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton**Respondent Number:** 4479 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Helen Dudden**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on Land to the West of Twerton**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I feel that the changes are compliant and sound legally.
Also, I ask about the Duchy proposals they too are needed, we have an extremely serious housing issue and it needs action. It seems as if our voices are still not heard!

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

The Duchy of Cornwall proposed to build at Newton St Loe, what happened about this application.

The time for the socialised building is too lay on time limits. As homes are built there will always be a significant back log.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Respondent Number:** 1180 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Christopher J.Thomas**Respondent Organisation:** Farmborough Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on new development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Parish Council representing Farmborough Parish welcomes the above change which removes the RA1 status for the village of Farmborough and gives the village an RA2 status.

The village has lost amenities and public transport links over recent times and as such the Parish Council feels that the

Bath North East Somerset Council

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

potential for excessive development, as identified within the recent SHLAA documentation, outside the defined housing development boundary would prove unsustainable and dramatically change the open and rural character of this village.

The village has had recent approval for 38 homes (with an application for a further 12 homes pending) within the housing boundary, this represents a 14% increase in our housing stock. Further developments, requiring the extension of the housing boundary into green belt land, would not be in proportion to the size of the village.

Parishioners have made their feelings known through various meetings and communications that the approved application for 38 houses has allowed our village to grow and although there are concerns about the sustainability of this development they are clear that with limited facilities in the village we are unable to sustain further development and keep the rural character of Farmborough.

The villagers have also recently completed our community plan survey (completed April 2013) expressing their views on a number of issues including development and traffic issues. A brief summary of the Community Plan Questionnaire results:

PLEASE NOTE THIS IS UNPUBLISHED DATA PROVIDED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY THE COMMUNITY PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPETING THIS CONSULTATION RESPONSE

487 households received questionnaires of which 293 responded: a 60% response rate.

Of the households that responded:

58% indicated that they came to live in Farmborough because of the countryside

96% stated the peace and quiet of the village is important or very important

As a village asset 92% stated that the green belt is important or very important

50% DO NOT think there is a need for more housing in the village

91% DO NOT have a need for alternative housing in the village

74% are concerned about the impact of new developments

88% consider that new developments should be sited to preserve the character of the village

52% consider that infill sites should be used

56% consider that gardens should NOT be used

70% consider that previously developed land should be used

57% consider that fields within the housing boundary should NOT be used

74% consider that green belt land should NOT be used

As any development comes with additional traffic; the current vehicle use is summarised as:

54% use the car to go to work (6% also use public transport)

92% use the car to shop (19% also use public transport)

87% use the car for social activities (13% also use public transport)

Only 12% consider themselves regular users of the local bus services.

73% consider that speeding is an issue

57% consider that road junction safety is an issue

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4712 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

New site - Rural Areas - Former Hawker Joinery Site, Batheaston (114 Northend, Batheaston, Bath. BA1 7HN)

We are promoting the above site on behalf of Environ Country Homes Limited for a potential C2 Use (Extra Care Housing) which would comprise a scheme of one, two and three bedroom houses, as well as a club house to be used by the residents and potentially opened up to the local residents of the village of Batheaston. As the number of old people has grown and their needs and aspirations have changed, there has been a shift from providing residential care to providing Extra Care Housing. Essentially, this is akin to very sheltered housing, offering independent living but with the benefit of on-site care provision. The scheme would provide Extra Care Housing and would form its own neighbourhood whilst integrating within the local village community of Batheaston.

The site is located at the northern edge of Northend (Batheaston) adjacent to the settlement boundary and can be accessed from the main road through the settlement. The site is located within the Green Belt, Cotswolds AONB and part of the site is within flood zones 2 and 3. There also exists a grade II listed property (114 Northend) adjacent to the site and across the road to the north west is a grade II* listed property 'Eagle House'. It is considered that these constraints can be overcome through sensitive and appropriate design.

A planning application was made in March 2012 to renew an outline consent granted in 2009 for the redevelopment of the existing site for general industrial use (Use Class B2). This application was refused on 19th December 2012 on ecology grounds because inadequate information had been submitted to fully understand the scale of the presence of protected species (bats) at the site and the potential impact of the development upon them. The original application (09/00522/OUT) was submitted because the existing buildings on site are in a poor state of repair and not well suited to modern day industrial practices. The existing buildings have been developed in an ad hoc fashion over a number of decades and a re-organisation of the site to make it a viable employment enterprise would need significant investment and it is therefore recommended that a residential care use, which creates employment as well as housing is promoted.

Principle of Development

The principle of development within the Green Belt and the impact on the openness was accepted under the original outline application and there has been no material change to policy or circumstances in the emerging Core Strategy that would justify a change from this view. Therefore the principle of developing this site has been established. However, the site would be better suited to sympathetic residential development given its close proximity to Batheaston and thus more sympathetic to the village context. Furthermore, Batheaston is predominantly residential in character with a large agricultural hinterland with small levels of employment and is served by adequate shopping, social, health and recreational facilities and acts as a hub to the surrounding rural catchment area. It is therefore a suitable place for the development and would help to support the existing services and maintain viability.

Our client's initial plans for the site indicate that it could accommodate 12 no. 1 bedroom units, 12 no. 2 bedroom units, 6 no. 3 bedroom units, a clubhouse, and other facilities for enjoyment by local residents of Batheaston. In terms of design and materiality, the scheme calls for a number of components to be arranged on site so that it relates well to the village of Batheaston which is fairly built up. Furthermore, a C2 use would need to be sympathetic to a variety of scales and forms, architectural styles and local vernacular which is characteristic of the surrounding area, enhancing the setting of the Listed Buildings and the AONB. A C2 scheme onsite would form its own neighbourhood but would also allow integration with the village community. The scheme would offer communal areas and gardens as the relationship between the houses and the communal areas would be essential.

Green Belt

Core Strategy Policy CP8 (Green Belt) which conforms to the National Planning Policy Framework states that the general extent and detailed boundaries of the Green Belt should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. The existing site constitutes Previously Developed Land (PDL) and has been vacant for some time. Marketing has been carried out on the site since the planning application to renew the B2 consent which was refused due to a lack of ecological survey information. The site remains vacant and there has been no interest in pursuing a light industrial use at the site and is currently having a negative impact on the AONB, Listed Buildings and the Green Belt.

The site adjoins the settlement boundary of Batheaston and extending the existing settlement boundary to include this previously developed site would be an appropriate and logical extension to the settlement limits for Batheaston. Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the construction of new dwellings is, by otherwise inappropriate development, in the Green Belt unless the proposed development would comprise limited infilling or the partial or

complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.

Paragraph 8.4.2 of the Inspectors comments BNES/9 states that 'Green Belt inset boundaries will be reviewed through the Placemaking Plan but will only be altered where exceptional circumstances are able to be demonstrated. The Council considers that it is unlikely that changes to the Inset boundaries will be made as there has been little or no change in circumstances since the Inset boundaries were last defined in the adopted Local Plan. However exceptional circumstances requiring changes to the inset boundaries may emerge through Neighbourhood Planning proposals.

AONB and Landscape Impact

The impact of the development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the surrounding landscape was accepted under the original outline application above and there has been no material change to policy or circumstances that would justify a change to this view. From within the site, there are glimpses of the river through the dense vegetation with distant views of the rising hills beyond. Looking into the site there are two key views; when approaching the site from the south-west looking towards the listed building and green space; and approaching from the north-west looking south-east across the field towards the collection of existing industrial buildings.

The existing buildings are poorly constructed and have deteriorated significantly over time. The buildings are metal clad and rusting in places and have a generally untidy appearance. Likewise the existing storage yard to the north of the buildings which is hard surfaced and strewn with miscellaneous storage gives the site a poor visual appearance. The removal of the existing buildings and the storage yard would act to significantly enhance the appearance of the site.

Listed Buildings

The impact of the development on the character and setting on nearby listed buildings was accepted under the original outline application and there has been no material change to policy or circumstances that would justify a change to this view. The proposed development would enhance the setting of the existing Listed Buildings. These heritage assets would be incorporated within the proposed scheme and thus an appreciation shown for the asset's significance in the present and the future.

Highway Safety

The impact of this development on highway safety was accepted under the original outline application for employment use and there has been no material change to policy or circumstances that would justify a change to this view. Furthermore, there is a vehicular access to the south-west and south entrance. It is important to note that the Highway Development Team raised no objections to the redevelopment of the site under planning permission 09/00522/OUT and this envisaged larger vehicles using the access associated with an employment (industrial) use. Therefore the type of vehicle using the access will be more domestic scale.

Neighbouring residential amenity

The site is located within a predominantly residential area and acquired consent for B2 purpose. Therefore the proposed residential use would be less intensive and would not generate comparative noise to a light industrial use which has been considered acceptable previously. Careful consideration would be given to the layout of the proposed housing and ancillary facilities in order to avoid any potential overlooking of neighbouring properties and would not significantly increase nuisance from the site to neighbouring properties.

Summary

A proposed C2 Use would be intended to significantly improve the visual appearance of the site. The existing buildings are in a very poor state of repair and are visually obtrusive. A proposed scheme would be designed carefully within the context of the edge of the settlement site. Furthermore, there would be an opportunity to develop this site more sympathetically and in keeping with the sustainable management of the landscape, maintaining landscape character and conserving or enhancing where possible the natural beauty of the surrounding AONB.

The new buildings would be located in a similar position to the existing buildings on the site and any redevelopment would be similar to the scale of the existing buildings. On this basis it is considered that there would be no harm caused to the setting of the neighbouring listed buildings. In relation to application 09/00522/OUT English Heritage were consulted on the application because of the potential to have an impact on the setting of the grade II* listed building (Eagle House) to the west and they raised no objections to the above planning application. Therefore, this development proposal would not

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

detract from the setting of this or any other listed building.

We consider this site would deliver a valuable contribution to the revised number of homes as part of Bath and North East Somerset Councils Core Strategy, in particular those 500 homes in rural areas to be delivered through a Place Making Plan. Furthermore this site would help support economic prosperity, provide a choice in the homes market to local people and the segment of the ageing population who require supported living. A number of jobs would be created from both the construction of the development and the management service positions provided as part of the scheme.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 1554 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Stowey Sutton Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Stowey Sutton Parish Council broadly support the revised targets for RA1 villages contained within SPC143, however the submitted amended draft core strategy fails to reflect the decision moved by Councillor Victor Pritchard and supported by a full council vote on March 4th 2013, which clarifies the revised housing targets for those RA1 villages not washed over by the greenbelt of 50 new homes over the entire life of the core strategy rather than the earlier 5 year target.

We would like to ensure that this amendment to the policy is fully publicised and incorporated within the version used for the examining inspectors report.

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to ensure that this amendment to the policy, clarifying the revised target for additional dwellings in RA1 settlements as 50 new homes in the period to 2029, is fully publicised and incorporated within the version used for the examining inspectors report.

Respondent Number: 1554 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Stowey Sutton Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Stowey Sutton Parish Council broadly support the revised targets for RA1 villages contained within SPC143, but fear that the approach taken by the B&NES planning department in the period until that Council has an approved and adopted Core Strategy will render those targets obsolete.

In meetings with officers and managers within the B&NES planning department in 2013 Stowey Sutton Parish Council have been informed that planning applications for small and medium sized developments will be considered with a presumption of acceptance, even where sites would otherwise be considered unacceptable due to the “development imperative” contained within the national planning policy framework.

This approach has led to a number of predatory planning applications within Bishop Sutton, with 35 new homes already approved, a further 41 new homes currently under appeal and two more developers under discussion with B&NES for an

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

additional 23 homes, all on sites which are outside the housing development boundary & considered unsuitable sites by the Parish Council.

As a parish council with a published residential planning policy since 2008 & proven track record of achieving infill development in line with the revised draft core strategy, we feel that this approach is inappropriate and will inevitably lead to overdevelopment of the village in a way that annex 1 of the draft core strategy specifically recognises as unsustainable.

Change to the policy requested:

Stowey Sutton Parish Council understands that at the previous examination the inspector made no negative comments regarding the rural housing allocation & feel that as this allocation has increased in the revised core strategy, if he is minded to do so, it would be appropriate for the inspector to make a comment highlighting the appropriateness of these targets, which would allow SPC 143 regarding RA1 settlements to be used as a material consideration in planning decisions for those settlements prior to full acceptance and adoption of the core strategy.

This would support the pro-active approach taken by Stowey Sutton Parish Council to encouraging development in line with the draft core strategy, whilst ensuring that inappropriate development is not permitted through fear of the cost of developer appeals prior to full core strategy adoption.

Respondent Number: 1554 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Stowey Sutton Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Stowey Sutton Parish Council broadly support the revised targets for RA1 villages contained within SPC143, but fear that the approach taken by the B&NES planning department in the period until that Council has an approved and adopted Core Strategy will render those targets obsolete.

In meetings with officers and managers within the B&NES planning department in 2013 Stowey Sutton Parish Council have been informed that planning applications for small and medium sized developments will be considered with a presumption of acceptance, even where sites would otherwise be considered unacceptable due to the "development imperative" contained within the national planning policy framework.

This approach has led to a number of predatory planning applications within Bishop Sutton, with 35 new homes already approved, a further 41 new homes currently under appeal and two more developers under discussion with B&NES for an additional 23 homes, all on sites which are outside the housing development boundary & considered unsuitable sites by the Parish Council.

As a parish council with a published residential planning policy in place since 2008 & proven track record of achieving infill development in line with the revised draft core strategy, we feel that this approach is inappropriate and will inevitably lead to overdevelopment of the village in a way that annex 1 of the draft core strategy specifically recognises as unsustainable.

Change to the policy requested:

Stowey Sutton Parish Council fully support the Place Making Plan process outlined by B&NES council, but have concerns that it will be rendered obsolete by that authorities approach in not opposing developments that are either in an inappropriate location or which would lead to development which would exceed the targets for an RA1 settlement, until the formal adoption of the core strategy following its approval by the inspector.

We feel that as a parish council with a published residential planning policy in place since 2008 & proven track record of achieving development in line with the revised draft core strategy, it would be appropriate for the inspector to make comment that in such situations the location of further development outside the existing housing development boundary should not be permitted until the completion of the place making plan process for such settlements.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

This would support the pro-active approach taken by Stowey Sutton Parish Council to encouraging development in line with the draft core strategy, whilst ensuring that inappropriate development is not permitted through fear of the cost of developer appeals prior to full core strategy adoption.

Respondent Number: 1554 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Stowey Sutton Parish Council
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Stowey Sutton Parish Council would like the inspector to clarify the conditions for RA1 status, SPC 143 states,

POLICY RA1 Development in the villages meeting the listed criteria

At the villages outside the Green Belt, proposals for residential and employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within in and adjoining the housing development boundary provided the proposal is in accordance with the spatial strategy for the District set out under policy DW1 and the village has:

a: at least 3 of the following key facilities within the village:

post office, school, community meeting place and convenience shop,
and

b: at least a daily Monday-Saturday public transport service to main centres

Change to the policy requested:

Stowey Sutton Parish Council would specifically question if four busses Monday to Saturday, all leaving Bishop Sutton before 1pm and four returning between 1pm & 6pm, to/from Bristol (which is outside the B&NES authority area) could be considered as fulfilling the requirements to SPC 143, b.

In which case the village of Bishop Sutton should not be considered as meeting the requirements for a RA1 settlement.

Respondent Number: 2567 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** John Cockerham **Respondent Organisation:** Temple Cloud Residents Group
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We do not support the changes made to the criteria for selecting RA1 villages as we believe them to be flawed for a number of reasons:

-[2]‘It is reasonable for villages that meet the requirements of Policy RA1 to review their Housing Development Boundaries over the plan period’:

We feel that although some development of villages is both inevitable and required, that it is unnecessary to adjust development boundaries. Rural villages have traditionally grown ‘piecemeal’ with small ‘in fill’ developments where for example a home owner has erected a single dwelling at the end of their garden.

Making provision for the adjustment of development boundaries will almost certainly encourage landowners to seek larger scale developments.

As demonstrated by the development history of our village, if boundaries were to remain the same and that villages be allowed to grow as they have done historically, the required number of dwellings would be fulfilled across the period of the

Core Strategy but at a controlled rate that would be sustainable and would allow the villages and their facilities to adapt gradually.

Special consideration should also be given to villages that have recently accommodated large scale development (for example Temple Cloud which during the period covered by the Core Strategy has had a development of 26 affordable homes built). These villages must be protected from further large scale development which could seriously harm the infrastructure and quality of life within these villages.

One exception would possibly be in the case of land reserved for a bypass at Clutton and Temple Cloud. We believe that in the event of any sizable development in these villages, it may be appropriate to review this reserved land and consider it for development. Given that it is unlikely that a bypass will ever be built, development of this land would provide balance to both villages either side of the A37, as well as helping the two villages to retain their individual identity rather than merging (as is highly likely should further development take place to the east of the A37). Alternatively the reserved land could be moved west to allow for development with the condition that any developer must also build the bypass.

The Campaign to Protect Rural England have identified that it is of particular importance that land currently being used to produce crops / food products must be protected to ensure sustainability. In addition, development of agricultural land into housing would be detrimental for local employment for persons working these lands. This would be in direct conflict with the ideology of 'localism'.

Additionally, with the removal for Greenbelt from areas surrounding Bath, we feel it appropriate that this should be replaced by giving protection to open spaces within existing rural developments.

-Removal for the requirement of local support:

We feel that it is important, especially in rural villages, that local people be intimately involved in the growth of their village. If the requirement for local people to demonstrate support for a given development is removed, there is a real danger that the identity of a village may be destroyed. Development of any scale, must meet with the approval of those who will be left with its legacy.

- 'at least 3 of the following key facilities within the village: post office, school, community meeting place and convenience shop':

We feel that the above criteria are too vaguely defined and should be reviewed.

For example, to simply have a school is not evidence enough that a development is sustainable. Does the school have capacity for additional students? If not, is there provision to expand the school? Where would the budget for any expansion come from?

- 'at least a daily Monday-Saturday public transport service to main centres':

Again, we feel that the above is too vague.

We must consider the impact of development on the wider community and the road network. If development is to be sustainable there must be appropriate public transport to cover all aspects of modern living. There must be fast, direct transport at appropriate times to all major local employment centres, as well as provision for transport to secondary schools. For example, Temple Cloud has no appropriate public transport provision for commuting to Bath. In addition to this, it has been identified that public transport is lacking in certain villages in the rural areas to major secondary schools (such as Norton Hill School).

Change to the policy requested:

We would therefore suggest the following adjustments:

"At the villages outside the Green Belt, proposals for residential and employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within in and adjoining the housing development boundary provided the proposal is in accordance with the spatial strategy for the District set out under policy DW1 and the village has all of the following:

1. A primary school with scope to expand to meet the needs of any additional development both financially and structurally.
2. A post office.
3. A convenience store that can realistically sustain the everyday needs of the community.
4. Fast, direct public transport at appropriate times to all major local employment centres, as well as provision for transport to secondary schools.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

We on the whole support the policy but wish to emphasise that any growth of a rural community should be in keeping with existing housing, should be infill, should take into account any previous recent development, and should be a slow release across the timeframe covered by the Core Strategy.

We would therefore suggest the following adjustments:

“At the villages which meet these criteria, development sites will also be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary will be reviewed accordingly to enable delivery during the Plan period of the 1,110 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

The Placemaking Plan should ensure that any development be in keeping with existing housing, should be infill, should take into account any previous recent development, and should be a slow release across the timeframe covered by the Core Strategy.

Proposals at villages outside the Green Belt for employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within and adjoining the housing development boundary.”

Respondent Number: 2567 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** John Cockerham **Respondent Organisation:** Temple Cloud Residents Group
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

1. Temple Cloud has been classed as a RA1 village under the core strategy. Currently the local PH (Temple Inn) is closed with no long term prospect, and is not a sustainable meeting place under the current RA1 guidelines.
 2. Temple Cloud has undergone recent expansion of over 35 new dwellings in the last 18 months which has increased the capacity of the village both in occupant numbers and extra traffic for the roads in and around the village.
 3. Under the core strategy, rural villages are only expected to increase by 20 new dwellings through the place making plan, and Temple Cloud has already exceeded this limit set under the strategy.
 4. The current road infrastructure of the village with the A37 running through it, has over the years increased considerably with regards to traffic volume and types of vehicles using this road.
 5. The loss of the speed camera which was situated in the village and the large increase of volume of traffic has made the A37 a dangerous road, both with excess speed of the vehicles travelling on the A37 and the large increase of volume of traffic.
 6. More development would exacerbate this problem and potentially cause accident blackspots in the village.
 7. Scenic land in the heart of the village would be lost forever, which gives Temple Cloud its village feel /look and character.
- All would remain is a village resembling a “emersons green” housing estate.
8. Also there are is very little sustainable jobs in the village due to its size. There are mainly “one man bands” operating out of the village. New occupants would need to commute to work in Bristol/Bath increasing an already overloaded road network.

Change to the policy requested:

1. Temple Cloud does not fit the criteria for a RA1 status.
2. Temple Cloud has already under the new Core Strategy exceeded its developments of 20 additional dwellings, through recent increase of houses in the last 18 months in the village.

Respondent Number: 2700 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Murphy **Respondent Organisation:**
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

don't understand how the number of houses to be built in rural area has gone up to such a high amount. All the villages on the A37 are unsustainable, where are all these jobs for houses. In Temple cloud we have Had 26 new social houses and flats built, they had to advertise outside the village to fill them, that's how sustainable our village is. Nearly everyone who lives on the A37 commutes to either Bristol or Bath for Work. Also it wasn't long ago BANES had to step in to subsidise the local bus into Bristol, which they were Going to stop, that's how sustainable Temple cloud is for lots of new houses.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment.

Respondent Number: 3095 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans**Respondent Organisation:** CPRE Avonside**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The policy currently states:
 "POLICY RA1 Development in the villages meeting the listed criteria
 At the villages outside the Green Belt, proposals for residential and employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within in and adjoining the housing development boundary provided the proposal is in accordance with the spatial strategy for the District set out under policy DW1 and the village has:
 a: at least 3 of the following key facilities within the village: post office, school, community meeting place and convenience shop, and
 b: at least a daily Monday-Saturday public transport service to main centres, and
 c: local community support for the principle of development can be demonstrated.
 At the villages which meet these criteria, development sites will also be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary will be reviewed accordingly to enable delivery during the Plan period of the 1,110 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Proposals at villages outside the Green Belt for employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within and adjoining the housing development boundary."
 We object to the change that has been made to the criteria for identifying RA1 villages. If the requirement for local support is removed, then local people are not given an opportunity to have any input into the suitability or otherwise of their village for the required scale of development. The test of the suitability of a village for inclusion in the RA1 category should therefore be more rigorous in order to make up for the absence of local input.

Change to the policy requested:

We suggest the following replacement text:
 "At the villages outside the Green Belt, proposals for residential and employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within in and adjoining the housing development boundary provided the proposal is in accordance with the spatial strategy for the District set out under policy DW1 and the village has all of the following:
 1. A post office;
 2. A primary school with demonstrable and deliverable potential to increase its capacity to meet the needs of new residents following new development;
 3. A convenience shop
 4. Public transport links that allow access to secondary education and to one or more shopping and employment centres,

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

defined as being Development Policy A and Policy B settlements as set out in the B&NES Settlement Classification Core Strategy Information Paper 2009.”

Respondent Number: 3095 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans

Respondent Organisation: CPRE Avonside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We object to the absence of reference to scale of new developments relative to settlement size in the revised Policy RA1. We feel that although the overall aim of this policy is sound and workable, it is of very great importance for village communities that development is gradual and to scale with the village.

Change to the policy requested:

We request the following addition to the second section of RA1 (our addition in bold):

“At the villages which meet these criteria, development sites will also be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary will be reviewed accordingly to enable delivery during the Plan period of the 1,110 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

The Placemaking Plan will ensure that development is appropriate to the scale of the settlement, with no single development adding more than 5% to the number of dwellings in a settlement.

Proposals at villages outside the Green Belt for employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within and adjoining the housing development boundary.”

Respondent Number: 3095 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans

Respondent Organisation: CPRE Avonside

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We object to the absence of reference to gradual phasing of development in rural villages in the revisions made to Policy RA1.

Rural villages owe their distinctive character to a gradual pattern of development over many years. This slow, steady growth also meets local needs – for example, if affordable housing is needed to meet the needs of young local families, clearly this needs to come onto the market gradually; if a large number of houses are offered at once, only a few will be taken by local people with the rest being offered to those living further afield.

We therefore feel strongly that the Core Strategy needs to require the Placemaking Plan to deliver this phasing.

Change to the policy requested:

We request the following addition to the second section of RA1 (our addition in bold):

“At the villages which meet these criteria, development sites will also be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary will be reviewed accordingly to enable delivery during the Plan period of the 1,110 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

The Placemaking Plan will ensure that development is phased gradually within individual settlements, according to the delivery timetable set out in this Core Strategy.

Proposals at villages outside the Green Belt for employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within and adjoining the housing development boundary.”

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 3095 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans**Respondent Organisation:** CPRE Avonside**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We object to the absence of a requirement for the Placemaking Plan to adopt a sequential approach to allocating housing sites within and around RA1 settlements.

The draft Core Strategy states:

“We will need to adopt environmentally friendly practices such as making buildings more energy efficient, increase the use of renewable energy, reduce car use and grow more local food.” – B&NES Submitted Core Strategy (Composite Version 2013) p.4

“The potential for the rural area to play an important role in local food production will be promoted.” – B&NES Submitted Core Strategy (Composite Version 2013) p.6

“5.36 With regard to agriculture it is predicted that agricultural production for local markets will become increasingly important as energy prices rise and globalised food supplies are disrupted by changing weather patterns. Farming in the rural areas will have an important role to play in supporting food security and as such, local farm shops, local food production and small scale farm developments will be supported.” – B&NES Submitted Core Strategy (Composite Version 2013) p.91

“Some of the more pressing demands are meeting the need for locally produced food and renewable energy in order to help respond to our changing climate.” - B&NES Submitted Core Strategy (Composite Version 2013) p.107

In order to deliver these policies, it is essential that building on green field sites should be avoided as much as possible. However, the Core Strategy does not contain a specific requirement for the Placemaking Plan to identify sites for new housing using a sequential approach, with brownfield sites identified first; land within existing housing development boundaries next, then finally green field sites if it is impossible for housing numbers to be achieved otherwise.

Change to the policy requested:

We suggest an amendment to RA1 as follows (our addition in bold):

At the villages which meet these criteria, development sites will also be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary will be reviewed accordingly to enable delivery during the Plan period of the 1,110 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Proposals at villages outside the Green Belt for employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within and adjoining the housing development boundary.

In preparing the Placemaking Plan, a sequential approach will be used in identifying sites for new housing, with sites considered in the following order:

1. Brownfield sites
2. Sites within the existing housing development boundary
3. Green field sites

Sites from each subsequent category will only be considered if the previous categories have been exhausted.”

Respondent Number: 4451 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Hallatrow Business Park Ltd**Agent ID:** 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations on behalf of Hallatrow Business Park are concerned to protect the interests of the SHLAA site HALL 4 which lies between the western edge of Hallatrow village and Hallatrow Business Park.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The proposed changes in SPC143 and 144 are supported in terms of:

1. Providing a criteria based policy to test the ability of villages to accommodate further growth.
2. Allowing for amendments to be made to the HDB through the Placemaking Plan if appropriate, and
3. Enabling the delivery of 1,110 dwellings in the rural areas.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4463 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Tony Piddock **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

As an ordinary member of the public I don't pretend to understand all the intricacies involved in this matter (although before retirement in 1996 I was employed by Department of the Environment in Bristol and was familiar at the time with national planning policy (PPGs etc) and Inspectors' reports).

I just want to make a small point in relation to housing development in Farmborough. As I understand it, it is not now proposed to make Farmborough an RA1 village. That makes sense as the village has a school, a meeting place and a very limited bus service, but no shop and no jobs. Three buildings which provided a small amount of local employment have been converted into dwellings. Planning permission exists for 38 dwellings in part of the village. I do not understand the logic of further significant housing when there are no jobs in the village. All new residents (and I was one 35 years ago) have to drive to Bath or Bristol or other surrounding areas for work and also for shopping. This only exacerbates the pressure on the local road infrastructure and adds to CO2 emissions. It just makes no sense to add to village development without providing jobs and shopping facilities locally. That is my point.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4539 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Sally Davis **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

As Ward Councillor & a resident of Farmborough I support the feedback given by Farmborough Parish Council. Residents have made it clear to both myself, as Ward Cllr, & The Parish Council they welcome the above change which removes the RA1 status for the village of Farmborough.

The reason being the village has lost amenities and public transport links over recent times and therefore potential for excessive development, as identified within the recent SHLAA documentation, outside the defined housing development boundary would prove unsustainable and dramatically change the open and rural character of this village.

Farmborough recently had approval for 38 homes (with an application for a further 12 homes pending) within the housing boundary, this represents a 14% increase in housing stock. Further developments, requiring the extension of the housing boundary into green belt land, would not be in proportion to the size of the village.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Parishioners have made their feelings known through various meetings and the recent community plan survey feedback (completed April 2013) will I am sure provide evidence that the approved application for 38 houses has allowed Farmborough to grow.

Concerns about the sustainability of this development have been raised but residents feel certain that with limited facilities in the village it would be unable to sustain further development whilst keeping the rural character of Farmborough.

Change to the policy requested:

No comment

Respondent Number: 4543 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Davey

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143 **Plan Reference:** Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

- 'It is reasonable for villages that meet the requirements of Policy RA1 to review their Housing Development Boundaries over the plan period':

I feel that although development of villages is both inevitable and required, that it is unnecessary to adjust development boundaries. Rural villages have traditionally grown 'piecemeal' with small 'in fill' developments where for example a home owner has erected a single dwelling at the end of their garden.

Making provision for the adjustment of development boundaries will almost certainly encourage landowners to seek larger scale developments.

As demonstrated by the development history of our village, if boundaries were to remain the same and that villages be allowed to grow as they have done historically, the required number of dwellings would be fulfilled across the period of the Core Strategy but at a controlled rate that would be sustainable and would allow the villages and their facilities to adapt gradually.

Special consideration should also be given to villages that have recently accommodated large scale development (for example Temple Cloud which during the period covered by the Core Strategy has already had a development of 26 affordable homes built). These villages must be protected from further large scale development which could seriously harm the infrastructure and quality of life within these villages.

One exception would possibly be in the case of land reserved for a bypass at Clutton and Temple Cloud. I believe that in the event of any sizable development in these villages, that it may be appropriate to review this reserved land and consider it for development. Given that it is unlikely that a bypass will ever be built, development of this land would provide balance to both villages either side of the A37, as well as helping the two villages to retain their individual identity rather than merging (as is highly likely should further development take place to the east of the A37).

The Campaign to Protect Rural England have identified that it is of particular importance that land currently being used to produce crops / food products must be protected to ensure sustainability. In addition, development of agricultural land into housing would be detrimental for local employment for persons working these lands. With the recent food scandals the requirement and demand for food originating from within the UK will, and has, increased. Brown field sites and poor quality grass field sits must be considered ahead of food producing and good quality agricultural land.

Additionally, with the removal for Greenbelt from areas surrounding Bath and Whitchurch, I feel it appropriate that this should be replaced by giving protection to open spaces within existing rural developments.

- Removal for the requirement of local support:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

I feel that it is important, especially in rural villages, that local people be intimately involved in the growth of their village. If the requirement for local people to demonstrate support for a given development is removed, there is a real danger that the identity of a village may be destroyed. Development of any scale, must meet with the approval of those who will be left with its legacy.

- 'at least 3 of the following key facilities within the village: post office, school, community meeting place and convenience shop':

I feel that the above criteria are too vaguely defined and should be reviewed.

For example, to simply have a school is not evidence enough that a development is sustainable. Does the school have capacity for additional students? If not, is there provision /available land on the current site to expand the school? Where would the budget for any expansion come from?

- 'at least a daily Monday-Saturday public transport service to main centres':

Again, I feel that the above is too vague.

The strategy must consider the impact of development on the wider community and the road network. If development is to be sustainable there must be appropriate public transport to cover all aspects of modern living. There must be fast, direct transport at appropriate times to all major local employment centres, as well as provision for transport to secondary schools. For example, Temple Cloud has no appropriate public transport provision for commuting to Bath. In addition to this, it has been identified that public transport is lacking in certain villages in the rural areas to major secondary schools (such as Norton Hill School). In addition the bus service to Bristol at weekends and evenings is subsidised by the council. How long will this continue?

Change to the policy requested:

I would therefore suggest the following adjustments:

"At the villages outside the Green Belt, proposals for residential and employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within in and adjoining the housing development boundary provided the proposal is in accordance with the spatial strategy for the District set out under policy DW1 and the village has all of the following:

1. A primary school with scope to expand to meet the needs of any additional development both financially and structurally.
2. A post office.
3. A convenience store that can sustain the everyday needs of the community.
4. Fast, direct public transport at appropriate times to all major local employment centres, as well as provision for transport to secondary schools.

On the whole I support the policy but wish to emphasise that any growth of a rural community should be in keeping with existing housing, should take into account any previous recent development, and should be a slow release across the timeframe covered by the Core Strategy.

Respondent Number: 4634 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Andrew Jones

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC143

Plan Reference: Policy RA1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I do not support the changes made to the criteria for selecting RA1 villages as I believe them to be flawed.

'It is reasonable for villages that meet the requirements of Policy RA1 to review their Housing Development Boundaries over the plan period'

Making provision for the adjustment of development boundaries will almost certainly encourage landowners to seek larger scale developments.

Special consideration should also be given to villages that have recently accommodated large scale development (for example Temple Cloud which during the period covered by the Core Strategy has had a development of 26 affordable homes built). These villages must be protected from further large scale development which could seriously harm the infrastructure and quality of life within these villages. If boundaries were to remain the same and villages be allowed to grow as they have done historically, the required number of dwellings would be fulfilled across the period of the Core Strategy but at a controlled rate that would be sustainable and would allow the villages and their facilities to adapt gradually.

The Campaign to Protect Rural England have identified that it is of particular importance that land currently being used to produce crops / food products must be protected to ensure sustainability. In addition, development of agricultural land into housing would be detrimental for local employment for persons working these lands.

Additionally, with the removal for Greenbelt from areas surrounding Bath, we feel it appropriate that this should be replaced by giving protection to open spaces within existing rural developments.

- Removal for the requirement of local support

I feel that it is important, especially in rural villages, that local people be intimately involved in the growth of their village. If the requirement for local people to demonstrate support for a given development is removed, there is a real danger that the identity of a village may be destroyed. Development of any scale, must meet with the approval of those who will be left with its legacy.

- at least 3 of the following key facilities within the village: post office, school, community meeting place and convenience shop':

I feel that the above criteria are too vaguely defined and should be reviewed.

For example, to simply have a school is not evidence enough that a development is sustainable. Does the school have capacity for additional students? If not, is there provision to expand the school? Where would the budget for any expansion come from?

Change to the policy requested:

I would therefore suggest the following adjustments:

"At the villages outside the Green Belt, proposals for residential and employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within in and adjoining the housing development boundary provided the proposal is in accordance with the spatial strategy for the District set out under policy DW1 and the village has all of the following:

1. A primary school with scope to expand to meet the needs of any additional development both financially and structurally.
2. A post office.
3. A convenience store that can sustain the everyday needs of the community.
4. Fast, direct public transport at appropriate times to all major local employment centres, as well as provision for transport to secondary schools.

On the whole I support the policy but wish to emphasise that any growth of a rural community should be in keeping with existing housing, should be infill, should take into account any previous recent development, and should be a slow release across the timeframe covered by the Core Strategy.

I therefore suggest the following adjustments:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

"At the villages which meet these criteria, development sites will also be identified in the Placemaking Plan and the housing development boundary will be reviewed accordingly to enable delivery during the Plan period of the 1,110 dwellings identified on the Key Diagram. Residential development on sites adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

The Placemaking Plan should ensure that any development be in keeping with existing housing, should be infill, should take into account any previous recent development, and should be a slow release across the timeframe covered by the Core Strategy.

Proposals at villages outside the Green Belt for employment development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village and its setting will be acceptable within and adjoining the housing development boundary."

Change Ref. SPC144**Plan Ref.: Policy RA2****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 93 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Jacqui Ashman**Respondent Organisation:** Highways Agency**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC144**Plan Reference:** Policy RA2**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions . These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements .

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency 's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows :

Rural Areas

The Agency recognises the potential to accommodate new residential development in villages that are assessed as being the most sustainable. As specific locations and proposals have not yet been identified it is difficult for the Agency to make any further comment , suffice to say that any planning application should be accompanied by a robust transport evidence base so that the impacts can be fully understood .

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving . In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 184 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis**Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC144

Plan Reference: Policy RA2

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC144

PHSV note that this says limited residential development at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an Adopted Neighbourhood Plan. This will not result in positive planning and is an invitation to villages not to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan in order to prevent the need to locate additional development. This issue should be resolved through the Place Making Plan .

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: No comment on Development Locations****Respondent Number:** 2387 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Roger Sirett**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC144

Plan Reference: Policy RA2

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I write to you as a Farmborough and B&NES Constiuent.

As the Councillor for B&NES and Farmborough I trust you were as shocked as myself reading the last Farmborough Flyer and that you will take appropriate against the proposals for this village to prevent B&NES and the Government from potentially desecrating our countryside as outlined in that Flyer. Firms in the building and energy trades are intent on “cashing-in “ on Government handouts of Tax Payers money, to all and sundry, who believe they can plug the energy gap and solve the much vaunted, but over-inflated claims in the housing market. We are so short of houses in this village that seven houses, to my knowledge, have simply sat on the housing market for months and months and months and cannot be sold. So where is this shortage ?

If the Core Strategy for B&NES is adhered to,

- there could be 443 houses built within the Farmborough Boundary. Essentially doubling the size of the village.
- the village neither needs this nor has the infrastructure, public services and jobs to cater for such a monstrous proposal.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4451 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Hallatrow Business Park Ltd**Agent ID:** 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC144

Plan Reference: Policy RA2

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

These representations on behalf of Hallatrow Business Park are concerned to protect the interests of the SHLAA site HALL 4 which lies between the western edge of Hallatrow village and Hallatrow Business Park.

The proposed changes in SPC143 and 144 are supported in terms of:

1. Providing a criteria based policy to test the ability of villages to accommodate further growth.
2. Allowing for amendments to be made to the HDB through the Placemaking Plan if appropriate, and
3. Enabling the delivery of 1,110 dwellings in the rural areas.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4451 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Hallatrow Business Park Ltd**Agent ID:** 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC144

Plan Reference: Policy RA2

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The purpose of these representations is to clarify inaccuracies in the SHLAA assessment of HALL 4.

The site is described as 4 hectares with housing potential for about 120 dwellings. It was never intended that the whole field should be brought forward for development, but rather it can be made available for a scale of development appropriate to provide a coherent link between the village, the Business Park and the approved Garden Centre development up to White Cross junction.

Given the significant job opportunities at Hallatrow Business Park and the Garden Centre, the Council's conclusion that the site is disassociated from the framework of the village, is not accepted.

The site is flat, isolated agricultural land with no ecological, archaeological or other environmental limitations to its development. Its confirmed availability is reaffirmed. Whilst the Council's assessment leaves "Achievability" blank, it should be completed in the affirmative that the site, of an appropriate area, could be brought forward immediately if required.

In addition, it is confirmed on behalf of the landowner who would be promoting the development that, if preferred, a mixed use housing and employment scheme could be promoted. Hallatrow Business Park has been continuously and fully occupied during the 18 years in which it has been under its current ownership. Development as an extension to it would be deliverable and of undoubted benefit to the local economy, just as the existing Business Park has been to date.

Change to the policy requested:

Correct and complete the March 2013 SHLAA assessment for HALL3: Land adjacent to Hallatrow Business Park.

Respondent Number: 4463 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr Tony Piddock**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC144

Plan Reference: Policy RA2

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

As an ordinary member of the public I don't pretend to understand all the intricacies involved in this matter (although before retirement in 1996 I was employed by Department of the Environment in Bristol and was familiar at the time with national planning policy (PPGs etc) and Inspectors' reports).

I just want to make a small point in relation to housing development in Farmborough. As I understand it, it is not now proposed to make Farmborough an RA1 village. That makes sense as the village has a school, a meeting place and a very limited bus service, but no shop and no jobs. Three buildings which provided a small amount of local employment have been converted into dwellings. Planning permission exists for 38 dwellings in part of the village. I do not understand the logic of further significant housing when there are no jobs in the village. All new residents (and I was one 35 years ago) have to drive to Bath or Bristol or other surrounding areas for work and also for shopping. This only exacerbates the pressure on the local road infrastructure and adds to CO2 emissions. It just makes no sense to add to village development without providing jobs and shopping facilities locally. That is my point.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref.** SPC145**Plan Ref.:** New para 5.42A**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 170 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick**Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC145

Plan Reference: New para 5.42A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Pegasus supports the Proposed Changes to new para 5.42, but objects to the Placemaking Plan which will identify and allocate sites for development and will define the revised detailed Green Belt boundary. In order for the plan to be sound the sites should be allocated in the Core Strategy as sites to be removed from the Green Belt are considered critical to the delivery of the housing .

It is considered that the Green Belt review should be completed for the purposes of the Core Strategy in accordance with the NPPF in particularly paras 83 – 85 ie that when altering the Green Belt boundaries through the preparation or review of the Local Plan, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Local Planning authorities should also identify “safeguarded land” between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer- term development needs stretching beyond the plan period.

The methodology for the Green Belt Review in the Draft (February 2013) refers to a two stage process: Stage 1 Completion of a high level district wide Green belt review to ascertain the extent to which different parcels of land serve national Green Belt purposes. It is understood that the scope of this work was intended to inform any update of the Core Strategy and potentially the identification of broad areas for Green Belt release. Stage 2 i.e. more detailed area based studies would be undertaken if the Council determined that alterations to the Green Belt were necessary. This would then inform detailed boundary changes that may be consulted upon through the preparation of a Site Allocations Plan document (Placemaking Plan).

It is not clear whether Stage 2 has taken place and in particular what role the Arup Concept Options Reports (March 2013) have, especially as they do not refer to comprising the Stage 2 Green Belt review and are caveated to the effect that they are not Council policy and have no planning status. It is noted that the Concept Option Reports are “only assessments used to help the consideration of potential development locations. By publishing these reports the Council is not agreeing to the development layout or capacities identified within them. The Council’s planning policy relating to any locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

taken forward through the Core Strategy, including the identification and allocation of specific areas of land for development, will be established through the Placemaking Plan in conjunction with the local community.”

It is considered that given the reliance on the release of locations from the Green Belt in order to meet the housing requirement for the plan period – that the sites should be identified in the Core Strategy in accordance with the NPPF para 47 and paras 83 – 85. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development.

Change to the policy requested:

New Paragraph 5.42A should be read as follows: “In order to meet the need for additional development within the District during the Plan period, land needs to be removed from the Green Belt to provide for housing at Whitchurch. The Placemaking Plan will identify and allocate the sites for development and will define the revised detailed Green Belt boundary. area to be released from the Green Belt at Whitchurch is allocated in Policy RA5. National planning policy makes it clear that when altering Green Belt boundaries consideration should be given as to whether land needs to be safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs. In defining the detailed Green belt boundary the Core Strategy Placemaking Plan will consider whether there is any scope to identify safeguarded land. Policy RA5 outlines the planning requirements for development in this location, which need to inform identification and allocation of the site in the Placemaking Plan and delivery of development through a planning application.”

Change Ref. SPC146**Plan Ref.: New Policy RA5****Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch****Respondent Number:** 86**Comment Number:** 1**Respondent Name:** Whitchurch Parish Council**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

In an ideal world, Whitchurch Parish Council believes that the protection of the existing Green Belt is of paramount importance in order that the Village protects its traditions, culture and sense of community which has been built and retained over many years.

However the Parish Council also recognises that there is huge pressure from Central & Local government to deliver an increasing number of houses in order to cope with an ever increasing population. Until recently the Parish Council had been under the impression that Whitchurch Village was classed as an RA1 development inset into the Green Belt and as such would be required to supply up to 50 dwellings, this being in the main acceptable to the population of Whitchurch. The fact that Bath & North East Somerset District Council has failed in gaining Inspectorate approval to the Core Strategy, and in particular the inability to demonstrate a plan to deliver acceptable housing numbers has lead to Whitchurch being in a totally vulnerable position to predatory planning applications and the potential for multiple large developments. A case in point is Barrett’s application for 47 houses for the Sleep Lane development where BANES refused the application but the Inspectorate has overturned the decline and agreed it.

In these circumstances the Parish Council reluctantly acknowledges that the imposition of some development is inevitable and as a consequence there will be some impact on the Green Belt surrounding the village.

Accordingly the Parish Council believes that it should accept BANES proposal to work collaboratively with them within the District’s Place-making Plan in order that any development is managed correctly, and as far as possible benefits the Village in terms of location, infrastructure and support services.

It must be made clear that our position remains that there should be a Green Belt buffer between Whitchurch Village and Bristol so that the village is not consumed into the Bristol metropolis.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 93 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Jacqui Ashman **Respondent Organisation:** Highways Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. We understand that the examination of the document started in January 2012 but is currently suspended so that the Council can respond to the Inspector's initial conclusions. These were that the Core Strategy may not be planning for enough new housing and that the methodology to calculate the requirement was not compliant with new national policy requirements.

The Agency is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It will engage with communities and the development industry to deliver sustainable development and, thus, economic growth whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the SRN. In Bath and North East Somerset, the SRN comprises the A46/A36. The A46 runs south from the M4 Junction 18 outside of the Council area to where it meets the A36 to the east of Bath which then continues south. The M5 and M4 are outside of Bath and NE Somerset and lie to the west and north respectively. The Agency is keen to ensure that any changes to the Core Strategy take account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated and that the principles of sustainable travel are reflected in the development of the site.

We need to ensure that as far as possible the Agency's interests are protected whilst at the same time not detracting from the purpose of the Core Strategy. Our comments are made only on the parts of the document which are relevant in the context of the Highways Agency's remit, and we acknowledge that the consultation is only to comment on the proposed changes. The main proposed changes centre around the new increased housing numbers. Our comments address the location of these additional dwellings as follows:

Land at Whitchurch

The location of residential led mixed use residential development at Whitchurch is close to the border with Bristol and is not anticipated in their Core Strategy. To this end we understand that Bristol has some concerns about the location of development in Whitchurch. In this document the Council acknowledges that there are constraints and that development outside the current constraints of approximately 200 dwellings as proposed would trigger the need for substantial transport infrastructure. For this reason it is particularly important that if development is to proceed in this location robust transport investigation is undertaken to understand the impact of proposals and the Agency would seek early involvement at the Masterplanning stage as far as was required. It is important that a cross administrative holistic approach to any necessary development mitigation is taken.

I trust that the comments within this letter are of use to the Local Authority. The Agency reiterates that these comments do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we are consulted at an early stage as development proposals for specific sites are evolving. In the meantime should you wish to discuss the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst Pegasus welcomes the recognition of the need to release land at Whitchurch from the Green Belt as set out in Proposed New Policy RA5 for the development of around 200 dwellings, it is nevertheless considered that there is scope in this area for further development as set out in the submitted planning application 12/04597/OUT and in our original representations on the Core Strategy.

It is noted that the Development Concept Options Report has been produced for "Land at Whitchurch". It is not clear how these reports relate to the Stage 2 of the Green Belt Review. These reports appear to be produced to assist the consideration of locations for development, but they are not planning policy and it is further noted that the Council is not agreeing to the development capacities contained in the report.

It is considered that the Policy is unsound as it should not only remove land from the Green Belt (which is in principle supported) but it should be site specific and identify the site in the Core Strategy – this approach would be consistent with the NPPF para 47 which states that sites that are critical to the delivery of the housing provision in the plan period should be identified in the Core Strategy, coupled together with the NPPF approach to Green Belt ie para 83 – 85 it is considered that the approach to the release of land from the Green Belt is unsound. Land of Stockwood Lane, Whitchurch should be identified as a site in the Core Strategy, and not left to come forward through another assessment in the Placemaking Plan. The Placemaking Plan is not the appropriate document to identify a strategic allocation in the Green Belt; neither should any safeguarding of land in the area be considered in the Placemaking Plan. This is a strategic issue which should be addressed in the Core Strategy. The NPPF para 85 states that local planning authorities "...identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan Review which proposes the development.

Policy RA5 sets out a detailed approach to the planning requirements which are more appropriate for the Placemaking Plan and would in any case accompany a planning application having regard to the Planning Checklist. However, we have suggested elsewhere in our representations that in order to be compliant with the NPPF para 153 the Core Strategy should include the issues that would be addressed in the Local Plan, this is particularly significant given the uncertainty that has arisen in respect of development needs and given the length of time that has been taken to prepare the Core Strategy (preparation commenced in 2007 and the Core Strategy has been suspended twice). Furthermore in order to implement the Government's growth agenda and to significantly boost housing supply as referred to in the NPPF there is a need to resolve the sites which are required to meet the housing provision in the Core Strategy – consequently land off Stockwood Lane should be identified and included in Policy RA5.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy RA5 should be amended as follows: "Land at Whitchurch Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 2300 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary. The need to identify safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs will be considered by the Placemaking Plan. Further land should be identified in this location and safeguarded for development in the longer term and may be released in order to meet the 5 year housing land supply." Planning requirements: - this section of the Policy should be deleted as the planning requirements are not always site specific and represent the Planning Checklist, therefore where they are not site specific they should be deleted.

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading

Respondent Organisation: Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

The Environment Agency have no objections to Policy RA5 and are supportive of point c requiring best practice in relation to green infrastructure and sustainable drainage to be followed. However for information the South West corner of the search area falls within the project area for the Dundry Hills flood risk management improvement works. This is a DEFRA funded scheme being led by Bristol Council to address existing surface water flooding in the area.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Change to the policy requested:

The location, scale and design of development taken forward in the Placemaking Plan should have regard to the existing surface water flooding issues in the Dundry Hills area and Bristol Councils plans to address the issues. We would recommend the Council contact Bristol Council Lead Local Flood Authority function to discuss appropriate additional wording.

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

- 1) RPS does not consider this to represent a credible allocation. It fails to meet the needs of either the Bristol HMA or the Bath HMA.
- 2) The CS fails to establish the needs within the District for the Bath HMA or the Bristol HMA.
- 3) Nevertheless, it does seek to provide a locational strategy that seeks to meet only the requirements of the Bath HMA. It does not do by identifying land outside of the HMA. If the CS were to persist with the current strategy then all development not already committed should be focused in the Bath HMA, leaving Bristol 'for another day'. Such an approach cannot of course be sound but it does highlight that the CS is a mixed solution that fails to meet the needs of anywhere. It fails to grapple properly with meeting the needs of Bath through further Green Belt releases preferring instead to distribute development to obscure parts of the District that by its own admission bear little relation to the Bath HMA.
- 4) 200 homes at Whitchurch is an allocation that fails to do one thing or the other. It is identified as a small allocation in the rural area but could also be a strategic scale urban extension to Bristol. If the CS is not prepared to make difficult decisions about strategic releases, then equally it should not be making piecemeal allocations that may prejudice comprehensive development in the future and the coordination of the necessary infrastructure provisions that need to be understood.

Change to the policy requested:

Deletion of policy.

Respondent Number: 251 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Bovis Homes

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

- 7.1 Our objections on the issues outlined above identify the need for additional land to be identified for housing within B&NES. This is not a new situation. The RSS proposed a significantly higher level of growth than has been proposed now which was tested through the preparation of the RSS; and through the B&NES Spatial Options Document in October 2009.
- 7.2 The RSS made provision for an area of search for an urban extension to the south east of Bristol in B&NES. The Proposed Changes to the RSS made provision for the urban extension to contain 9,500 new homes of which 8,000 would be in BANES. The Core Strategy Spatial Options Document produced by B&NES in October 2009 made provision for a much reduced urban extension of around 3,500 new homes at Whitchurch. This was produced, we assume, in anticipation of a change of Government at the 2010 general election and the proposals were based on the level of provision contained in the Draft RSS of June 2006, albeit distributed differently.
- 7.3 Following the change of Government the Council concluded that it need no longer include proposals for the urban

extension at Whitchurch in its Core Strategy, which has now been re-introduced, albeit at a far smaller scale following the further work on housing numbers requested by the Inspector. However, we have prepared a detailed objective assessment of housing need to show that the evidence base carried out for the Council is flawed, and the provision of 12,700 new homes remains significantly short of the level of housing required to meet the needs of the area. We have also shown that there is clear evidence that some of Bristol's housing needs need to be met in adjoining areas, and Whitchurch is one of the logical places for this to happen, as previously accepted by B&NES.

7.4 We therefore submit that there is a compelling case on grounds of need to reinstate the proposal for about 3,500 new homes at Whitchurch in order to address the issues of soundness we have raised elsewhere

7.5 Whilst we recognise that the draft RSS was never adopted, and the adopted RSS is soon to be revoked, but in light of the demonstrable housing needs for the District, the Council must look again at the scale and locations of development that were accepted through the RSS. The evidence base remains useful and it demonstrates how the West of England could accommodate the scale of development which our evidence points to (and puts in some context the case we are making for Whitchurch in B&NES).

7.6 There were three parts to the RSS area of search south-east of Bristol: Hicks Gate, on the A4 between Bristol and Keynsham, Whitchurch and Stockwood Vale in between them. Stockwood Vale was excluded as a potential development area early in the process. It is an important landscape feature, it plays a strategic Green Belt role and the topography is challenging. Hicks Gate was also rejected because its capacity was considered to be limited, as a result of which it would not be large enough to guarantee being able to support a range of local services. It is physically separate from Bristol and could create an isolated development. The Council did however conclude at paragraph 5.11 of the Core Strategy Spatial Options Report (October 2009) that, "...subject to phasing and appropriate infrastructure as aforesaid and through Strategic Sustainability Assessments and Environmental Capacity Appraisals, that there is considered to be capacity for "around 3,500 dwellings at Whitchurch."

7.7 When assessing appropriate locations to accommodate the increased level of housing needed to meet an NPPF compliant plan, it is therefore important to recognise that the principle of an urban extension at Whitchurch is one that has previously been accepted by the Council, and followed a significant amount of work by the Council investigating the environmental constraints of the area around Whitchurch. Within the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy however, we consider that the Council has used flawed assessments within the Sustainability Appraisal and Transportation Study to artificially limit the allocation for Whitchurch.

Sustainability Appraisal

7.8 We do not consider that the Sustainability Appraisal has considered all reasonable alternatives.

7.9 In respect of the overall housing numbers, the Sustainability Appraisal fails to assess any housing figure over 14,000 (although the Site Assessment table refers to 16,000) because it suggests that the housing numbers do not support this level of growth. However, through information disclosed from our Freedom of Information Act request, we know that the interim housing findings from ORS indicated that even an Oxford central based growth target would require in the order of 16,000 dwellings would be needed. It must therefore be appropriate for the SA to consider a higher level of housing than 14,000; and furthermore, given the housing requirements proposed through the RSS, which are largely ratified through the Barton Willmore assessment, it seems appropriate for the level of housing proposed through the RSS to also be assessed.

7.10 Instead, the SA constrains its assessment to three low-medium trend migration options, which all fall significantly short of the level of housing that our objective assessment of housing need demonstrates is necessary.

7.11 Each option of housing growth scenarios is comprised of a series of sites at varying capacities. However, there is seemingly no commentary and no justification for which sites at which capacities are included to contribute to that option; and indeed whether an alternative mix of sites and capacities would fair better against the sustainability appraisal indicators. For example, in Option 2 (the middle housing growth option 2), Hicks Gate is not deemed to have any capacity, but Whitchurch is assessed at accommodating 200. However, in Option 3 (the highest housing growth option) Hicks Gate is assessed at accommodating 800, and Whitchurch only 600. We do not understand why in the highest growth scenario such an emphasis is placed on Hicks Gate, and other sensitive sites, such as West of Twerton, when sites already identified in Option 2 (such as Whitchurch) could accommodate significantly higher numbers of housing with limited further impact.

7.12 Further, there seems to be no acknowledgement of the potential benefits that could be delivered at these locations if a significant amount of development were to provide the critical mass required to deliver such benefits.

7.13 A higher level of growth has been considered previously, and found to be acceptable at Whitchurch. The RSS Proposed Changes identified 9,500 homes in South East Bristol (8,000 of which in B&NES) and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal found this level of development to be acceptable.

7.14 Indeed, B&NES themselves have assessed and found to be acceptable levels of housing growth between 3,300 and 3,650. The Core Strategy Spatial Options Consultation (October 2009), states the following in relation to development at Whitchurch:

'The lower level of housing provision suggested and subject to necessary infrastructure (i.e. 3,300 rather than 3,650 houses) is considered to be the preferred option as this would recognise the environmental impact of development and have a lesser impact. It is believed that this level of development could largely be accommodated within areas assessed as having a lesser environmental impact.'

7.15 The SA recognises that the 3,300-3,650 range is a reduced scale of development than in the draft RSS and that such a scale of development would pull development back from areas which could cause impacts on the setting of the Maes Knoll scheduled monument and affect the Chew valley skyline. The main uncertainty recognised within the SA was the need for improvements to transport infrastructure, much of which is reliant on the South East Bristol transport package.

7.16 The SA of the Core Strategy Spatial Options consultation provides recommendations for further work/amendments to the Core Strategy. These are very much echoed in the later stages of the SA process, as follows below in relation to the work undertaken for the proposed changes (2013). This includes Annex L, which presents the detailed appraisal of strategic sites. Annex L presents the findings of 2 stages of assessment - the first considering SE Bristol in a B&NES-wide context and the second honing down the details of each site individually:

7.17 The stage 1 district-wide locational sequence assessments scores strategic development at South East Bristol positively against the majority of SEA/SA objectives, specifically noting that the area provides the opportunity to:

- 'Improve accessibility to community facilities and local services', particularly where strategic levels of development with appropriate on-site facilities (such as primary schools and open space) will contribute towards improving access to community facilities in adjacent areas.
- 'Improve the health and well-being of all communities', particularly for large scale developments, there is some potential for onsite provision such as health facilities and open space, potentially offering better facilities adjoining to existing communities.
- 'Improve the availability and provision of training' due to the area's good access to training facilities in Bristol. Potential for on-site facilities improving accessibility to new and existing communities.
- 'Ensure communities have access to a wide range of employment opportunities, paid or unpaid' due to the area's good access to Bristol residents should have access to a wide range of work opportunities.

7.18 The Sustainability Appraisal therefore shows that Whitchurch performs well against many of the sustainability appraisal indicators. It does however perform less well against the objectives to 'protect and enhance local distinctiveness' and 'protect and enhance the district's historic, environmental and cultural assets'. However, the extent to which possible mitigation can be used to minimise any potential negative impact on these objectives is questionable. Our Green Belt Review provides a detailed assessment of the local distinctiveness and environmental assets of the area and together with the masterplanning document illustrate that provided that the development of the area is done in an appropriate manner, it can be achieved without negatively impacting upon the features of historic and environmental importance in the area.

Transportation

7.19 Another issue that appears to have been used to limit the capacity of development that has been considered at Whitchurch is concerns over the transportation links and highway capacity. The Council has commissioned a report on the transportation impact of the development options for the strategic allocations.

7.20 The evaluation report undertaken by Arup on behalf of B&NES (Core Strategy Transport Evaluation, February 2013) tests three scenarios for development. Land at Whitchurch is included in the tested scenarios, with residential quanta of 200, zero and 800 dwellings for scenarios 1 to 3 respectively. There appears to have been no consideration of a larger allocation than the 800 dwellings at Whitchurch, despite the Sustainability Appraisal claiming to have considered the site

for up to 3,000 dwellings.

7.21 The report recommends that Scenario 1 offers the best mix of allocations from a transport perspective, this scenario comprises 200 dwellings at Whitchurch. There is considered only to be a marginal preference for Scenario 2 over Scenario 3.

7.22 The report acknowledges the benefits of development at Whitchurch, in that it “provides better potential access to sustainable transport facilities as Land at Whitchurch is connected to the NCN and well served by buses operating on the A37”. It therefore recognises Whitchurch as a sustainable site for cycling and public transport.

7.23 It also recognises that the key reason why Scenario 3 (the highest level of development) is found to be less preferable to Scenarios 1 and 2 is because Land at Whitchurch is not currently as well located to employment areas as many of the other sites. We question this conclusion however and query whether the report relates to a Bath-Centric assessment of employment opportunities. There are many employment opportunities within South Bristol that can be better accessed by improved public transport which with the BRT and potential connections to Whitchurch which will provide greater accessibility which is not picked up in the transport evaluation. The modelling work undertaken focuses on peak hours/journeys to and from work, highlights the negative impact of additional trip lengths and their consequences and concludes that “the development area is isolated from major employment areas and the ward exhibits higher car dependency”.

7.24 However, all of the assessment work undertaken focuses on impact on the highways network without taking account of opportunities to make improvements. The reports fails to assess how the sustainability of the area would be improved through the provision of a larger quantum of development at Whitchurch, which due to the scale of development would potentially provide amenities and facilities such as education, local centre retail, leisure and medical facilities, which would typically be within walking distance of the majority of the development site.

7.25 There is an opportunity to provide for more than the 800 dwellings at Whitchurch (as considered in Scenario 3 of the Core Strategy Transport Evaluation) and for a material percentage of trips to be contained within the development, with e.g. the provision of education and retail land use within the site (it is noted that Scenario 3 for 800 dwellings allows for the provision of a primary school). The testing undertaken in the evaluation report has considered peak hour trips only, excluding retail, education and leisure uses. Had these trips been included in analysis it may well be found that Scenario 1, where the dispersal of development has been assumed on a relatively even basis (sites ranging from 120 to 300 dwellings), did not perform as well as optional scenarios where larger sites with more of a mix of development uses, would be capable of containing trips, might have done.

7.26 With regard to local highway impact and potential mitigation, the report identifies limitations in terms of the ability to improve capacity on the A37 and A4174, and the poor performance (journey time) of the A37, but it does not recognise the potential benefits for the dispersal of traffic to optional routes that a larger allocation of land could provide through the provision of internal infrastructure and multiple access points to the local road network. It also does not reflect the potential for the promotion of park and ride opportunities and extension of bus services as part of the improved public transport opportunities proposed at Hengrove.

7.27 The report suggests that potential accident rates for the Whitchurch site would be higher than other optional sites under consideration, but the analysis appears to have been determined on the basis only of the potential distance travelled and road classification. The conclusions reached in this regard are highly questionable, as the nature, use and complexity of the road network are all significant parameters which would also need to be taken into account.

7.28 The Transport Evaluation report has considered matters at a high level, and acknowledges that a more detailed assessment for any of the sites would be derived from a tailored full Transport Assessment.

7.29 Although the Whitchurch development would have traffic impacts on Bristol, in particular on the A37, the report notes that the Scenario 3 arrangement would have less impact on Bath than the ‘preferred’ Scenario 1 or Scenario 2. This is a material consideration for The City of Bath, which UNESCO added as a ‘cultural site’ to its World Heritage List in 1987.

7.30 The additional vehicle kilometres and the additional CO2 resulting from the Scenario 3 test compared with Scenario 1 is 3.7% and 3.8% respectively. The difference in both measures is not considered to be material in relation to the potential benefits that can be achieved from the larger 800 dwelling allocation at Whitchurch in Scenario 3, or a greater quantum,

where the potential for planning gain measures is potentially higher, and where resources in respect of, for example, support for local bus services, can be made more effective through the economies of scale and the achievement of an appropriate critical mass of development on the site.

7.31 The Land at Whitchurch is well located and has relatively easy access via Whitchurch Lane to connect with the proposed Bristol Bus Rapid Transit route at nearby Hengrove, which has received government funding approval. A planning application is expected to be submitted for this proposal towards the end of 2013. This Rapid Transit route will connect the North Fringe, Cribbs Causeway and Emersons Green to Hengrove in south Bristol via the M32, City Centre, Bedminster and Inns Court. The route, and potential connection to other routes offers a significant additional sustainable transport benefit to the area, and can reasonably be anticipated, to contribute to reducing the car mode share experienced in the Hengrove/Whitchurch area.

7.32 The Core Strategy Transport Modelling Technical Note, Core Strategy Information Paper 4, January 2011, states that "...a bus-based P&R option should not be pursued for Whitchurch, but a site served by an extended BRT (from Hengrove) could merit further investigation". It is entirely feasible that a larger allocation of housing at Whitchurch could bring forward workable options for either a Park and Ride or extended BRT.

7.33 As a general observation, it should be noted that, notwithstanding the concerns expressed about journey times on the A37, the important issue to drivers is journey time reliability. There is good reason to forecast that journey times will not deteriorate to unacceptable levels, as the tendency will be for drivers to seek alternative modes of travel, alternative workplaces, alternative routes or alternative times of travel. From this perspective it is important that not too much emphasis is placed on parameters such as journey time, but that the overall gains associated with a larger allocation at Whitchurch be given significant weight.

Proposed Allocation

7.34 To provide the Inspector with further assurance that the allocation of land at Whitchurch is capable of accommodating about 3,500 homes and associated services and infrastructure in a sensitive and appropriate manner that protects and preserves the environmental assets around the site, we have undertaken a detailed site assessment and prepared a masterplan for the site. The masterplan document which details the design approach and the benefits that a large scale development in this location could deliver to the existing community of Whitchurch is attached at Appendix 5.

7.35 At present, Policy RA5 defers the allocation of the site to subsequent DPD, referred to as a Placemaking Plan. The Government has reintroduced a requirement for Local Authorities to prepare Local Plans that identify strategic allocations within one comprehensive document. The proposal by B&NES to defer the allocation of land to a future date through a future DPD conflicts with the Government aspirations.

7.36 Furthermore, whilst it may be acceptable for a Placemaking Plan to detail the specific design and infrastructure considerations for the development of these strategic allocations, the extent of the Green Belt should only be altered in exceptional circumstances and through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. In addition, the boundaries should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period (as required by para 83 of the NPPF); and when defining Green Belt, physical boundaries should be used that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent (NPPF, para 84).

7.37 Furthermore, the delay in formalising the removal of the land from the Green Belt and the extent of the allocation conflicts with the presumption in favour of sustainable development by introducing unnecessary delay to development. Flexibility should be introduced to allow for planning applications for the development of land at Whitchurch to be approved ahead of, or instead of, the production of a Placemaking Plan.

Change to the policy requested:

Changes Sought:

7.38 We therefore request that the Inspector rules that the Green Belt be amended at Whitchurch as recommended to accord with the conclusions of the Barton Willmore the Green Belt Review (Appendix 3), and redefined along the defensible boundaries established through this report.

7.39 This will establish a Green Belt boundary that accords with the requirements of the NPPF and can endure beyond the Plan period, but it also allows the Council the ability to undertake a Placemaking Plan with additional community engagement following adoption of the Core Strategy. In order to make this Policy Sound, we therefore request that the

Inspector make Main Modifications to insert a strategic allocation at Whitchurch on a Policy diagram (as at Appendix 6) and revise Policy RA5 Whitchurch as follows:

Land at Whitchurch Policy RA5

Land will be removed from the Green Belt at Whitchurch to accommodate a major mixed use urban extension by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 200 3,500 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the Plan period, with additional safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs beyond the plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and establish detailed development principles for the site through community engagement define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary. The need to identify safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs will be considered by the Placemaking Plan. Planning applications for the development of the site will be approved in advance of the Placemaking Plan in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development provided that they are informed by extensive community engagement and respond to the following Planning requirements.

Planning requirements:

a. Residential led mixed use development of around 200 3,500 dwellings in the plan period.

B. Be developed to a comprehensive Masterplan, reflecting best practice as embodied in 'By Design' (or successor guidance), ensuring that it is well integrated with Whitchurch village and South East Bristol

c. Development should complement the regeneration plans for South Bristol and look to this area for local employment, facilities and services. This should include:

- Two new Primary Schools
- Local retail provision to complement Whitchurch Village and Stockwood
- Community Facilities
- Park and Ride Facilities
- District Park and associated Public Open Space network

d. Ensure good public transport provision, particularly towards Bristol, Keynsham and other local facilities and services such as Hengrove Community Hospital.

E. Development should scope potential for and incorporate renewable energy.

F. Educational needs generated by the development must be met; a primary school is to be provided on site, unless an alternative solution can be found and agreed with the Education Authority. e. Ensure that the principles and benefits of Green Infrastructure contained in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and other guidance and best practice are embedded in the design and development process from an early stage. Key requirements include provision of habitat connectivity through the retention and enhancement of the any existing high valued habitats; provision of well integrated green space (formal, natural and allotments); provision of well integrated Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems; retention and integration of the former railway line; and provision of cycle and pedestrian links through the site connecting to the existing network particularly towards Whitchurch village local centre and South East Bristol.

i. Appropriate site assessment and ecological surveys to be undertaken to inform site master planning with particular attention to potential impacts to protected sites and priority species.

J. Identify and assess the landscape character, landscape features and significant view points and the likely effects of development on them. Protect and enhance these aspects and mitigate to avoid or minimise the effects. Significant aspects of landscape include Queen Charlton Conservation Area and its setting; Maes Knoll; the character of the open plateau landscape leading towards the Chew Valley; trees, woodland, tree belts, hedges and field patterns; and the disused railway line. Significant viewpoints include local properties; Maes Knoll and the associated Scheduled Ancient Monuments; Queen Charlton; important local Public Rights of Way; and the disused railway line.

K. Assess and evaluate any direct or indirect impacts on designated heritage assets and their visual/landscape settings. Prepare and implement management schemes (including avoidance or physical separation) in order to mitigate the impacts of development and ensure the long-term protection and enhancement of the designated heritage assets and their settings.

Designated heritage assets potentially affected by development at this location include St Nicholas Church and Lyons Court

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Farmhouse (Grade II*) Whitewood Farmhouse (Grade II), Queen Charlton Conservation Area, and Maes Knoll and Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monuments.

Assess and evaluate any impacts on non-designated heritage assets. The degree of harm to or loss of nondesignated heritage assets will be balanced against the positive contribution made by the development and the extent to which harm/loss can be mitigated. Nondesignated heritage assets of equal significance to designated heritage assets will be subject to the same considerations as designated historic assets. Nondesignated heritage assets potentially affected by development at this location include Bronze Age ring ditch or henge monument, Roman occupation, medieval ridge and furrow, radiating early medieval fields around the village, and the line of the former North Somerset Railway.

The assessment and evaluation of the above designated and non-designated heritage assets should also consider their cumulative or collective "group value" and also understand the heritage assets' relationship to other environmental considerations such as landscape, historic hedgerows, ancient woodland and ecology.

Provide integrated waste management infrastructure.

M. Development should complement the regeneration plans for South Bristol and look to this area for local employment, facilities and services.

Respondent Number: 281 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Amanada Grundy **Respondent Organisation:** Natural England

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Development at Whitchurch

The Plan proposes land at Whitchurch for development. We are content that the site selection process has been robust and the justification for proposed development here appears reasonable. We note that part of the site is highly sensitive with respect to the setting of Maes Knoll and Wansdyke SAM and the Chew valley, particularly in terms of views to and from the edge of the plateau; however we are also satisfied that the importance of these assets has been recognised and will be protected by relevant Plan policies.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 286 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Savills (UK) Ltd

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We strongly support the identification of land for 200 dwellings at Whitchurch. The allocation will support growth at this important settlement on the edge of the Bristol urban area.

Whilst the Local Plan does not allocate a specific location for the 200 dwellings, the scale of development proposed would be sufficient to support Horseworld's development proposals on the existing Visitor Centre site. Discussions are currently ongoing between Horseworld and the Council regarding the redevelopment of the existing Visitor Centre site for residential in order to cross subsidise the delivery of a new modern facility on adjacent land. There are a considerable number and range of benefits from the proposed development which could be achieved through the development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

It is not appropriate or necessary to enter into this degree of detail in the representations to the Core Strategy, save to say that the allocation of 200 dwellings at Whitchurch would be entirely deliverable, achievable and deliverable on a sustainable site.

With regard to the principle of an allocation at Whitchurch, we recognise that Whitchurch is the 'exception to the rule' insofar as the policy approach is applied to rural settlements. There is, in our opinion, a very clear and rational logic to this stemming from the location of the settlement and its proximity to the Bristol urban area. Whilst many future residents of B&NES would seek to live and work within the Authority area, there will inevitably be a number of residents who wish to live in Whitchurch and travel into Bristol for employment. The allocation of a proportion of development within B&NES administrative area but within close proximity to Bristol will help address this need in a

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 407 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Luker **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I strongly disagree with the proposal that Whitchurch Village should accommodate an extra 200 houses on Green Belt land.

I understand that some additional housing must be provided if BANES is to meet its overall targets. However I would submit that Whitchurch Village is being asked to take an unreasonable number of additional houses. The figure of 200 is excessive compared with what is being required of other RA1 villages and in my view Whitchurch is being discriminated against. I would therefore argue that the figure of 200 should be significantly reduced.

There is already a major traffic problem in Whitchurch Village. The A37 and Staunton Lane are very congested, particularly during rush hours, and Sleep Lane, a narrow road, cannot accommodate the traffic which uses it to try to avoid the queues on these roads. These problems will only increase if extra housing is built in the area, with no Whitchurch bypass now planned.

There are limited facilities in Whitchurch Village and the area is poorly served by public transport to Keynsham and other adjoining areas. Residents of any new houses would inevitably use the car to reach the services they need thereby exacerbating the traffic problem.

On a matter of general principle I see that Bristol City Council does not wish to see a development of the proposed scale on the Stockwood/Whitchurch border. Local authorities should adopt a cooperative approach on an issue such as this which affects both authorities.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 411 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Mary Walsh **Respondent Organisation:** Whitchurch Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Why Whitchurch to become RAS instead of RA1 is does this mean B&NES can build over the whole of the Green Belt in this area? The village has approx 476 house and will double in size if the developers get the go ahead .The people of Whitchurch have made their decisions and have exercised this right by attending exhibitions and meeting to air their views I think the term is LOCALISM ! Perhaps B&NES does not know the term used by the government and should define this with MPs

Whitchurch does not have the infrastructure to cope with added houses There appears to be a sufficient turnover of homes Why are there proposals to build more before we gauge the need The proposed houses so urgently needed have not been started by Barratts Homes in Sleep Lane which were given the go ahead on appeal This appeal referred to village shop The new shop opened is certainly not sufficiently stocked to do a "weekly shop" and could not be considered a convenience store as required by RAI villages

Whitchurch is smaller than most RA1villages so WHY are you allocating so many more houses 20 at the most would suffice

The local primary school is over subscribed and transport is required to take pupils to senior school.

I have contacted the leader of Bristol City Council and she agrees there should be no urban extension to theSE shared boundary.

Change to the policy requested:

RAS the allocation of 200 must be reduced as 47 Barratt Homes to be built in Sleep Lane have not reduced the figure to 153 surely this is a mistake or maybe my maths is incorrect. 153 is far too many for a village with 476 houses as mentioned before some RA1 villages have more houses and will be allocated 20-30 how can this be fair? Who was responsible for the change perhaps he/she could visit Whitchurch and learn from the residents who I am sure will make it very clear these proposed changes are too severe and they would prefer RA1 status and treated as other villages.

Respondent Number: 437 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Michelle Bane

Respondent Organisation: Whitchurch Village Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whitchurch village is being discriminated against as it is being asked to take more houses than any other RA1 Village. 200 houses is too many can this be reduced?

200 properties would mean a massive increase in congestion. Realistically this would bring 400+ cars to the area.

The infrastructure is not capable of taking this development the roads flog, the local doctors take 10 days at which to get an appointment and all the local primary schools are over subscribed.

Bristol city council does not wish to see this development on their border, surely local authorities should work together.

Change to the policy requested:

Reduction in number of houses in area to below 200 including the already approved Sleep Lane development.

Respondent Number: 571 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Brian Ogborne

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

As a resident in Whitchurch Village for many many years, I have seen the volume of traffic increased almost in a grid-lock situation. During peak periods the traffic piles up, the exhaust fumes are toxic!
The proposed 200 houses to be built would cause unbearable problems and would also spoil green belt land.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Respondent Number: 572 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Patricia Ogborne**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I am completely opposed to the proposed housing developments because:

1. The volume of traffic it would entail. The Bristol Road is already bursting at the seams with cars and Lorries, just waiting for an accident to happen.
2. Whitchurch village is being asked to take more houses than any other RAI villages, and Green Belt land would be used.... Completely unacceptable.
3. Bristol City Council is opposed to a development of this size being constructed on its borders. Authorities should work together – not against each other.
4. Noise and pollution also plays a big part in my objection to the core strategy.
5. Whitchurch is a VILLAGE.... NOT A TOWN!!

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

The change I am requesting is that the proposed houses to be built in Whitchurch Village is totally cancelled.

Respondent Number: 717 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Terrence Gerrish**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We agree we need housing in the future but the 200 houses now allocated to Whitchurch is not appropriate as the village is now at saturation point with traffic passing through on A37. All new homes would require a car for basic amenities (Doctor surgery, new hospital, Walk in Centre, supermarkets). The only bus service A37 direct to Bristol. No link to Stockwood, Keynsham or Bath.
School numbers are at their peak and the grounds would not support an extension to accommodate more children.
“Banes Mantra – Care in the Communities!”

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Allowing 200 houses there would dispel all of our “CARE”
Our neighbours “Bristol City Council” are not in favour of losing our GREEN BELT which acts as a natural divide between neighbourhoods, so keeping individual communities.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 720 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** RH Bamford **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

I see the proposed building of 200 homes at Whitchurch Village is wholly inappropriate as the infrastructure is not compatible with that amount of homes.
 Understanding that homes need to be built, 20 homes would be more sustainable for Whitchurch.
 200 houses would put more under pressure on the road network around the village, plus increased pollution.
 Schools already are full, having to take more pupils, would be much to the detriment of the children.
 The Doctors surgery at Stockwood already has its full quota for Whitchurch and surrounding areas, to add 200 more families would greatly increase an already over-stretched service.
 Bristol City Council can see the folly in building 200 houses. I hope BANES can too.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Allowing 200 houses there would dispel all of our "CARE"
 Our neighbours "Bristol City Council" are not in favour of losing our GREEN BELT which acts as a natural divide between neighbourhoods, so keeping individual communities.

Respondent Number: 755 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Pamela Barrett **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

CONSIDERING THE BUILDING ON GREEN BELT LAND IN THIS AREA IS BEYOND BELIEF!WE HAVE ONLY A SMALL CORRIDOR OF GREEN BELT SEPERATING BRISTOL FROM BANES AND PEOPLE WISH TO BUILD ON THIS ONCE PROTECTED LAND. I APPRECIATE THAT HOUSES ARE NEEDED BUT SURELY THERE IS BROWN BELT LAND AVAILABLE?
 45 HOUSES HAVE ALREADY BEEN PASSED FOR SLEEP LANE.
 HITCHENS HAVE AN APPLICATION OF 395 HOUSES IN ALREADY.
 HORSEWORLD IS CONSIDERING AN APPLICATION FOR EXPANSION AND THE SALE OF GREEN BELT LANE PREVIOUSLY 95 HOUSES - NOW INCREASED TO 125? . HOW MUCH MORE CAN THIS AREA TAKE.
 THE INFASTRUCTURE WOULD BE IMMENSE – ALSO THE TRAFFIC WOULD BE UNBEARABLE AS STOCKWOOD LANE & STAUNTON LANE IS ALREADY CONJESTED AT PEAK TIMES – WE HAVE NO BUS SERVICE , THE PRIMARY SCHOOL IS NOT LARGE ENOUGH FOR INCREASE IN CHILDREN, AND ONLY SMALL LOCAL SHOPS – SO SHOPPING AND SCHOOL RUNS WOULD BE ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC.PLEASE PLEASE DO NOT MAKE US A BUILT UP AREA,

Change to the policy requested:

THE NUMBER OF HOUSES, IF ANY HAD TO BE BUILT 150 MAX WOULD BE THE LIMIT AND IF ANY GREEN BELT IS TO BE RELEASED PERHAPS HORSEWORLD WOULD BE CONSIDERED.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 756 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr George Barrett**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

MY OBJECTIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:-

1)OPPOSED TO ANY BUILDING ON GREEN BELT

2)AMOUNT OF HOUSES PROPOSED WOULD MAKE WHITCHURCH AN OVERSPILL OF BRISTOL

3)THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC WOULD BE TOO MUCH FOR STOCK AND STAUNTON LANES TO COPE WITH – THERE ARE ALREADY HOUSES IN THE PIPE LINE FOR SLEEP LANE.

4)IF ALL THESE HOUSES ARE GIVEN THE GREEN LIGHT – AND HORSEWORLD SUBMIT THEIR APPLICATION FOR HOUSES AND VISITORS BEING INCREASED TO A 1/3rd TRAFFIC WOULD BE A COMPLETE CHAOS!!!

5)PERHAPS YOU COULD LOOK FOR BROWN SITES.

6)IF THE APPLICATION BY HITCHENS IS GIVEN THE GREEN LIGHT , (HOPEFULLY NOT) WE WOULD LAND UP WITH 500+++ AS I AM GIVEN TO UNDERSTAND, THE HITCHENS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS NOT INCLUDED IN THE CORE STRATEGY, NOR THE SLEEP LANE DEVELOPMENT!

Change to the policy requested:

IF THE CORE STRATEGY IS ACCEPTED PLEASE CONSIDER 130-150 HOUSES ONLY AND KEEP OUR GREEN BELT WHICH ONCE GONE NEVER TO RETURN!!!

Respondent Number: 758 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Rosenthal**Respondent Organisation:** Orchard Park Residents Association**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The following is a summary of comments from a meeting of the membership of Orchard Park Residents Association .

Please consider the following when developing Core Strategy amendments.

In order to resolve the nationwide housing shortage It is understood that there is a necessity to build more houses throughout the whole of the UK, but to Build 200 or more houses in Whitchurch appears to be a very high percentage considering the total of 491 at present, an increase of 40% Are other similar villages required to provide space at a similar scale? Any figure that is ultimately agreed should of course include those developments that have already been allowed i.e. 47 homes at Sleep Lane, it would be important to consider that one such proposal namely that by Messrs Hitchens space on its own vastly exceed 200 figure and if agreed would on its own increase the number of houses in Whitchurch by 50%,

In the past an important element of the core strategy has been to maintain separation between built-up areas to prevent urban sprawl if the green belt is reduced or taken away in order to build more houses in and around Whitchurch, would we be either swallowed up by Bristol or joined to Stockwood culminating in no separation at all. Incidentally Bristol City Council have indicated that they are strongly opposed to developments which would remove the small boundaries between Whitchurch and Bristol, one of their main objections appears to be the expected increase in traffic and the infrastructure issues that such increases would bring and they are opposed to any housing development to the Southeast of Bristol.

What plans do Banes have for maintaining or developing the green belt?

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Before targeting green belt land have all other avenues been explored for example: have all vacant properties been examined to ensure that their usage is maximised: rather than build massive new developments in large green field plots has anybody looked at the possibility of adding say one or two properties only to existing roads or sites or estates? A couple of houses here a couple of houses there at the end of existing streets could have less environmental impact on the village but could ultimately achieve the required objective.

We already frequently experience traffic queues around the Staunton Lane area which can make it very difficult for some of our residents to enter and leave the Park at certain times of day.

Before any substantial increase in developments within our area there would need to be infrastructure improvements including doctors surgeries schools and bus services (there is in fact no bus service from Staunton Lane.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Respondent Number:	763	Comment Number:	1	Respondent Name:	Mr Leonard Henry Wills	Respondent Organisation:	
Agent ID:		Agent Name:					

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

1.My wife and I moved here 3 years ago, we loved Orchard Park when we came to view our home. Fields at the back, it was like living in the country. Jacob Rees Mogg said that no houses will be built on Green Belt land, so I believed him. Please keep the fields between Whitchurch and Stockwood free of houses.

2Sleep Lane is a bottleneck, now it will be even worse with homes built here. There must be brown sites around for this purpose.

Change to the policy requested:

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Respondent Number:	764	Comment Number:	1	Respondent Name:	Ms Linda Wills	Respondent Organisation:	
Agent ID:		Agent Name:					

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

While we appreciate that some housing must be accommodated we still cannot understand why it has to be Green Belt. Surely there is other available ground for this purpose.

Any extra houses in a small village like Whitchurch would generate too much traffic. The roads are already congested and not wide enough to take an extra load and there is very little scope to widen the roads esp Sleep Lane and Staunton lane.

Our neighbouring authority Bristol City Council does not wish to see this and Neighbouring Authorities surely should agree and work together.

We were always told that 'Green Belt' land was protected and feel very disappointed in this, we were assured by Jacob Rees-Mogg MP, that Green Belt would not be built on. He actually stated this in a flyer that we received during his last

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

election. Peter Edwards also proposed to support us in this. I write these comments with concern that our own Local Authority could actually consider allowing development on 'Green Belt Land'. We are retired people and moved here 3 years ago for the peace of the Rural surroundings around our Mobile Home site and the neighbourhood – and we are concerned that the village will become yet another housing estate.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 811 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Ms Jill Britten

Respondent Organisation: Whitchurch Village Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We write to you with regard to your Council's latest Draft Core Strategy and its housing figures. Whitchurch Village has been allocated a housing figure of 200 which we feel is far too high for the following reasons:-

- Neighbouring authorities are supposed to be working together as stated in the NPPF. Bristol City Council, our neighbouring authority, states in its ratified Core Strategy, that it does not want or need urban expansion on the southern fringe at Whitchurch/Stockwood. Firstly it wishes to see the Green Belt in this area left intact to provide continuing identities for communities and secondly the infrastructure is unable to cope with large development. Therefore should not B&NES be trying to co-operate with Bristol City Council?
- Whitchurch Village is being discriminated against. Other Villages of similar designation have been allocated much lower housing figures.
- When allocating housing your Council could have taken into consideration the 47 houses recently agreed for Barratt Homes and considered a lower figure than 200 at that point.

Change to the policy requested:

We would like your Council to seriously review the housing figure of 200 and reduce this to 100 which we think is a much more manageable number for our area and circumstances. Traffic generated from this size of housing would only exacerbate the volume on the A37, minor roads through Whitchurch and Stockwood trying to access the A4. Services are already stretched to capacity and there would really be no net gain for B&NES as employment would be sought in Bristol.

Respondent Number: 811 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Ms Jill Britten

Respondent Organisation: Whitchurch Village Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

See letter attached from Whitchurch Village Action Group but to summarise:- Whitchurch Village has been redesignated from RA1 to RAS
It is now not having 30 houses but 200
This contradicts BANES own assessment of the unsuitability of this development
NPPF states neighbouring authorities should work together. Clearly BANES are not doing this as Bristol City Council do not wish for any urban extension at this SE Boundary as supported by Bristol City Cllr. Helen Holland.

(Text from letter attached) –

We set out below our opinions/objections to the latest amended Core Strategy and request to appear and speak at the

reconvened Examination In Public at the Inspectors hearing in July

Bath and North East Somerset Council give four very important reasons against development at Whitchurch Village:-

- 1.Lack of scope for service to Bath.
- 2.Bristol Core Strategy does not envisage housing here and has concerns about loss of green belt.
- 3.Capacity constrained here due to topography and infrastructure
- 4.Green Belt very important function here. More SUSTAINABLE locations should be identified first before developing here.

Bath and North East Somerset Council then go on to completely contradict their own assessment by deciding to remove green belt at this highly sensitive and vulnerable location to impose 200 houses on Whitchurch Village.

RA5

Whitchurch Village has now been designated RA5. It is now being described as “Edge of Bristol” – a total irrelevancy.

Whitchurch Village comprises only some 476 houses. It has no Doctors Surgery, no NHS Dentist, there is a small paper shop selling odds and ends and in no way serves as a Convenience Store, its Primary School is oversubscribed, employment is very limited and there is no Post Office. The Infrastructure is already congested on minor roads and the A37. Much mention is made of the “former North Somerset Railway line”. It would be wise to realise that this “former North Somerset Railway Line” has been closed for 40 years, sold and now owned privately. In parts it has already been built on. Other parts are farmed.

SPC 208 137

Whitchurch Village is now being allocated 200 houses all on Green Belt Land with no consultation. The village survives because of the Green Belt. It is being severely discriminated against other much larger villages which are only being allocated 50 houses. Whilst it is appreciated that Bath & North East Somerset Council are compelled by Government to increase their housing figures, we would request that the figure of 200 be reduced to 100 – 150. Barratt Homes have already, through the Appeal process on 28th November 2012, gained Planning Permission for 47 houses and these should be included in the SHLAA figures. As it stands Whitchurch Village would not have 200 but 247 houses increasing the size of the village by over 60%. That does not take into account other Planning Applications in the pipeline. This increase in housing figures from 30 to 200 is unacceptable and discriminatory.

RA5 again states “The need to identify safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs will be considered by the placemaking plan” There should be no requirement to identify safeguarded land. Whitchurch Village is already contributing heavily to BANES housing needs and should not be required to carry this onerous burden. The fact of the matter is, that when land is identified and safeguarded, it is inevitably developed. This need should be removed.

ID/28

The neighbouring authority of Bristol City Council has stated in its ratified Core Strategy that it does not need or seek an Urban Extension on the SE of its boundary with BANES. The NPPF clearly states that neighbouring authorities should communicate and work together and expanding Whitchurch Village to this extent, is not seen as working together. All requirements from such development place pressure upon Bristol City Council.

We ask that the housing figures for Whitchurch Village therefore be reduced and feel that there has been no consultation for us to object to Bath & North East Somerset Council before their decisions were made regarding this amended Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

RAS

We seek to have the 200 housing figure reduced to 100-150. Still a large development for a Village of only 476 houses.

Respondent Number: 811	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name: Ms Jill Britten	Respondent Organisation: Whitchurch Village Action Group
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

It is now not having 30 houses but 200.

This contradicts BANES own assessment of the unsuitability of this development

NPPF states neighbouring authorities should work together. Clearly BANES are not doing this as Bristol City Council do not wish for any urban extension at this SE Boundary as supported by Bristol City Clr.Helen Holland.

Change to the policy requested:

We seek to have the 200 housing figure reduced to 100-150. Still a large development for a Village of only 476 houses.

Respondent Number: 837**Comment Number:** 5**Respondent Name:** David Redgewell**Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The development site at Whitchurch and Stockwood is not big enough and could take further development with good quality urban design and good buffers between them and improved bus links to Bristol Temple Meads, City Centre, Wells, Keynsham station with a Park and Ride bus link at Whitchurch. The site at Whitchurch does not provide enough affordable housing and employment opportunities .

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a proper development plan for Brislington, Hicks Gate, Whitchurch, and Stockwood protecting the "Green lungs" and providing affordable housing including a public transport plan for the area improving bus links to the City Centre, Keynsham Station, South Bristol Hospital (Whitchurch), Stockwood and Brislington with its protected public transport corridor between Brislington Callington Road and Bristol Temple Meads and the City Centre (Policy SPC23 and SPC24) are not strong enough in providing housing and employment growth.

Respondent Number: 837**Comment Number:** 6**Respondent Name:** David Redgewell**Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The development site at Whitchurch and Stockwood is not big enough and could take further development with good quality urban design and good buffers between them and improved bus links to Bristol Temple Meads, City Centre, Wells, Keynsham station with a Park and Ride bus link at Whitchurch. The site at Whitchurch does not provide enough affordable housing and employment opportunities .

Change to the policy requested:

We would like to see a proper development plan for Brislington, Hicks Gate, Whitchurch, and Stockwood protecting the "Green lungs" and providing affordable housing including a public transport plan for the area improving bus links to the City Centre, Keynsham Station, South Bristol Hospital (Whitchurch), Stockwood and Brislington with its protected public transport corridor between Brislington Callington Road and Bristol Temple Meads and the City Centre (Policy SPC23 and SPC24) are not strong enough in providing housing and employment growth.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 1024 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Colin Chapman**Respondent Organisation:** Bristol City Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Bristol City Council's comments relate to the following changes: SPC18, SPC19, SPC24, SCP145 & SCP146. The changes collectively refer to the proposed release of Green Belt land at Whitchurch for Development.

The proposed changes to the B&NES Submitted Core Strategy, that identify the removal of land from the Green Belt at Whitchurch to allow for the development of housing and a potential to safeguard other land in this location to meet longer term development needs, are considered unsound. The broad areas of concern are as follows:

The principle of removing Green Belt land on the edge of Bristol to provide housing to meet the needs of the Bath housing market area is not justified and not consistent with Government policy as set out in the NPPF.

Significant development in the Whitchurch area is inconsistent with specific Bristol Core Strategy policy objectives and is likely to result in adverse impacts on existing surrounding communities. The approach is not effective in terms of joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.

The council's concerns are set out in more detail as follows:

Inconsistency with spatial strategy

The submitted B&NES Core Strategy, sought to steer growth to brownfield land in urban areas of Bath, Keynsham and the larger settlements in the Somer Valley. New development in rural areas would be restrained in comparison with the urban areas. The identification of land at Whitchurch for development would be inconsistent with that strategy resulting in a very different pattern of development to that initially envisaged.

In particular, the provision of housing on the edge of Bristol is not suitable to meet the needs of the Bath Housing Market Area (HMA), including the City of Bath with Whitchurch lying at some significant distance from the HMA. In terms of employment locations, 2001 Census data shows that a high proportion of the resident workforce of Publow and Whitchurch ward (48%) travel to work in Bristol and only a very small proportion of the resident workforce (3.3%) travel to work in Bath, less than those travelling to South Gloucestershire. This suggests that any additional homes built in this location would not significantly support any jobs growth in Bath. It is clear that the City of Bath is the main focus of population and jobs within the HMA. Growth should therefore be focussed within the Bath HMA and Travel to Work Area. Proposed change SPC18 acknowledges this issue and identifies development at Whitchurch as 'not well placed for Bath'. In addition, the scale of development proposed at Whitchurch would not be proportionate to the size of the settlement and would harm the character of the surrounding open countryside. The strategy initially identified Whitchurch as only being appropriate for small-scale development with community support (paras. 5.17 & 5.18). The proposal would therefore be contrary to the strategy of restrained development in rural areas.

For the reasons given the choice of Whitchurch as a location for development is not considered justified.

Loss of Green Belt

The proposed release of Green Belt land at Whitchurch for development raises serious concerns. The importance attached to Green Belt by the Government is clearly articulated through national planning policy. The NPPF identifies the essential characteristics of Green Belt as being 'their openness and their permanence'. The NPPF also identifies the purpose of Green Belt, namely:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.'(para. 80)

It is relevant to note that a recent DCLG press release, announcing the abolition of the South West Regional Spatial Strategy, stated:

'In recognition of the importance that the government places on the Green Belt the Order revoking the South West regional strategy will not revoke the safeguards around the North East Somerset Green Belt known as 'Policy S6' of the

Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan. The government is determined to protect this country's cherished natural and cultural heritage.' (<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-step-for-localism-as-every-regional-plan-has-gone>)

This underlines the importance attached to maintaining Green Belts .

The Green Belt surrounding Whitchurch village is mostly in B&NES, with some smaller areas within Bristol. It has a pleasant rural character comprising pasture, paddocks and open space. There is a network of public footpaths in the Whitchurch area, which extend from the built-up areas of Hengrove and Stockwood (within Bristol) into the undeveloped countryside. Fairly narrow tracts of Green Belt separate Whitchurch village from Hengrove and Stockwood. Any development in this location will undermine both the essential characteristics and the purposes that Green Belt fulfils, as defined by the NPPF. Of particular concern is the potential for Whitchurch Village to merge with South Bristol. The Green Belt Review undertaken for B&NES (Ove Arup & Partners Ltd – February 2013) identified the Green Belt surrounding Whitchurch as important for 4 of the 5 purposes identified in the NPPF.

The boundaries of the Green Belt in B&NES were established in the B&NES Local Plan adopted October 2007. The NPPF explains that..

'Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances...'

The release of Green Belt land at Whitchurch would fail to complement Bristol's adopted Core Strategy. There is concern that any release of Green Belt land across the boundary would isolate land in the designated Green Belt within Bristol and create pressure for inappropriate development. This may undermine Core Strategy objectives for regeneration and to focus development on previously developed land. It would also fail to reflect the very high value attached by the community of Bristol to the openness of the surrounding countryside.

Bristol City Council does not consider an exceptional case exists for the release of Green Belt land in this location. The proposed changes, in relation to loss of Green Belt, are therefore not justified, effective (in terms of joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities) or consistent with national policy.

Impact on green infrastructure including public rights of way

NPPF paragraph 75 requires that planning policies should 'protect and enhance public rights of way and access'. There is a concentration of public footpaths (and a cycle route – NCN3) in the area, leading from the city into the wider countryside. The character and amenities of existing paths are likely to be fundamentally altered and/or alignments permanently changed by development in this location. Such change would be liable to diminish the enjoyment of the countryside by residents of the built-up area. This underlines the concerns in principle regarding the loss of Green Belt.

Bristol Core Strategy Policy BCS9 (Diagram 4.9.1) identifies a strategic green infrastructure link via Whitchurch Railway Path and Stream corridor to Whitchurch. Development in this area could potentially be harmful to the integrity of this important green infrastructure link between the city and the wider countryside.

The existing green infrastructure in the vicinity includes sections of the Bristol Wildlife network. Stockwood Open Space SNCI and Sturminster Road SNCI are linear conservation habitats that also provide a wildlife link between urban Bristol and the surrounding countryside. The potential scale of development adjacent to these sites could have adverse effects on the long-term condition of the SNCI sites and their role in linking wildlife habitats within Bristol to the wider countryside. For the reasons identified the proposed changes, in relation to impacts on green infrastructure, would neither be justified nor effective (in terms of joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities).

Impact on south Bristol regeneration

The regeneration of South Bristol is an important component of Bristol's spatial strategy. Bristol's approach to the release of Green Belt supports the priority given to the regeneration of this area. The approach is consistent with a key purpose of Green Belt - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land - as identified in the NPPF.

The release of Green Belt land at Whitchurch would conflict with both Bristol's spatial strategy approach and a key purpose of Green Belt. The identification of land for development in this location would create unacceptable competition with sites in south Bristol. The creation of significant development opportunities and ongoing developer interest in specific sites at Whitchurch may also divert investment away from South Bristol frustrating regeneration objectives for this area.

The proposed changes, in relation to south Bristol regeneration, would neither be effective (in terms of joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities) nor consistent with national policy.

Sustainable transport/highway impacts

A high-level transport evaluation (Ove Arup & Partners Ltd – February 2013) was commissioned by B&NES council to inform the choice of locations identified for potential development. Ten locations, including Whitchurch were considered, in terms of opportunities to promote sustainable transport and potential highway impacts associated with development. The review identified Whitchurch as one of the worst performing locations, highlighting the following impacts/issues:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- Any development at Whitchurch is likely to result in car dependant behaviour and relatively high numbers of vehicular trips given its isolated location, Significant additional traffic is forecast along the A37 and A4 into Bristol, the A4174 Callington Road and through Keynsham. Routes into Bristol are already heavily congested with low journey speeds.
- There is little scope for mitigation measures on these routes through highway capacity improvement works or demand management.
- The Whitchurch area has low existing public transport patronage despite reasonable levels of bus provision. Whilst there is some scope for modal shift to public transport, journey times/distances may be uncompetitive with the private car. Bristol City Council is concerned over development in this location. The creation of appropriate connections to Bristol would be difficult. Many of the lanes in the area are very narrow and without footways. These would need to be upgraded. The environmental impact of such change may be harmful.

With regard to east-west orbital movements, the existing orbital roads (Maggs Lane/Ridgeway Lane/Stockwood Lane/Scotland Lane) are not suitable for significant traffic flows and it would be very difficult to prevent rat-running. Additional homes would put significant additional pressure on these routes.

The proposed changes, in relation to sustainable transport and highway impacts, would neither be justified nor effective (in terms of joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities).

Impact on local services, facilities etc.

The release of Green Belt land for development in this location will necessitate new or enhanced infrastructure. It is expected that pressure will be placed on existing infrastructure across the boundary in Bristol. The council notes that proposed change SCP146 includes a planning requirement (m and i) that requires development to look to South Bristol for facilities and services including Hengrove Community Hospital. Whilst other planning requirements identify the need for good public transport provision (i) and the provision of a primary school (k) the council is concerned that development will not provide the level of investment necessary to accommodate additional demands whilst also sustaining current facilities and services for the benefit of existing communities.

Bristol's Infrastructure Delivery Programme is based on the levels and locations of growth set out in the adopted Bristol Core Strategy. That strategy did not envisage significant development on the edge of the urban area at Whitchurch. At present the planning requirements set out in proposed change SCP146 do not consider the full extent of developer contributions that would be needed to address the impacts of development within Bristol. For this reason the proposed changes would not be justified or effective (in terms of joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities).

Impact on character and residential amenities

Significant development at Whitchurch has the potential for harmful impacts on the pleasant surrounding character and residential amenities of nearby residential areas in Bristol, including Magg's Lane, Washing Pound Lane, Ridgeway Lane, Church Lane, the Strawberry Road area, and the Craydon Grove/Road area and Stockwood Road/Lane in Stockwood.

Community involvement

The B&NES Core Strategy submitted for Examination in May 2011 did not propose any changes to the general extent of the Green Belt, in the form of either extensions or deletions. The Proposed Changes will have an impact on communities in Bristol, in particular in the wards of Stockwood, Hengrove (Hengrove and Stockwood Neighbourhood Partnership) and Whitchurch Park (Dundry View Neighbourhood Partnership). To date these communities are unlikely to have been actively engaged in the preparation of the B&NES Core Strategy and would have understood that it was not proposing significant development in this location.

NPPF paragraph 69 requires that 'local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans'.

Change to the policy requested:

SCP18: Delete proposed change
SCP19: Any strategic changes to the inner Green Belt boundary should exclude the Green Belt at Whitchurch
SPC24: Delete reference to 'Land at Whitchurch'
SPC145: Delete proposed change
SPC146: Delete proposed change

Respondent Number: 3000 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Karen Abolkheir

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I do not consider the development planned for Whitchurch to be sound. It is within the Green Belt, bordering Bristol City. The whole point of Green Belt is to stop the erosion of the rural areas and the spread of the city, this proposed development contradicts this. The report commissioned by BaNES from Arup confirms that the district's Green Belt is preventing the spread of urban areas.

Whitchurch is a reasonably small village with no shop appropriate for a weekly shop, an oversubscribed school, and poor and congested local roads.

I fail to understand why the allocated development of 200 houses during the lifetime of the Core Strategy cannot include the 47 house development by Barratts in Sleep Lane when planning permission was approved through the appeal process in November 2012, long after the draft Core Strategy was submitted to the Inspector. In addition, nearly 250 houses in a village with approximately 470 houses is a significant amount of development which will overwhelm the character of the village and add to the congestion on the A37 especially at the junction with Woollard Lane.

The proposed development will have an impact on Bristol City's development of South Bristol. Whilst this has been acknowledged no solutions have been proposed.

Change to the policy requested:

Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the Plan period.

Respondent Number: 3095 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Joe Evans**Respondent Organisation:** CPRE Avonside**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy RA5 – Whitchurch

We object to the inclusion of the following section (in bold):

"POLICY RA5 Land at Whitchurch

Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 200 dwellings and associated infrastructure during the Plan period. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary. The need to identify safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs will be considered by the Placemaking Plan."

The NPPF states:

"85. When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:

- where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period;"

This does not place an absolute obligation on local authorities to identify safeguarded land when Green Belt boundaries are changed; it states clearly that this should only be done "where necessary". We feel that in the case of Whitchurch, it is not necessary, and that the sentence (in bold above) should be removed.

There are considerable restraints on development at Whitchurch. As stated in the B&NES consultation document on the revised Core Strategy, its location adjacent to Bristol means that it is poorly placed to provide housing for B&NES; the Bristol Core Strategy is clear in rejecting development in the area; there are considerable environmental restraints both from topographical features (steep slopes) and the presence of Maes Knoll; and the transport links to education and employment are poor.

Bristol's Core Strategy is explicit in valuing the open space around the city and in maintaining the current urban boundaries. It states:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

“Green Belt areas on the city fringes will be safeguarded to maintain the city’s attractive setting”

Bristol’s Core Strategy Policy BCS6 states:

“Countryside and other open land around the existing built up areas of the city will be safeguarded by maintaining the current extent of the Green Belt.”

Bristol’s Core Strategy specifically identifies the area around Whitchurch as having particular value as open space, identifying the Stockwood Open Space to Whitchurch and the Railway Path and Stream Corridor to Whitchurch as Strategic Green Infrastructure (Diagram 4.9.1). It also states:

“The city is set within a distinctive landscape defined by the valleys of the Rivers Avon, Frome, Trym and Malago, the flood plain of the Severn Estuary, the Dundry Slopes...”

Bristol’s Core Strategy is therefore very clear on the need to limit development around Whitchurch and under the Duty to Co-operate, B&NES has a clear responsibility not to allow development to proceed unless a joint approach is taken to transport, education and other infrastructure.

If the B&NES Core Strategy or Placemaking Plan were to identify safeguarded land for further development, this would in practice make such development more or less inevitable.

Whitchurch currently lacks the facilities to support any great level of development, and Bristol City Council policy shares this view of Whitchurch as unsuitable for large-scale development. While we accept that around 200 dwellings can be accommodated, all the evidence suggests strongly that that would be a maximum even in the long term. We therefore request that any reference to safeguarding further land be deleted from this policy, as in the case of the development sites identified on the fringes of Bath.

There seems to be some ambiguity about how the 200 dwellings are counted, given that there are a number of developments already at various stages in the planning system in and adjacent to Whitchurch. We suggest that the wording could be changed as follows (our addition in bold)

“POLICY RA5 Land at Whitchurch

Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of a total of 200 dwellings and associated infrastructure to be completed during the Plan period of March 2013 to March 2029.”

We also note that on p127 of the Composite Core Strategy of 2013, there is a reference to land being safeguarded for a Whitchurch bypass. Our understanding is that this land has already been built on; this should be checked and if necessary the reference should be removed or clarified.

Change to the policy requested:

We request that Policy RA5 be amended as follows:

“POLICY RA5 Land at Whitchurch

Land will be removed from the Green Belt by the Placemaking Plan in the location shown on the Key Diagram in order to provide for development of around 200 dwellings and associated infrastructure to be completed during the Plan period of March 2013 to March 2029. The Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green Belt boundary. The need to identify safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs will not be considered by the Placemaking Plan, given the restraints on larger-scale development in the area.”

Respondent Number: 3498 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs and Mrs D Williams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I understand more houses are necessary, but object to building on Green Belt. 200 houses will affect traffic (already traffic builds up at rush hour outside my house due to congestion in Whitchurch Village). 47 houses have been planned for Sleep Lane (rear of my property). Sleep Lane floods in bad weather, where will all this water go when these houses are built? Plus 200 more, other villages (R.A.I) are not allocated as many as 200, so why has Whitchurch been allocated as many? Bristol Council does not wish to see development on its borders, so Councils should work together. Whitchurch Village needs a by-pass to ease traffic congestion NOT 200 more houses to hinder.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Consider the residents and abort any further proposals.

Respondent Number: 4438	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Richard Dean	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We wish to comment on your proposed change to SPC146 Whitchurch.

The proposed 200 homes for the Whitchurch area is far too large a number for the area, facilities in this area for schooling, doctors, jobs and general infrastructure to allow for this many new homes are not available.

The consideration that on top of 200 homes you could also build suitable schools and facilities is even more difficult as the loss of even more green belt land to facilitate the building of such would still further worsen an already over populated village.

Whitchurch does not offer the same facilities as the Town of Keynsham (SPC120), which is well placed with schools both primary and secondary, shopping facilities and infrastructure in general to increase its population.

It is noted in your leaflets on the strategy that Bristol is not in favour of the increase in housing to the Whitchurch area because of the effect on its own regeneration aspirations, B.A.N.E.S would be advised to take great care in going ahead with this provision because the proximity of Whitchurch to Bristol makes for a special case. The fact is that the services and roads in Whitchurch are already stretched because of the proximity to Bristol, much of the infrastructure is shared with Bristol, the problem in the future could arise that should Bristol also pinpoint nearby sites for Housing and this strategy go ahead, you could end up with in reality a huge population increase in this area over the next few years. The effect of which would be to bring services to their knees.

We are constantly reminded that new houses are needed, but Whitchurch has little employment so you will, with new homes, be creating further commuters for Bristol and Bath, to add to the already unacceptable congestion. You have made no reference in your Strategy for Whitchurch to make sure that roads are improved before housing could go ahead - this needs to be a priority.

You have already noted in your leaflet that "it is not well placed to meet the needs of Bath", so why then would you provide homes which would inevitably be commuter homes for Bristol. Bristol has huge sites such as the old Air field and surrounding land which is well placed to provide this amount of housing for the area with much better infrastructure already in place.

If Whitchurch needs new homes, we have seen over the last 20 years, homes built manly of the more expensive variety. If anything is needed, it is starter homes for the local families.

The number should be reduced to reflect the true situation in Whitchurch. Recently 30 or so homes have already been passed by default in an area which is not suitable, regardless of the fact it has now been passed at appeal. With this 30 or so already to be built the figure of 200 will have to be lowered.

Should extra homes have to be built it would be more realistic to down grade this to an extra 70 maximum if you wish Whitchurch to remain a village but even this number would, in our opinion, be a strain on the community and services. Much of the proposed land that could be available in Whitchurch at first glance, in reality would not be suitable. The land between Whitchurch and Stockwood has always been water logged and creates a natural soak away for the area. If you build here you will create problems as that water will end up going somewhere else regardless of what your drainage engineers may tell you.

Land on the opposite side of the A37 would impact on the Maes Knoll Setting.

Basically the number of new homes for the Whitchurch area needs to be reduced to 70 and this should only be allowed providing the correct drainage; facilities and infrastructure can be put in place.

Change to the policy requested:

Change of Core Strategy to 70 dwellings for Whitchurch.

Addition of a strategy 14. As follows

Proposed Core Strategy Planning Requirement is changed in section 1 to read.

1. Residential led mixed use development of around 70 dwellings in the plan period.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Addition to be

14. All development shall look at road provision and infrastructure and provide facility to alleviate congestion and its effect on the local community and environment.

Respondent Number: 4440 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Jonathan Bane

Respondent Organisation: Whitchurch Village Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

It is appreciated that some houses must be accommodated however we strongly believe that 200 is far too many. Please consider that 47 have just been approved for Sleep Lane, Whitchurch. Can this number be included in the 200 or it will be 250.

Having lived in the area for 8 years it is quite apparent that the main A37 is struggling to cope with the traffic increase, this means the surrounding roads are getting worse and worse. I regularly have to queue for 20 mins passing Horseworld to get into my estate, 250 more houses on this small stretch of road will bring a minimum of 250 cars but more like 500+. Sleep Lane has flooded every winter for the last 3 years, the local schools are all oversubscribed and the nearest doctors surgery takes 10 days to get an appointment at the moment!!! The infrastructure in the immediate proposed development area does not cope with the current traffic levels, we have 1 bus an hour stopping in the village!!! Bristol City council does not wish to see development of this size on its border. Neighbouring authorities should work together.

Change to the policy requested:

Reduction in number of houses in area to below 200 including the already approved Sleep Lane development.

Respondent Number: 4639 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Lands Improvement

Agent ID: 156 **Agent Name:** Turley Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Overview

Whilst noting and supporting the recognition in the Proposed Changes that a Green Belt Review is required in order to release additional land for development, including at whitchurch, other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement set out our significant concerns that the Core Strategy remains unsound. These include:

1. That the Core Strategy does not address the objectively assessed the need for development in the area;
2. That the housing requirement in the Core Strategy remains significantly below what is required;
3. That the scale of growth proposed at Keynsham is ill-conceived and is unlikely to be delivered as relied upon by the Core Strategy;
4. That, as a result of the above and by reference to the SHMA, the Core Strategy is not positively prepared or effective; and
5. That the SHLAA confirms the potential for addition land for development at Whitchurch, South East Bristol.

The matters set out below should therefore be read in conjunction with other objections submitted by Lands Improvement.

We do not wish to make a specific objection to the identification of around 200 dwellings at Whitchurch under SPC 146. We do, however, consider that this area can accommodate significantly more development than currently proposed to

assist in meeting the objectively assessed need of the area.

Land at Whitchurch

Lands Improvement controls land at Norton Lane, Whitchurch which falls within an area promoted by various parties for development through the Core Strategy process. The history of potential development at Whitchurch has therefore been well rehearsed at previous sessions of the Examination and is not repeated in any detail at this stage. That said, Whitchurch was considered through the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), including at independent Examination, and was found to be an appropriate and sustainable location for new development. It therefore formed part of a search area for an urban extension to Bristol identified under policy HMA1 of the dRSS.

The search area, as confirmed by the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes, was to accommodate 9,500 dwellings of which 8,000 were to be provided for within the BANES administrative area. The suitability of this area for development is therefore well established.

We note that the Council's own Evidence base accepts that Whitchurch is an appropriate location for substantial new development. In March 2013, the Council published "Land at Whitchurch Development Concept Options Report" produced on its behalf by consultants Ove Arup. This report confirms that the area is suitable for development for up to 3,000 dwellings. Likewise, the SHLAA repeats the findings of the Concept Options Report thus confirming that it is available and suitable for this level of development.

Whilst we welcome the overall findings on the suitability of Whitchurch, we are of the view that the Concept Options Report underestimates the actual capacity of the area. In particular, we note that the

majority of our client's land, whilst forming part of the potential development area, is not considered appropriate for built development and is instead identified for playing fields. This is based on the Council's interpretation on potential impacts on the Maes Knoll Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM).

Whilst we acknowledge the importance of the SAM, we consider that the Council has adopted an unduly restrictive approach and that built development on the Lands Improvement parcel would not harm its setting in the manner suggested. In order to assess this issue, Lands Improvement commissioned Optimised Environments Ltd to assess the likely impact and they confirmed that the site would not materially harm the setting of the SAM.

We are also aware of representations made on behalf of other developers at Whitchurch, principally Taylor Wimpey and Bovis Homes. These include a further Concept Masterplan produced by Barton Willmore which was based on a detailed assessment of the constraints and opportunities that exist at Whitchurch. This masterplan, which has been submitted to the Inspector, accords with our view that the Lands Improvement site is suitable for built development and that the area has a capacity for approximately 3,500 dwellings.

Need for Development at Whitchurch

Other representations submitted on behalf of Lands Improvement have demonstrated that the housing land requirement being advocated in the Proposed Changes is significantly deficient. In summary:

- The Core Strategy has failed to objectively assess the full needs of the area including meeting the shortfall in provision at Bristol;
- By adopting a low growth profile, the Core Strategy is contrary to the NPPF requirement for Plans to be positively prepared;
- That the scale of the proposed development at Keynsham will have significant impacts on both the character and services and infrastructure of that settlement and is unlikely to be delivered as relied upon by the Core Strategy and is therefore contrary to the requirements of paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

We have therefore suggested that the housing requirement should be increased to at least 21,000 dwellings. This, when the currently shortfall in delivery is added, broadly accords with the higher growth profile identified in the SHMA and through Chelmer modelling undertaken by others.

Lands Improvement considers that the Whitchurch area, which has been endorsed by the Council's SHLAA and other background documents, should be identified as a location for at least 3,500 dwellings to both assist in meeting this increase

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

in the requirement and to provide flexibility should other sites fail to deliver as anticipated.

Conclusions

For the reasons set out above, we consider that the Core Strategy is unsound on the basis that:

1. It is not positively prepared in that it does not seek to meet objectively assessed needs
2. It is not justified in that it does not promote the most appropriate strategy
3. It will not be effective in that it is unlikely to be deliverable as envisaged by the Council
4. It is not consistent with National Policy in the form of the NPPF.

Change to the policy requested:

Consequential changes as set out in other representations on behalf of Lands Improvement including:

- An increase in the quantum of residential development proposed to at least 21,000 dwellings;
- The identification of additional development at Whitchurch, South East Bristol for approximately 3,500 dwellings, the potential for which is recognised in the SHLAA and the details of which will be confirmed through the Placemaking Plan.

Respondent Number: 4654 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Professor Sir Michael Gregory **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: 157 **Agent Name:** Origin3

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change Ref: SPC 146

This change introduces a new policy RA5 which relates to the removal of land at Whitchurch from the Green Belt by the 'Placemaking Plan' in order to provide development of around 200 dwellings. As a matter of principle the new policy is supported. Land at Whitchurch should be removed from the Green Belt in order to assist the delivery of sustainable development growth in this location.

The new policy requires the development to provide a significant level of infrastructure including cycle paths and footpaths, improved public transport and a primary school. In this regard, it is unclear whether any viability exercise has been undertaken to assess the ability of the proposed 200 units to deliver such infrastructure. Origin3 question whether a larger allocation is required at Whitchurch to ensure the successful delivery of the necessary infrastructure, particularly the new school.

The requirements of the new policy RA5 with regard to the delivery of a scheme which has appropriately considered environmental opportunities, constraints, heritage assets and the mitigation of impacts from the development is supported.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4655 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Paul Smith **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146 **Plan Reference:** New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

a) The proposed change has no regard for the character and appearance of Whitchurch village, a right which has been conferred on other BANES villages. This is unreasonable and unjust.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- b) The proposed 200 allocation, together with the 47 dwellings already given planning permission represent an increase of more than 50% in the current size of our village of less than 480 dwellings. This will destroy the character of our Village and put unrealistic strains on the infrastructure.
- c) There are much larger BANES villages which could more easily absorb this number of new dwellings. It is far from clear why Whitchurch village should be singled out in any objective review of suitable opportunities.
- d) The selection of Whitchurch village would appear to be contrary to NPPF guidelines that neighbouring authorities work closely together. Bristol City Council have expressed concerns about maintaining the Green Belt to the south east of the city and this is evidenced in their ratified Core Strategy, which states that urban extension to the south east (on its boundary with BANES) is neither needed nor desirable.
- e) Whitchurch village is a bottleneck on the A37. Traffic queues of a mile and more often build up, sometimes outside of peak periods, caused by local activity. This would be exacerbated by such a large increase in the village population. Traffic queues often extend well back into Bristol. We would not have thought Bristol City Council would be that happy with an avoidable escalation in their already considerable traffic problems.
- f) Whitchurch village does not have the facilities to support an increase in population of the scale proposed. We have a confectionary, news and tobacconist's shop but no general store or post office. There is no doctor's surgery (virtually everyone in the village is registered with GPs inside the City boundary) again putting pressure on the Bristol City Council infrastructure. The village primary school is already oversubscribed.

Change to the policy requested:

We request that SPC146 be removed in its entirety and that Whitchurch be included with villages designated RA1

Respondent Number: 4688 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr R Appleyard

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Please find attached a completed comment form Part 1, further to which I wish to make the following few points with regard to change SPC120 - Land at Whitchurch.

- I think the allocated number of houses for Whitchurch (200) is low and that this area could accommodate a larger number of housing, given its existing infrastructure and services.

- The area outlined seems a large area for only 200 houses, although if this is deemed the required number then it would seem logical to locate these on areas around the School and adjoining the existing development.

- I attach a plan with an area of land edged red which I wish to put forward for consideration as a suitable site for housing, which at approximately 10 acres would go some way towards meeting the 200 houses target.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4711 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Crest Nicholson (SW) Ltd

Agent ID: 168 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC146

Plan Reference: New Policy RA5

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC145/146

1.84 These changes introduce a new policy (Policy RA5) to the Core Strategy in order to provide for around 200 no. dwellings and associated infrastructure during the plan period. It confirms that the Placemaking Plan will allocate the site for development and define a revised detailed Green belt boundary.

1.85 Whitchurch has been identified as a RA1 settlement by the Core Strategy, and because of its close proximity to Bristol, has been considered as a sustainable location for development to help meet housing need.

On the basis that Saltford also falls under the definition of an RA1 village, and offers similar sustainability credentials to Whitchurch, whilst lying is easy commuting distance of Bath and Bristol, it is not understood why the potential for any expansion to Saltford has been dismissed. The Green Belt review confirms that land surrounding both Saltford and Whitchurch has some Green Belt function, and therefore, there is no reason why land around Saltford should not have been considered in helping to meet housing need.

Change to the policy requested:

The policy should consider potential expansion of Saltford given that it has similar sustainability credentials to Whitchurch.

Change Ref. SPC147**Plan Ref.: Para 5.43****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 197 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Nigel Bray**Respondent Organisation:** Railfuture Severnside**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC147**Plan Reference:** Para 5.43**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The only transport improvements specified refer to the Greater Bristol Bus Network, with no mention of train services despite the aspirations of the Greater Bristol Metro project to reopen stations at Bathampton and Saltford. All four stations in B&NES have shown very substantial growth in passenger numbers in recent years (see table below) and this augurs very well for additional stations as a means of attracting people from their cars. Station Footfalls based on data from Office of Rail Regulation Station Usage Files.

Station 1997/98 2005/06 2011/12

Bath Spa 2,681,441 3,905,144 5,676,002

Freshford 18,255 20,779 37,286

Keynsham 102,253 187,693 306,292

Oldfield Park 111,442 156,753 252,936

Change to the policy requested:

We would amend the sentence to read "...key transport improvements including Greater Bristol Bus Network and possible additional railway stations."

Change Ref. SPC149**Plan Ref.: New para 6.02a****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 821 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Porter**Respondent Organisation:** Cam Valley Wildlife Group**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC149

Plan Reference: New para 6.02a

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

I support changes SPC 25, SPC 149, SPC 168

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 265 **Comment Number:** 25 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC149

Plan Reference: New para 6.02a

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst there is an obvious benefit from sustainability, there is a wide range of opinions about what sustainability is. If it is to be an established principle, then there needs to be a definition for the avoidance of doubt. It appears from recent planning decisions that the emphasis is on a minimum fuel demand for heating whilst occupied coupled with micro-generation, which thus fails to take into account the whole life carbon footprint of demolition (if appropriate), the embodied energy of production and shipping of materials, erection, through life cost of occupancy, all amortised over the expected life.

The current short-sighted view fails to recognise that the reuse of an existing building, even if it is not constructed to the highest modern levels of insulation, is a more sustainable option than demolishing it and building new. The Core Strategy needs to give better guidance.

Change to the policy requested:

Sustainability Principles

Central to national planning policy is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, though without any indication of how sustainability should be measured. The Council is committed to help achieve sustainable development using the yardstick of its embodied energy and its whole life carbon footprint, and will give favourable consideration to proposals which will contribute towards delivering a strong, flexible and sustainable economy; the protection and enhancement of our natural, built and historic environment, the prudent use of natural resources and which mitigate and adapt to climate change; and which support strong, vibrant and healthy communities. This approach is embodied in Policy SD1 and is reflected in all policies in the Core Strategy and planning decisions made by the Council.

Change Ref. SPC150**Plan Ref.:** New Policy SD1**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 246 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE**Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC150

Plan Reference: New Policy SD1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

It is essential, for consistency, that both Parts of the B&NES Local Plan (Part 1 – the Core Strategy and Part 2 – the Placemaking Plan) are cited where relevant.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

In the second paragraph of the new Policy SD1, insert "and in the Placemaking Plan" after "Core Strategy".

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC150 **Plan Reference:** New Policy SD1**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

SPC 46
 SPC 85
 SPC 150
 SPC 171
 SPC 183
 SPC 184
 and to the omission of Planning Policies NE.1 and NE.2 from the list of "Saved Policies" from the 2007 Local Plan

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4564 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC150 **Plan Reference:** New Policy SD1**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Objection

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4642 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC150 **Plan Reference:** New Policy SD1**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:****Support:**

Objections

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 4654 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Professor Sir Michael Gregory **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: 157 **Agent Name:** Origin3

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC150 **Plan Reference:** New Policy SD1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change Ref: SPC 150

The introduction of new policy SD1 'Presumption in favour of sustainable development' is supported. The core strategy should demonstrate a clearly consistent approach with the National Planning Policy Framework and this new policy helps this transparency.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas **Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC150 **Plan Reference:** New Policy SD1

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

We support the over-arching Policy SD1 and related text for the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the critical, semantic recognition by B&NES that true sustainable developments must have all of economic, social and environmental benefits – the three pillars of sustainability, Gro Harlem Brundtland and the Bruundtland Report. In the case of East Keynsham, the need to release land from the Green Belt to build a minimum of 250 dwellings and employment floor space in 2011-2029 on development sites that provide a mix of housing, employment and environmental enhancement. This will help mitigate the mismatch of resident workforce and available jobs, provide a good mix of affordable, private and live/work households and make good use of Green Belt assets for social, leisure and educational rewards. We believe that any mixed use sustainable development like that proposed by our project, must clearly account for local jobs alongside housing need. It should ideally include live/work opportunities and food production for households in allotments and/or market gardens. Our project plan includes a marina and associated boat and boating services, a water ecology park to diversify rural income to the farm and an early learning aquatic centre to increase the number of visitors and schools to the area. This will provide a definite increase in a diverse range of affordable and private housing, jobs and skills for local people and provide educational attainment for all. Our proposals include an additional 8 full time (FT) park jobs, 30 FT craft and retail unit jobs, 30 FT live/work jobs, 30+ FT micro business jobs, 14 FT marina and boatyard jobs and 2 FT education jobs, in addition to around 25+ part time / summer vacation jobs in peak seasons.

Change to the policy requested:

None.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC150 **Plan Reference:** New Policy SD1

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. We quote this in full to emphasize that there is absolutely no evidence that the authority understands this statement which can only be regarded as opportunistic rhetoric.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Change Ref. SPC155**Plan Ref.: Policy CP2**

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Respondent Number: 4560 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** IM Properties Ltd & Linden Homes

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC155 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP2

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

- Policy CP2 (Document reference - Sustainability)

We accept the need for new development to make a contribution to sustainable energy; however, we consider that the scale of requirements sought by the Council should be assessed on a site by site basis. A blanket approach to standards, regardless of the Greenfield or previously development nature of the site and also consideration of the size of a development, can result in onerous requirements which hinder proposals being developed within the Council's 5 year housing supply timeline.

In the current economic climate, it is consider the code levels set out for 2013 and 2016 should be targets rather than thresholds. There have been a number of delays introduced recently in terms of changes to NHBC and Building Regulations, such that developers would not now be expected to build to increased energy efficient standards, to reduce the burden on development and allow sites to come forward.

The standards set out in the Core Strategy are therefore in excess of the current national standards and there is no statutory requirement for CfSH level 3 currently, let alone CfSH 4 from 2013.

With larger development sites, this policy could require a scenario where different houses, which are the same housetype, have to be constructed differently and will look different across the same site, depending upon the time at which they are being built.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: The objectives set out in policy CP2 are too prescriptive. The text should be revised to identify each objective as a target for proposed development subject to viability and delivery considerations.

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas **Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC155 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP2

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

We support the need for new homes to meet Code for Sustainable Homes 4 in 2013 and Government Zero Carbon Standard for Homes in 2016. We believe that regeneration opportunities as proposed by our development must clearly incorporate homes that encourage greater materials resource efficiency, energy efficiency and sustainable design so that housing stock can increasingly meet the needs of climate change adaptation and that helps the Council achieve its carbon management plans and targets. We also expect the design and manufacture of our houseboats to meet Passive design criteria, so that boat dwellers and river travellers may also have access to equally sustainable and low carbon homes.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 246 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE **Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC155 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP2

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

To correct typographical errors.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 155 - table heading to read "2011-2012", not 201-2012.

Respondent Number: 270 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Blue Cedar Homes

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC155 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP2

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Objections are lodged against the inclusion of a table setting out the standards required to be met by major development. The Coalition Government is currently considering the removal of the raft of existing building standards which place additional burdens on the development industry. It intends to create a simpler, less costly system of building standards.

Until such time that the new system of regulation is established, it is considered that these local requirements should be removed and national regulations relied upon.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Removal of table in Policy CP2.

Respondent Number: 4532 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Silverwood Partnership Ltd / JE Sheppard & Sons**Agent ID:** 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC155

Plan Reference: Policy CP2

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy CP2 - Sustainable Construction

Objections are lodged against the inclusion of a table setting out the standards required to be met by major development. The Coalition Government is currently considering the removal of the raft of existing building standards which place additional burdens on the development industry. It intends to create a simpler, less costly system of building standards.

Until such time that the new system of regulation is established, it is consider that these local requirements should be removed and national regulations relied upon.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Required

Removal of table in Policy CP2.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 248 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt**Respondent Organisation:** Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd**Agent ID:** 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC155

Plan Reference: Policy CP2

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- 1) The proposed changes do not address the concerns raised in relation to the original policy. There is no justification for imposing CSH standards; there is no evidence that those standards can be delivered in a viable way in B&NES.
- 2) CSH level four is required now; this will act as a red light to the necessary step change in housing delivery.

Change to the policy requested:

- 1) The proposed changes do not address the concerns raised in relation to the original policy. There is no justification for imposing CSH standards; there is no evidence that those standards can be delivered in a viable way in B&NES.
- 2) CSH level four is required now; this will act as a red light to the necessary step change in housing delivery.

Change Ref. SPC157**Plan Ref.: Policy CP4****Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh****Respondent Number:** 4560 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** IM Properties Ltd & Linden Homes**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC157

Plan Reference: Policy CP4

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Policy CP4 (Document reference SPC157 – District Heating)

We recognise the importance of the Core Strategy actively seeking a transition toward a low carbon economy. However, Policy CP4 in its current form, requires all new development to connect into (existing or) proposed Decentralised Energy Networks, which is considered unreasonable in cases where the proposal and implications are not sufficiently advanced and will have delivery implications for development.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: The policy is currently drafted in an all-encompassing way which could stifle development and should be revised to allow for assessment on a site by site basis.

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 255 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Taylor Wimpey Developments

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC157

Plan Reference: Policy CP4

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy CP4 (District Heating) has been amended and now identifies Somerdale as one of 12 District Heating Opportunity Areas where development will be encouraged to incorporate infrastructure for district heating.

A hybrid planning application was submitted to BANES Council on 2nd April 2013 for the mixed use redevelopment of Somerdale, including up to 700 homes.

Taylor Wimpey (the applicant) gave due consideration to the potential for district heating at the Proposed Development. Sustainability consultants examined feasibility, along with 'Soft Market Testing' through consultation with a market leading international Energy Services Company (ESCO) to understand whether a district heating scheme at the Proposed Development could be commercially viable.

Potential technologies that could deliver heat to a district heating network include:

- Biomass boilers
- Gas fired boilers
- Gas fired CHP

Biomass

Biomass CHP is currently considered unfavourable owing to the relatively young position of the technology in the market-place and little competition. Presently the Applicant is aware of only one major supplier of biomass CHP, and it is understood that only around 4 projects have been completed in the UK. It's worth noting that these projects tend to be city-scale where a very high density of load is served. Biomass boilers can also result in higher emission of Nitrous Oxide (Nox) and Particulates (PM2.5 & PM10) which can have a negative impacts on local air quality. Somerdale is close to an Air Quality Management Area which is another significant constraint to this type of technology.

Gas fired boilers

In order to service the Proposed Development, it has been estimated that a network of around 5km of distribution pipework would be required.

When accounting for heat-loss from the distribution pipework to the ground, this would lead to an additional fuel consumption of around 780,000kWh of gas per annum. This is equivalent to an increase in CO2 emissions (relative to de-centralised gas boilers in each building) of around 155 tonnes per annum, or put another way, around 65 semi- detached new-build houses.

As such, a district heating network serving the extent of the Proposed Development, fuelled by gasfired boilers, has been deemed to be unfavourable owing to a likely increase in overall CO2 emissions.

In addition to the heat-losses from the pipework, significant additional electrical consumption would also be manifest owing to the requirement to pump the heat around the network.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Gas fired boilers and CHP**

Gas fired boilers with CHP has the advantage of improving the overall efficiency by providing heat and power to properties. However, in order to effectively manage the plant, the involvement of an ESCo would be required. Through consultation with a market leading ESCo, it has been estimated that a capital investment of at least £ 2M would be required in order to connect the Proposed Development to a district heating network. The ESCo has confirmed that owing to the low density of heat-load, they do not consider that at the level of investment required, that they could generate a return and ensure commercial viability. The ESCo outlined that the maximum level of investment they would be prepared to contribute would be £ 500,000, suggesting that the potential financial returns from the site over a typical 25 year contract period would amount to only 25% of the necessary capital investment cost. As such, a district heating network at the Proposed Development is commercially un-viable.

We draw the Inspector’s attention to the B&NES District Heating Opportunity Assessment Study (2010) which examined the potential of 15 opportunity areas and Somerdale was ranked 15 of 15.

A subsequent report (West of England Low Carbon Initiative Project 2 Lot 4, 2012) which was commissioned to identify opportunities for low-carbon solutions across the former Avon county, has not identified Somerdale as an ‘Opportunity Area’ for district heating, and has not included the site within the ‘Bristol Heat Priority Area’ which extends into Keynsham.

Research by Taylor Wimpey shows that passive design and energy efficiency measures will result in an 11% reduction in regulated CO2 emissions beyond current building regulations for the early phase of development at Somerdale. This shows that renewable energy technologies are not necessary to achieve meaningful CO2 reductions.

The NPPF (para 173) requires that “plans are deliverable” and “sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened”.

Somerdale is a mixed use allocation in the BANES Core Strategy which forms a key component of the future strategy for Keynsham, as well as the BANES spatial strategy as a whole. A district heating system at Somerdale is not viable and does not present an opportunity for district heating. Therefore, policy CP4 and diagram 19 are not sound as they are not consistent with national policy, nor are they justified or effective. The development at Somerdale should not be included as a District Heating Opportunity Area and should be removed from the list in Policy CP4 and from Diagram 19.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 28 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC157

Plan Reference: Policy CP4

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

There appears to be considerable pressure to adopt district heating schemes without any evidence that they are beneficial or more sustainable than other methods. Yet the larger the distribution area the greater the wastage and the more energy is consumed in distributing it. The impact of a fault also increases the more people are affected. The policy needs to require judgement not a yes/no tick box system.

It is difficult to see how district schemes would fit into the opportunities for individual householders to adopt micro-generation products, and such considerations need to form part of the masterplanning exercises.

Change to the policy requested:

The use of combined heat and power (CHP), and/or combined cooling, heat and power (CCHP) and district heating will be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

encouraged where such systems are beneficial.

Respondent Number: 4704 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Warminster Road Developments**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 165 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC157**Plan Reference:** Policy CP4**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

This policy identifies Bathwick Ward (the Ward which the MOD Warminster Road site falls within) as a District Heating Opportunity Area.

The policy as currently worded expects development to incorporate infrastructure for district heating, and will be expected to connect to any existing suitable systems, unless this would render the development unviable.

Given the constraints associated with the Warminster Road MOD site (topography, Conservation Area, World Heritage Site, landscape setting), it would not be reasonable to require a sustainability credential which would either hamper the delivery of the delivery of the site (in terms of number of units and design) or impinge on the financial viability of the site.

WRD are therefore encouraged to see a caveat in the policy which requires District Heating solution, unless it is demonstrated that this would render development unviable. This flexibility must continue to be built into the policy.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC161**Plan Ref.:** Para 6.28a**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 245 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading**Respondent Organisation:** Environment Agency**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC161**Plan Reference:** Para 6.28a**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We are supportive of the updates to para 6.28a in light of findings of the Flood Risk management Project (Feb 2013) . We do however consider that further detail could be added to the supporting text to better explain the latest proposals to manage flood risk in the river corridor.

We are supportive of the updates to paragraph 6.28a in light of the findings of the Flood Risk Management Project (February 2013). We do however consider that further detail could be added to the supporting text to better explain the latest proposals to manage flood risk in the river corridor.

Change to the policy requested:

We would recommend paragraph 6.28a are revised as follows:

'6.28a In relation to flood risk management in Bath as a whole, the Flood Risk Management Strategy concluded that there is no comprehensive strategic solution for reducing peak flows through Bath which would be both technically and economically viable. With a number of potential development locations falling in Flood Zone 3a and 2 there is a need to ensure any land raising/defences needed to protect new development and provide safe access and egress does not increase flood risk elsewhere. Previous studies suggested that upstream storage might be a suitable approach to achieve this, but concluded that further more detailed modelling work would be needed to confirm this approach. The latest Flood Risk Management Project (Black & Veatch, February 2013) has now undertaken this modelling and confirms that the principal impact of raising developments in the Central Area and Enterprise Area is a loss of flow conveyance, rather than a

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

loss of flood storage. It therefore recommends provision of flow conveyance improvements, raising/protecting proposed development sites and improvements to existing defences and buildings to ensure safe access and egress. This will be needed to new development is safe and not increase risk elsewhere.'

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4660 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Norfolk Crescent Green Residents Association

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC161 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.28a

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

SPC105 and SPC161 – in Appendix C (Hydraulic Modelling) of B&V’s study all key development sites which were considered (including housing and mixed use) are stated to be raised either in whole or part - please see Section 8 for requested change to text.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 105 and 161 - Request to change supporting text in third sentence from “It recommends, where necessary, to raise all the development sites and” to “It recommends to raise all development sites in whole or part as necessary and”

Change Ref. SPC165**Plan Ref.: Policy CP5****Development Location: Comment on general development locations**

Respondent Number: 245 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mr Andy Reading **Respondent Organisation:** Environment Agency

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC165 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP5

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

We are supportive of the revision to Policy CP5 to refer to the NPPF. At present the last sentence of the policy refers to the Councils Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Flood Risk Management Strategy. Given that the strategy specifically for Bath is now conveyance improvements, rather than upstream storage, the policy should also refer to the recommendations of the Bath Flood Risk Management Project (Black & Veatch, February 2013).

Change to the policy requested:

Update policy wording to also refer to implementing the findings of the latest Black & Veatch report.

Change Ref. SPC167**Plan Ref.: Policy CP6(1)****Development Location: Comment on general development locations**

Respondent Number: 233 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas **Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC167

Plan Reference: Policy CP6(1)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support the change to Policy CP6(1), which recognises the need for “high quality design of schemes, including transport infrastructure, which reinforces and contributes to its specific local context, creating attractive, inspiring and safe place”. We especially support the need to take account of collective local infrastructure requirements, so that overall investment in High Quality Design adds value to a number of projects and local communities that may not be viable without collective financial contributions.

Our project North of the railway line in East Keynsham has similar access and infrastructure needs to those of:

1. Somerdale (second access),
2. Broadmead Lane Sewage Works (climate change flood defence and HGV access),
3. B&NES Broadmead Lane Environment Park, Site BA19 in the West of England Joint Waste Core Strategy, Site K3 in the Adopted B&NES Local Plan 2007 and Site Saved in this Core Strategy (climate change flood defence and HGV access),
4. Broadmead Lane (climate change flood defence and HGV access), and
5. Extension of the Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate.

We support the need for collective accountability to resolve the local infrastructure and access needs of Somerdale, Broadmead Peninsula and Avon Valley in order that wider benefits to the community can be achieved. This is one of four clear requirements of the current Town Plan for Keynsham: ‘Ensuring all necessary services and infrastructure are maintained and enhanced’. This is why we clearly support this change to Policy CP6(1) to help meet the immediate and sustainable needs of Keynsham’s infrastructure. The map attached to this response shows that there is definitive need for a joined-up solution that we would welcome.

However, we disagree with presumption made of Arup in their ‘Transport Evaluation Report East Keynsham’ that “It has been assumed that development north of the A4 will be light industry, with development south of the A4 residential.” Arup should not be making presumptions that are subjective and not following due process in such an important consideration of releasing land from the Green Belt.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226	Comment Number: 14	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Radstock Action Group
-------------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC167

Plan Reference: Policy CP6(1)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We are entirely in favour of such a principle but question how this fits with the complacent and passive approach of the authority as expressed elsewhere in the revised Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 255	Comment Number: 2	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Taylor Wimpey Developments
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC167

Plan Reference: Policy CP6(1)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy CP4 (District Heating) has been amended and now identifies Somerdale as one of 12 District Heating Opportunity Areas where development will be encouraged to incorporate infrastructure for district heating.

A hybrid planning application was submitted to BANES Council on 2nd April 2013 for the mixed use redevelopment of Somerdale, including up to 700 homes.

Taylor Wimpey (the applicant) gave due consideration to the potential for district heating at the Proposed Development. Sustainability consultants examined feasibility, along with 'Soft Market Testing' through consultation with a market leading international Energy Services Company (ESCo) to understand whether a district heating scheme at the Proposed Development could be commercially viable.

Potential technologies that could deliver heat to a district heating network include:

- Biomass boilers

- Gas fired boilers

- Gas fired CHP

Biomass

Biomass CHP is currently considered unfavourable owing to the relatively young position of the technology in the market-place and little competition. Presently the Applicant is aware of only one major supplier of biomass CHP, and it is understood that only around 4 projects have been completed in the UK. It's worth noting that these projects tend to be city-scale where a very high density of load is served. Biomass boilers can also result in higher emission of Nitrous Oxide (NOx) and Particulates (PM2.5 & PM10) which can have a negative impacts on local air quality. Somerdale is close to an Air Quality Management Area which is another significant constraint to this type of technology.

Gas fired boilers

In order to service the Proposed Development, it has been estimated that a network of around 5km of distribution pipework would be required.

When accounting for heat-loss from the distribution pipework to the ground, this would lead to an additional fuel consumption of around 780,000kWh of gas per annum. This is equivalent to an increase in CO2 emissions (relative to decentralised gas boilers in each building) of around 155 tonnes per annum, or put another way, around 65 semi-detached new-build houses.

As such, a district heating network serving the extent of the Proposed Development, fuelled by gasfired boilers, has been deemed to be unfavourable owing to a likely increase in overall CO2 emissions.

In addition to the heat-losses from the pipework, significant additional electrical consumption would also be manifest owing to the requirement to pump the heat around the network.

Gas fired boilers and CHP

Gas fired boilers with CHP has the advantage of improving the overall efficiency by providing heat and power to properties. However, in order to effectively manage the plant, the involvement of an ESCo would be required.

Through consultation with a market leading ESCo, it has been estimated that a capital investment of at least £ 2M would be required in order to connect the Proposed Development to a district heating network. The ESCo has confirmed that owing to the low density of heat-load, they do not consider that at the level of investment required, that they could generate a return and ensure commercial viability. The ESCo outlined that the maximum level of investment they would be prepared to contribute would be £ 500,000, suggesting that the potential financial returns from the site over a typical 25 year contract period would amount to only 25% of the necessary capital investment cost.

As such, a district heating network at the Proposed Development is commercially un-viable.

We draw the Inspector's attention to the B&NES District Heating Opportunity Assessment Study (2010) which examined the potential of 15 opportunity areas and Somerdale was ranked 15 of 15.

A subsequent report (West of England Low Carbon Initiative Project 2 Lot 4, 2012) which was commissioned to identify opportunities for low-carbon solutions across the former Avon county, has not identified Somerdale as an 'Opportunity Area' for district heating, and has not included the site within the 'Bristol Heat Priority Area' which extends into Keynsham.

Research by Taylor Wimpey shows that passive design and energy efficiency measures will result in an 11% reduction in

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

regulated CO2 emissions beyond current building regulations for the early phase of development at Somerdale. This shows that renewable energy technologies are not necessary to achieve meaningful CO2 reductions.

The NPPF (para 173) requires that “plans are deliverable” and “sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened”.

Somerdale is a mixed use allocation in the BANES Core Strategy which forms a key component of the future strategy for Keynsham, as well as the BANES spatial strategy as a whole. A district heating system at Somerdale is not viable and does not present an opportunity for district heating. Therefore, policy CP4 and diagram 19 are not sound as they are not consistent with national policy, nor are they justified or effective. The development at Somerdale should not be included as a District Heating Opportunity Area and should be removed from the list in Policy CP4 and from Diagram 19.

Change to the policy requested:

A district heating at Somerdale is not viable and therefore, policy CP4 and diagram 19 are not sound as they are not consistent with national policy, nor are they justified or effective. The development at Somerdale should not be included as a District Heating Opportunity Area and should be removed from the list in Policy CP4 and from Diagram 19.

Change Ref. SPC168

Plan Ref.: Policy CP6(2)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 821 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Porter **Respondent Organisation:** Cam Valley Wildlife Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC168

Plan Reference: Policy CP6(2)

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I support changes SPC 25, SPC 149, SPC 168.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 226 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Radstock Action Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC168

Plan Reference: Policy CP6(2)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The deletion of the firm commitment to the preservation and enhancement of the cultural and historic environment only serves to underline the poor standing of the authority as expressed in the English Heritage ‘At Risk Register’ (see our introduction). Further vague policies lacking any strategic underpinning and continuing a tradition of ignoring the very great assets of the built environment throughout the authority. As a group which, amongst other things, has spent many years seeking to preserve our unique cultural/built environment, we believe that the Core Strategy as amended, poses an even greater risk to Radstock than already exists. B&NES has consistently failed to acknowledge the worth of the town and with the cooling of commitment in this section, will allow itself even more leeway to destroy important buildings and environments.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

No Comment

Respondent Number: 249 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Royal Mail Group Ltd

Agent ID: 31 **Agent Name:** BNP Paribas Real Estate UK**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC168

Plan Reference: Policy CP6(2)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The proposed new wording should be balanced and brought fully in line with the NPPF by specific reference to paragraph 133 of the NPPF .

Change to the policy requested:

Either:

The following sentence should be added to the end of the second suggested new paragraph:

“Development proposals that may harm or result in the loss of significance of designated heritage assets will be assessed by the Council in line with paragraph 133 of the NPPF.”

Change Ref. SPC169**Plan Ref.:** Policy CP6 Delivery**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 821 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Porter **Respondent Organisation:** Cam Valley Wildlife Group

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC169

Plan Reference: Policy CP6 Delivery

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC169 says that the strategy for the historic environment will include consideration of the preparation of a ‘local list’ to ensure non-designated assets are sustained and conserved. This is a meaningless addition if not backed up by a commitment to more concrete action .

Change to the policy requested:

SPC169 : I would like to see removal of the word "consideration"

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 29 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton **Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC169

Plan Reference: Policy CP6 Delivery

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The protection of non-designated locally important heritage assets has been Government Policy for some time, and B&NES has steadfastly refused to implement it, despite having a policy in the Local plan to deal with it if implemented. The Core Strategy should require it, not just recognise the possibility.

Change to the policy requested:

prepare a 'local list' to ensure non-designated assets are sustained and conserved

Change Ref. SPC170**Plan Ref.: Para 6.55****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 233 **Comment Number:** 16 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas**Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC170

Plan Reference: Para 6.55

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support the concept of a Green Infrastructure "...network of multi-functional green space that is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities" We believe that regeneration opportunities as proposed by our development must clearly integrate Green Infrastructure within their plans in order to enhance and diversify access to these areas in order to continually improve environmental and quality of life benefits. We support in principle the Green Infrastructure Spine proposed by Arup in the map on page 20 of their East Keynsham Development Concept Options Report (2013), one of additional documents commissioned by B&NES as part of this Core Strategy Schedule of Changes Consultation process.

Our project will increase access to that Green Infrastructure Spine and its connectivity with the Green and Blue Infrastructure proposed in the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy, via a network of new rights of way, cycle routes and sustainable transport links within and to our land. This is in addition to the significant increase of biodiversity, habitats, green corridors and blue corridors that will be provided by our integrated parks, water ecology park, mosaic wetland and early learning aquatic centre.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref. SPC171****Plan Ref.: Para 6.63****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 170 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick**Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst the removal of land in the Green Belt is supported, an objection is made to the revised boundaries being established through the Placemaking Plan, this is unsound. According to the NPPF the sites which are critical to the delivery of housing in the plan period should be identified in the Local Plan (para 47). Furthermore, paras 83 – 85 of the NPPF set out how the Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed in the Local Plan.

The Placemaking Plan is not the appropriate document to identify a strategic allocation in the Green Belt; neither should

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

any safeguarding of land in the area be considered in the Placemaking Plan. This is a strategic issue which should be addressed in the Core Strategy. The NPPF para 85 states that local planning authorities "...identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan Review which proposes the development.

Change to the policy requested:

The following changes to para 6.63 are requested:

"The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES other than the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath, Keynsham and Bristol as set out in Policy DW.1. The areas to be released from the Green Belt are allocated in Policies RA5,in these locations will be established through the Placemaking Plan. The Placemaking Plan also provides the opportunity for a review of the inner detailed boundary, such as to address anomalies. In accordance with the NPPF Green Belt boundaries will only be altered in exceptional circumstances."

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC 46
 SPC 85
 SPC 150
 SPC 171
 SPC 183
 SPC 184
 and to the omission of Planning Policies NE.1 and NE.2 from the list of "Saved Policies" from the 2007 Local Plan

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Objection

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 13 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Objections

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4654 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Professor Sir Michael Gregory **Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 157 **Agent Name:** Origin3**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Change Ref: SPC 171

The additional text to paragraph 6.33 with regard to the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bristol is supported.

Notwithstanding the above comments, we endorse the proposed changes, specifically the proposed removal of land from the Green Belt at Whitchurch and the promotion of development in this location. However, the core strategy leaves the exact extent and location of the Green Belt review to 'the Place Making Plan'. In this regard, a timetable for the place making plan needs to be put in place promptly to avoid speculative applications without detailed assessment of environmental issues. My clients land is located within the Key Diagram area for proposed development and Green Belt review at Whitchurch, and would be pleased to engage in the process of any discussions with the Council and adjacent landowners, including via 'The Placemaking Plan', on how the development growth at Whitchurch should occur.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Respondent Number:** 4721 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Mr & Mrs Ziemniak **Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

Amend:
The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES other than the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath, Keynsham and Bristol as set out in Policy DW.1. The revised boundaries in these locations will be established through the Placemaking Plan. The Placemaking Plan also provides the opportunity for a review of the inner detailed boundary, such as to address anomalies. In accordance with the NPPF Green Belt boundaries will only be altered in exceptional circumstances.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

To read:

The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES other than the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath, Keynsham and Bristol as set out in Policy DW.1. In accordance with the NPPF Green Belt boundaries will only be altered in exceptional circumstances.

Any proposals to alter the green belt around Bath should be brought forward (and consulted on) as part of the Core Strategy and not relegated to the Placemaking Plan.

Respondent Number: 4723 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Jacquie Murray & Robert Black **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Weston

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Please see changes sought

Change to the policy requested:

Amend:

The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES other than the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath, Keynsham and Bristol as set out in Policy DW.1. The revised boundaries in these locations will be established through the Placemaking Plan. The Placemaking Plan also provides the opportunity for a review of the inner detailed boundary, such as to address anomalies. In accordance with the NPPF Green Belt boundaries will only be altered in exceptional circumstances.

To read:

The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES other than the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath, Keynsham and Bristol as set out in Policy DW.1. In accordance with the NPPF Green Belt boundaries will only be altered in exceptional circumstances.

Any proposals to alter the green belt around Bath should be brought forward (and consulted on) as part of the Core Strategy and not relegated to the Placemaking Plan.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 20 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whilst the removal of land in the Green Belt is supported, an objection is made to the revised boundaries being established through the Placemaking Plan, this is unsound. According to the NPPF the sites which are critical to the delivery of housing in the plan period should be identified in the Local Plan (para 47). Furthermore, paras 83 – 85 of the NPPF set out how the Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed in the Local Plan.

The Placemaking Plan is not the appropriate document to identify a strategic allocation in the Green Belt; neither should any safeguarding of land in the area be considered in the Placemaking Plan. This is a strategic issue which should be addressed in the Core Strategy. The NPPF para 85 states that local planning authorities "...identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

granted following a Local Plan Review which proposes the development.

Change to the policy requested:

“The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES other than the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath, Keynsham and Bristol as set out in Policy DW.1. The areas to be released from the Green Belt are allocated in Policies KE4.....in these locations will be established through the Placemaking Plan. The Placemaking Plan also provides the opportunity for a review of the inner detailed boundary, such as to address anomalies. In accordance with the NPPF Green Belt boundaries will only be altered in exceptional circumstances.”

Respondent Number: 265 **Comment Number:** 30 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton

Respondent Organisation: Bath Heritage Watchdog

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC171

Plan Reference: Para 6.63

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The legislation states that Green Belt should remain sacrosanct unless there are exceptional circumstances requiring a change, and throughout the Core Strategy there is a lack of circumstances that can be described as exceptional. Therefore there can be no commitment to varying the Green Belt, only a recognition of the potential to do so.

Change to the policy requested:

The Core Strategy retains the general extent of the Green Belt in B&NES other than recognizing the potential for the removal of land from the Green Belt on the edge of Bath, Keynsham and Bristol as set out in Policy DW.1. If revised, the boundaries in these locations will be established through the Placemaking Plan.

Change Ref. SPC172**Plan Ref.: New para 6.63A**

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 16 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick

Respondent Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC172

Plan Reference: New para 6.63A

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Pegasus consider that the proposed change new para 6.63 A is unsound as the issue of safeguarded land should not be deferred to the Placemaking Plan. According to the NPPF para 83 – 85 the issue should be addressed in the Local Plan. The Placemaking Plan is not the appropriate document to identify a strategic allocation in the Green Belt; neither should any safeguarding of land in the area be considered in the Placemaking Plan. This is a strategic issue which should be addressed in the Core Strategy. The NPPF para 85 states that local planning authorities “...identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan Review which proposes the development.

Change to the policy requested:

Para 6.63.A should be deleted as it is unsound for the reasons set out above.

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 233 **Comment Number:** 17 **Respondent Name:** Mr John Douglas**Respondent Organisation:** Avon Valley Farm**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC172

Plan Reference: New para 6.63A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining East Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We support the release of land from the Green Belt to meet identified housing, employment and infrastructure needs, but it is also important to safeguard some land released from Green Belt to meet longer term development needs; such as the possible Saltford Bypass.

We encourage the Council to take account of a possible Saltford Bypass South of the A4 so that some of this land released from Green Belt be safeguarded for the future. The possibility of a Saltford Bypass be addressed during the Placemaking process, and defined and allocated in the Placemaking Plan (Local Plan Part 2). We believe that due consideration is given to this possibility at this time, so that all infrastructure and highways investment adds value to Keynsham and the District as a whole both now and in the future.

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Respondent Number:** 275 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Redrow Homes (South West) Ltd**Agent ID:** 164 **Agent Name:** DLP Planning Consultants**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC172

Plan Reference: New para 6.63A

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining South West Keynsham**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Insofar as Stage One of the Ove Arup Green Belt Review is concerned, we see nothing in its scope and methodology which takes it much beyond the (Buchanan Study and West of England Green Belt Reviews – Core Strategy Examination CD3/16 &17).

The limitations of the Stage One Study are therefore self-evident in that it does not consider the primary driving force behind undertaking the review in the first place i.e. promoting sustainable patterns of development.

Indeed, this is made clear in Section 7: What the Green Belt Review does not seek to do is balance Green Belt purposes with sustainability objectives and therefore reach conclusions on whether there should be amendments to the Green Belt boundaries.

Accordingly, we consider the approach to this review to be fundamentally flawed in that, on its own admission, it has been undertaken independently of the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence-based work assessing potential development options and therefore it does not set out recommendations on the extent to which some development in the Green Belt would promote sustainable development.

We also consider the partial/piecemeal and pragmatic approach to the Review, in combination with the partial/piecemeal approach to the SHMA to be fundamentally flawed in not having been undertaken at a strategic level, covering all parts of the Bristol and Bath Green Belt and the wider West of England strategic housing market area. Certainly, there has been no evidence of any meaningful joint working and co-operation with adjoining authorities and clearly the opportunity to rectify that now, before the resumption of the hearing sessions, has now been missed.

So called “consultation” with other WoE Planning Authorities on the methodology hardly corresponds to a proper strategic approach to this issue in the spirit of the duty to co-operate (NPPF Paragraph 182), in lieu of any formal arrangement for regional or sub regional strategic planning.

It is self evident, from examining the Review of Green Belt undertaken by Ove Arup, that no new work has been undertaken that could ‘satisfy the Council’ that there would be no need to adjust Green Belt boundaries during the remainder of the plan-period or for a reasonable period beyond, consistent with the requirements set out at paragraphs 83

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

to 85 of the NPPF. Indeed, proposed change SPC27 (and associated proposed change SP134 Paragraph 7.05 – Monitoring) which inserts an additional clause in Policy DW1, raises the prospect of just that happening in response to a 5 year review. The NPPF is unequivocal that LPAs should “satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period”. This fundamental flaw to such a crucial element of the Plan is reinforced by what appears more of an after thought at SPC172: and proposed new para 6.63A i.e. that: “the issue of safeguarding land will be considered in the Placemaking Plan”. This is a clear admission of there being an anticipated risk of ad hoc alterations being required during and

beyond the Core Strategy period; the very risk that Ove Arup indicated should be limited and we say should be avoided if at all possible through judicious identification now of safeguarded land. The Council’s approach risks undermining confidence in Green Belt as a strategic long term planning tool.

There is simply no support whatsoever in the NPPF for relegating/postponing the consideration of safeguarded land, which is a long-term issue of strategic importance, to a subsequent DPD.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 21 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC172 **Plan Reference:** New para 6.63A

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Pegasus consider that the proposed change new para 6.63 A is unsound as the issue of safeguarded land should not be deferred to the Placemaking Plan. According to the NPPF para 83 – 85 the issue should be addressed in the Local Plan. The Placemaking Plan is not the appropriate document to identify a strategic allocation in the Green Belt; neither should any safeguarding of land in the area be considered in the Placemaking Plan. This is a strategic issue which should be addressed in the Core Strategy. The NPPF para 85 states that local planning authorities “...identify in their plans areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan Review which proposes the development.

Change to the policy requested:

Para 6.63. A should be deleted as it is unsound for the reasons set out above.

Change Ref. SPC173

Plan Ref.: Para 6.64

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4450 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Landowners of FAR3 **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC173 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.64

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

These representations are on behalf of the landowners of the site identified as FAR3 in the March 2013 SHLAA. The concern is with the lack of clarity as to how land which can sustainably be brought forward for housing development, during the period of the Core Strategy, in and around inset Green Belt villages such as Farmborough, can be achieved. As

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

amended the Core Strategy does not provide sufficient clarity and is, in this regard, unsound for the following reasons.

1. The Core Strategy Proposed Change refers to Inset boundaries being reviewed through Placemaking and Neighbourhood Plans, which is accepted as the correct approach. It then continues that “exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated” for any changes to the Inset boundaries to be made. The Core Strategy is however silent as to what would comprise, or how a case for exceptional circumstances is to be made.

2. The Inspector raised a number of concerns about the proposed treatment of RA1 and RA2 villages in his post examination document ID/7. At paragraph 8.4 he stated:

“The position appears ambiguous. The Core Strategy should make clear what the Placemaking Plan needs to do and the Council should clarify the position. If the Council does intend to review the boundaries of settlements inset from the Green Belt, what are the potential exceptional circumstances that might justify such changes...”

From the change introduced at paragraph 6.64 no guidance whatsoever is provided as to what exceptional circumstances would comprise. Hence the policy and text are unsound.

3. In relation to Farmborough, which is acknowledged to be a major village, with good access to services and facilities, most of the sites identified in the March 2013 SHLAA are within Green Belt. Clarity is required therefore as to the nature and scope of the case which would need to be made to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in terms of evidence base and evaluation process. Without this policy direction in the Core Strategy, the subsequent Placemaking or Neighbourhood Plan has no evaluation process to follow. There would be no consistency between different Placemaking Plans for different Green Belt Inset villages and, in summary, the Core Strategy would have demonstrably failed to provide the strategic policy context for this category of Green Belt boundary amendment, and is therefore unsound.

4. The majority of the representations submitted by Pro Planning on behalf of a number of clients relate to the Rural Areas and villages within BANES. The representations are all too often concerned with the absence of attention or careful consideration given in updating the evidence base and evaluating opportunities for sustainable development within these areas. It is accepted as appropriate that the principal focus should be on the major growth areas in Bath, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton. It is nevertheless the fact that a very significant proportion of the jobs and housing within the district arise within the Rural Areas, and there is a stark mismatch between the detailed consideration given to the mechanism for Green Belt amendments around Bath and Keysham, compared with the vague procedure for amendments elsewhere in the District.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4712 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC173 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.64

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Support in part Change reference SPC173 (Page No. 105 of the Draft Core Strategy) proposed to read, ‘In light of the opportunities for development in the plan period, most of the urban area of Keynsham continues to be excluded from the Green Belt and an Inset boundary is defined on the Proposals Map. There are a number of villages which meet the requirements of national policy in the NPPF and continue to be insets within the Green Belt as established in the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan. The inset boundaries will be reviewed through the Placemaking Plan and through Neighbourhood Planning. Exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated through this review process in order for any changes to the Inset boundaries to be made .

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC174

Plan Ref.: Para 6.64a

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 283 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Prior Park College & Paragon School

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** St Catherine's Court

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC174

Plan Reference: Para 6.64a

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Change to the policy requested:

Policy CP8 Green Belt:

Once again, this core policy has seen considerable revisions since it was submitted and examined, though we are disappointed that these do not take the opportunity to identify existing and proposed major developed sites in the Green Belt. This is therefore not consistent with current status of the site. This will compromise future re-investment into the facility and ability for the College to manage and maintain the suite of listed buildings across the site.

It is noted that the supporting text identifies that 'The Existing Buildings within the Green Belt' SPD will continue to guide decisions on proposals within the Green Belt. This is misleading, as the SPD is actually Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt, and does not set the context for other facilities such as Prior Park College and Paragon School. This erroneous text has not yet been corrected.

Whilst the College notes that Policy GB.3 'Major Existing Developed Sites' is to be saved until replaced through the Bath LDF, we are concerned that a lack of reference to the continued role of the College or any identification of the site and its important role in the Core Strategy could lead to it being overlooked. This would place a considerable restriction on the ability for the College to continue its programme of investment. On this basis, the College seeks some form of recognition of both its role, and the future strategic designation attached to it within the Green Belt.

Secondly, the College would seek the designation of the Paragon School site as a new major developed site in the Green Belt to reflect its current status and to enable the school to maintain and improve the education offer from the site through the plan period.

We recognise that this public consultation invites comments only on the proposed changes to the Core Strategy. However, given that we strongly feel that there remains scope to incorporate further changes to the strategy to ensure it robustly addresses the need to accommodate expanded educational facilities and capacity, our comments do go beyond the limits of discussing these changes in and of themselves.

We are disappointed that B&NES have not taken this opportunity to address extant deficiencies in the Core Strategy in relation to outlining a strategy for the growth of education facilities and capacity across the district, particularly given our previous representations upon the matter. Prior Park College and Paragon School provide the following comments upon the proposed changes to the Core Strategy:

Policy DW1 and Paragraphs 1.27 and .131:

The Council have lost an opportunity here to either revise the Green Belt boundaries or to declare both the college and the school as major developed sites in the Green Belt. We are disappointed that while the Council has clearly seen a need to release land for residential development in the Green Belt, it has not recognised a concurrent need to expand educational facilities, or considered the opportunity to expand existing schools in the Green Belt.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

and villages within BANES. The representations are all too often concerned with the absence of attention or consideration given in updating the evidence base and evaluating opportunities for sustainable development within these areas. It is accepted as appropriate that the principal focus should be on the major growth areas in Bath, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton, but it is nevertheless the fact that a very significant proportion of the jobs within the district arise within the Rural Areas, frequently serving the local population in the surrounding villages in a sustainable manner and to the benefit of the local economy. Such is the case for Kelston Sparkes' business at Stanton Drew.

The fact that the Core Strategy simply refers back to an out of date Local Plan policy is considered to be unsatisfactory as well as unsound.

For these reasons, the Proposed Change to the Core Strategy is considered to be unsound and inconsistent with the NPPF and should be amended.

Change to the policy requested:

The Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan Policy GB.3 identified specific major existing developed sites (MEDS) on the Local Plan Proposals Map. The NPPF does not provide for the designation of MEDS, but instead provides at paragraph 89 for the "limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (Brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development."

The Council will review previously designated MEDS and their site boundaries, and other previously developed sites within the Green Belt, which fall within the scope of the NPPF policy, through the relevant Placemaking Plan."

Respondent Number: 4450 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Landowners of FAR3

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: 143 **Agent Name:** Pro Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC174

Plan Reference: Para 6.64a

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

These representations are on behalf of the landowners of the site identified as FAR3 in the March 2013 SHLAA. The concern is with the lack of clarity as to how land which can sustainably be brought forward for housing development, during the period of the Core Strategy, in and around inset Green Belt villages such as Farmborough, can be achieved. As amended the Core Strategy does not provide sufficient clarity and is, in this regard, unsound for the following reasons.

1.The Core Strategy Proposed Change refers to Inset boundaries being reviewed through Placemaking and Neighbourhood Plans, which is accepted as the correct approach. It then continues that "exceptional circumstances will need to be demonstrated" for any changes to the Inset boundaries to be made. The Core Strategy is however silent as to what would comprise, or how a case for exceptional circumstances is to be made.

2.The Inspector raised a number of concerns about the proposed treatment of RA1 and RA2 villages in his post examination document ID/7. At paragraph 8.4 he stated:

"The position appears ambiguous. The Core Strategy should make clear what the Placemaking Plan needs to do and the Council should clarify the position. If the Council does intend to review the boundaries of settlements inset from the Green Belt, what are the potential exceptional circumstances that might justify such changes,..."

From the change introduced at paragraph 6.64 no guidance whatsoever is provided as to what exceptional circumstances would comprise. Hence the policy and text are unsound.

3.In relation to Farmborough, which is acknowledged to be a major village, with good access to services and facilities, most of the sites identified in the March 2013 SHLAA are within Green Belt. Clarity is required therefore as to the nature and scope of the case which would need to be made to demonstrate exceptional circumstances in terms of evidence base and evaluation process. Without this policy direction in the Core Strategy, the subsequent Placemaking or Neighbourhood Plan

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

has no evaluation process to follow. There would be no consistency between different Placemaking Plans for different Green Belt Inset villages and, in summary, the Core Strategy would have demonstrably failed to provide the strategic policy context for this category of Green Belt boundary amendment, and is therefore unsound.

4. The majority of the representations submitted by Pro Planning on behalf of a number of clients relate to the Rural Areas and villages within BANES. The representations are all too often concerned with the absence of attention or careful consideration given in updating the evidence base and evaluating opportunities for sustainable development within these areas. It is accepted as appropriate that the principal focus should be on the major growth areas in Bath, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton. It is nevertheless the fact that a very significant proportion of the jobs and housing within the district arise within the Rural Areas, and there is a stark mismatch between the detailed consideration given to the mechanism for Green Belt amendments around Bath and Keysham, compared with the vague procedure for amendments elsewhere in the District.

Change to the policy requested:

A new policy needs to be introduced as a criteria based policy following from Policies RA1 and CP8 to identify and confirm sustainably located villages. The new policy would set criteria to test the robustness and explain the case to be made to demonstrate whether exceptional circumstances exist to allow the review and amendment of a village Inset boundary to allow for growth and housing development on a specific site. The policy would be applied through the Placemaking Plan.

Change Ref. SPC175**Plan Ref.: Para 6.69 footnote****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 95	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: David Berry	Respondent Organisation: The Coal Authority
------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC175

Plan Reference: Para 6.69 footnote

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Coal Authority welcomes the minor change that is proposed to the footnote at paragraph 6.69 of the Core Strategy (Change Ref. SPC175) to update the reference to the BGS/Coal Authority Guide to Minerals Safeguarding in England 2011. I note, also, that the changes that were proposed at the earlier consultation stage in September 2011 are confirmed again, for information, at this stage. For reference, The Coal Authority reiterates its support for the changes that have been previously made to address the representations we made at the Publication Stage and welcomes the positive engagement that the Council has had with The Coal Authority in responding to our previous concerns with the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref. SPC177****Plan Ref.: Para 6.74****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 234	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Taylor Wimpey
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: 160 **Agent Name:** Pioneer Property Services Ltd
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**
Change Reference: SPC177

Plan Reference: Para 6.74

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The proposed wording in respect of the affordable housing definition within paragraph 6.74 of the draft Core Strategy should be amended to align with the NPPF definition of affordable housing; currently it does not reflect the NPPF emphasis on household eligibility (as opposed to affordable housing affordability) being determined on the basis of local incomes and house prices. It also suggests that Social Rented housing must be owned and 'managed' by local authorities or private registered providers – this does not align with the NPPF definition which does not refer to such homes being managed by local authorities or private registered providers. The wording as proposed refers to 'market prices' when defining Intermediate housing as opposed to 'market levels', and fails to note that Intermediate housing can include 'other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent'.

Change to the policy requested:

It is proposed that Proposed Change SPC177 should be altered to read as follows: "Affordable housing is defined by the National Planning Policy Framework as:

Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.

Social rented housing is owned by local authorities and private registered providers (as defined in section 80 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008), for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime. It may also be owned by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or with the Homes and Communities Agency.

Affordable rented housing is let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable).

Intermediate housing is homes for sale and rent provided at a cost above social rent, but below market levels subject to the criteria in the Affordable Housing definition above. These can include shared equity (shared ownership and equity loans), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent, but not affordable rented housing.

Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as "low cost market" housing, may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes."

Change Ref. SPC178**Plan Ref.: Para 6.75****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 170 **Comment Number:** 17 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick**Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC178

Plan Reference: Para 6.75

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Pegasus consider that the SHMA which was published in draft in February 2013 and again in draft in March 2013 is unsound as it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF para 158 and 159 and satisfy the Core Principles in para 17 of the NPPF. Please see separate critique the SHMA

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 22 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC178 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.75

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Pegasus consider that the SHMA which was published in draft in March 2013 is unsound as it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF para 158 and 159 and satisfy the Core Principles in para 17 of the NPPF . Please see separate critique the SHMA

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 234 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Taylor Wimpey **Respondent Organisation:** Taylor Wimpey

Agent ID: 160 **Agent Name:** Pioneer Property Services Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC178 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.75

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Whilst it is welcomed that BANES has recognised the need to update the SHMA evidence base the 'SHMA' referred to within proposed amendment SPC178 and published in March 2013 remains in draft form. When finalised, it is intended that this will provide an updated review of housing requirements across BANES to that provided within the 'West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment ("WESHMA" – June 2009v2).

However, it is unclear that the document has been prepared in consultation with stakeholders / been made available for comment prior to publication within the evidence base in March 2013. This is a key requirement of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Practice Guidance Version 2 ("SHMAPG2") Process Checklist.

The SHMAPG2 remains in place as providing Government guidance in respect of the preparation of SHMA and therefore represents a material consideration when determining the objectivity and credibility of the BANES draft SHMA ("draft SHMA").

Given the lack of prior opportunity to comment on the draft SHMA it is entirely reasonable for the following concerns in respect of the draft SHMA to be raised during this consultation and to request that these be taken into consideration when considering the soundness of the approach proposed to affordable housing provision in both draft Policy CP9 and supporting text.

The following paragraphs provide an overview of the draft SHMA, and in the context of other supplementary secondary data sources:

Affordable Housing Mix

1. The draft SHMA Figure 51 suggests that the following subsidised rented social housing net mix requirements apply in BANES 2011 - 2031 (Table 9.1):

- 1 bedroom 50%
- 2 bedrooms 30%
- 3 bedrooms 17%
- 4 bedrooms +3%

This suggests that 80% of additional affordable housing should be provided with 1 and 2 bedrooms, particularly given the approach taken within the Welfare Reform Act 2012 to the under occupation of social housing by households in receipt of Housing Benefit. In the light of the Council's new draft SHMA evidence it is of concern that an amendment has not been proposed to the second paragraph under the 'Property Size and Mix' heading within draft CP9 – this wording states that the Council will seek for at least 60% of additional affordable housing to be provided as family houses including larger 4 and 5 bedroom homes – this is not supported by the Council's evidence.

2. The draft SHMA does not present conclusions in Figure 51 in respect of the size of Intermediate dwellings that are likely to be required, and appears to suggest a nil requirement for additional Intermediate housing – this conclusion is questionable and is reviewed below.

Tenure Split

3. As stated above, the draft SHMA suggests a nil requirement for additional Intermediate affordable housing in Figure 51 for the period 2011 to 2031 – this suggests that there will not be an Intermediate ‘gap’ between Target Rent levels (i.e. Social Rents) and private sector housing costs in BANES for the entire 20 year Plan period. This feels intuitively wrong, and the following paragraphs review the draft SHMA in further detail.

4. In its current form the draft SHMA does not transparently identify how it arrives at a conclusion for a nil requirement for additional Intermediate affordable housing. Whilst outputs are presented within summary Figures 43 and 44, the process by which these are calculated and the source data tables are not clearly referenced / presented.

5. Furthermore, the recent 2012 BANES Viability Study Update does not test the viability of affordable housing contributions on the basis of a 100% rented social housing requirement. The 2012 BANES Viability Study Update acknowledges that the inclusion of Affordable Rent and Intermediate Sale improves viability, particularly in the lower value sub-areas in BANES, and may make the difference between viable and non-viable development (paragraph 4.6, 2012 BANES Viability Study Update).

6. There are various concerns in respect of the draft SHMA modelling (particularly as this is likely to be relied upon by the Council to inform development proposal negotiations and the Planning Obligations SPD referred to in proposed change SPC180), including:

i) The baseline modelling summary in Figure 43 (which is then altered on the basis of tenure profile assumptions in summary Figure 44) is based on 2001 existing household profiles as opposed to 2011 Census results (paragraphs 8.6 and 8.12). It is unclear whether the tenure profile adjustments to the stock configuration purported to have been applied to the modelling in Figure 44 are based on 2011 Census or other non 2011 Census assumptions (paragraph 8.57) – this point should be clarified and if the latter is the position then the draft SHMA should be amended to reflect the 2011 Census results.

ii) When projecting forwards over 20 years the draft SHMA applies an affordability test to determine the future split between market and affordable housing requirements (paragraph 8.14). However, the outputs of this approach should not be inflexibly applied by the Council; assumptions made in respect of affordability have significant impacts on the modelled tenure requirement outputs and yet may prove inaccurate over this long period.

The SHMAPG2 confirms that, whilst SHMA are able to provide a basis for developing Planning Policy over a 20 year period, assessments will need to be updated every five years. Furthermore, the SHMAPG2 states that the number of households in housing need or demand and household movements between tenures are ‘particular aspects’ which will need to be reviewed regularly (page 61, SHMAPG2).

The draft SHMA outputs represent a statistically modelled estimate of changing tenure requirements over a 20 year period, and it would be inappropriate to apply these directly at a site level when negotiating tenure provision, where a variety of site specific factors including location, scale and overall development viability will need to be taken into consideration.

iii) The draft SHMA uses CACI Paycheck household income data (available to postcode level) to inform its affordability calculations, but suggests that the CACI data is unreliable (i.e. in terms of households’ income distribution) and applies a ‘tool’ to ‘improve the accuracy of the distribution of local household incomes’ and which increases the concentration of households within lower income bands (paragraph 8.10).

The draft SHMA suggests that the ‘tool’ has been developed on the basis of household survey data collected by the author and which suggests higher concentrations of households within lower income bands than suggested by the CACI data (paragraph 8.10).

The draft SHMA does not clarify: the date at which this survey data was collected; whether it relates specifically to BANES or is part of a wider national survey; the level of statistical confidence that applies to the survey and how / why its reliability exceeds that of the CACI data; the response rate achieved, the banded proportionate and numerical distribution of household incomes concluded as a result, or how the tool functions (including a clear presentation of inputs and outputs).

It is unclear why, if the author’s survey household income data is felt to be more reliable than CACI data, it has not been applied directly thus avoiding the need to draw on CACI data at all. The approach taken overlays another set of assumptions onto a modelling approach already reliant on a plethora of statistical assumptions extending over a 20 year period.

iv) The draft SHMA establishes an income threshold for entry level access to market housing and then estimates the number of non-owner households able to afford to access market housing at this threshold (paragraph 8.14). The requirement for affordable housing is calculated in the draft SHMA by deducting non-owner households able to afford market housing. The background data tables and the inputs applied to derive the draft SHMA conclusions are not clearly presented within the body of the draft SHMA.

v) However, it would appear that the approach fails to reflect that there is likely to be a proportion of non-owner households that currently live in the private rented sector (both at, and above, the entry level housing costs threshold) and who choose to spend more than 25% of their gross household income on housing costs to enable them to do so – such households are unlikely to present themselves to local authorities as households in need of affordable housing, even though, based on the draft SHMA affordability test, they would technically be eligible.

The inclusion of such households as being in need of affordable housing will inflate the modelled level of affordable housing need above that which is likely to be presented to the Council in reality, and will skew modelling outputs to conclude insufficient levels of market housing, excessive levels of overall affordable housing and inaccurate affordable housing tenure splits to be required to the detriment of the wider housing market. Given the 20 year modelling period and the use of the evidence base to inform the development of Plan policy, significant inaccuracies in these areas are of great concern.

vi) The draft SHMA estimates an Intermediate / Social Rented affordable housing tenure split on the basis of 'social trends' – i.e. trends in the profile of tenures occupied by household type are reviewed and then applied to the projected requirement for affordable housing (considered at 'v' above).

This approach is problematic when seeking to assess the extent of the future requirement for Intermediate housing for sale as it will simply reflect the choices that households have made in the past within the context of the housing opportunities available to them at the time.

The most recent Census data (2011) suggests that just 0.5% of households in BANES live in Shared Ownership housing (below levels across the South West and England and lower than the 0.52% BANES level suggested in the 2001 Census). This suggests that, historically, an extremely limited proportion of the overall housing stock across BANES has comprised of Intermediate Housing for Sale. Thus, the choices available to households in need of affordable housing have been (and remain) extremely limited.

vii) The draft SHMA approach does not provide an accurate assessment of the proportion of households which could afford an Intermediate Sale option and would seek to live in one were the option to be more widely publicised and were a more balanced supply of such housing made available. The draft SHMA approach simply projects the existing imbalances in the affordable housing supply forwards over 20 years and does not represent an objective assessment of Intermediate affordable housing needs.

Whilst the draft SHMA could be adjusted to apply an affordability test when calculating the level of Intermediate housing for sale required, any affordability assumptions will need to be updated regularly in line with SHMAPG2 advice, as opposed as assumed at the outset to apply over a 20 year period.

The draft SHMA takes a dichotomous approach; on the one hand it assumes that all non-owner households assessed as unable to afford market housing (i.e. housing with housing costs at the lower quartile private rent threshold and above) require affordable housing (paragraphs 8.14 and 8.15), and includes these in the overall affordable housing requirement calculation.

On the other hand, when modelling net affordable housing tenure split requirements the draft SHMA assumes that a supply of 'sub-market' non-Intermediate housing (paragraph 8.20) (i.e. unsubsidised housing in the private rented sector with rents below and up to the lower quartile threshold as a supply of 'sub-market' housing - paragraphs 8.33, 8.34, and 8.36) will address the housing requirements of households in affordable housing need and able to afford Intermediate affordable housing costs.

The methodology therefore contradicts itself, and in so doing it arguably: i) artificially inflates the overall level of affordable housing need by including households that should be assessed as able to access unsubsidised market housing, and ii) artificially represses the requirement for Intermediate affordable housing by including an unsubsidised market housing supply (which will have a knock on effect resulting in an inflated proportionate requirement for rented social housing).

viii) The above concerns are further compounded by the inclusion in the Intermediate housing supply assumptions of a supply of Affordable Rented housing occupied 'without Housing Benefit support' (paragraph 8.36). This fails to accord with the NPPF definition which makes it clear that Affordable Rent is not an Intermediate product (and therefore should not be concluded to represent an Intermediate housing supply) and is housing which is to be provided to households eligible for Social Rented housing.

All Affordable Rent accommodation is eligible for Housing Benefit support where occupants are assessed to require it, and in line with the NPPF definition Affordable Rent should be concluded to represent a supply available to address the requirements of households eligible for Social Rented housing.

In line with the NPPF emphasis upon the creation of sustainable communities and widening housing choice, it would also be inappropriate to assume that households seeking to purchase an Intermediate Sale product can have their housing requirements resolved in a private rented sector home with housing costs in the lowest quartile or in converted and / or shared private rented sector accommodation. It is unclear from the information provided that this distinction is drawn in the draft SHMA modelling.

The draft SHMA methodology impacts upon the assessed overall affordable housing tenure split requirements in both

Figures 43 and 44, and will inflate the proportion of the affordable housing requirement purported to be for subsidised rented social housing, and artificially reduce the Intermediate affordable housing requirement.

ix) The modelling outputs summarised in Figure 44 conclude the same numerical requirements for Social Rented housing as Figure 43. Indeed, paragraph 12.44 of the draft SHMA confirms that the modelling assumes that 'the number of claimants already receiving housing benefit support to live in the private rented sector remains constant'.

This static approach is taken despite that the supply in the Private Rented Sector is assumed when modelling Figure 44 to have increased by 35%, along with an increase in the supply of converted dwellings into shared accommodation (paragraph 8.57). However, Census data suggests that the proportion of all unshared housing that is private rented sector housing (rented from a private landlord) in BANES has increased from 10.10% in 2001 to 15.5% in 2011 (Census tables KS402EW (2011) and KS18 (2001)). This suggests a 53% increase in the sector compared to the 35% assumed in the draft 2011.

A more logical approach would be for the draft SHMA to assess how the increased supply of shared low cost market accommodation and private rented sector unshared accommodation impacts upon the net numerical requirement for both Social Rented and Intermediate affordable housing. An increased supply of private rented / converted housing is just as likely to result in a reduced Social Rented requirement and this should be reflected in the modelling.

Department for Work and Pensions data sourced from the 'Single Housing Benefit Extract

(SHBE)' (http://83.244.183.193/hb_la/#) suggests that between November 2008 and November 2012 of the proportion of the total number of households in BANES claiming Housing Benefit via the Local Housing Allowance ("LHA") scheme and who live in Private Rented Sector accommodation has increased from 610 to 2,490.

Whilst some of this increase may be due to a corresponding decline in households in receipt of Housing Benefit outside of the LHA scheme and not living in Local Authority or Registered Provider accommodation (i.e. households in private rented or other private sector housing), even when these two categories are taken together a suggested overall increase between November 2008 and November 2012 from 1,910 of all households in receipt of Housing Benefit to 3,080 is suggested. The numerical data provided by the Department for Work and Pensions is as follows:

BANES: Total Housing Benefit Claimants by Tenure, November 2008 and 2012

Housing Tenure Month: November 2008 - November 2012

Local Authority Housing

Registered Provider Housing 6,670 - 7,620

Regulated 160 - 110

Private Rented Sector Local Housing Allowance 610 2,490

Non-Local Housing Allowance 1,300 590

The above suggests an increasing supply of subsidised private rented housing between 2008 and 2012 – this supply source is likely to increasingly assist with addressing Social Rented housing requirements (see paragraph 8.31 of the draft SHMA). This contrasts with the draft SHMA approach which concludes a static numerical Social Rented housing requirement over a 20 year timespan in both Figure 43 and Figure 44, despite that the former is based on a 2001 housing stock configuration* and the latter is described as having been adjusted to reflect a 35% increase in the private rented sector and a 100% increase in converted houses.

*[NB: The draft SHMA appears in paragraph 8.36 to suggest the application of a 2011 level of housing benefit supported private rented sector housing in its modelling – it is not absolutely clear whether this approach is applied in both Figure 44 and Figure 44, but such an approach would be counter intuitive in Figure 43 which is purported to reflect a 2001 housing stock configuration to provide a baseline position against which Figure 44 (which is described as being adjusted to include a 35% private rented sector and 100% converted house increase from 2001 to 2011) can be compared.]

The same static approach is not taken in terms of private rented sector supply assumptions applied in the modelling to derive net Intermediate affordable housing requirements; the draft SHMA concludes a significant decrease in Figure 44 (to nil) in the numerical requirement for Intermediate affordable housing presumably as a direct result of increased supply assumptions.

7. Figure 44 (which concludes no requirement for Intermediate housing over the next 20 years) is likely to significantly underestimate the net requirement for Intermediate housing; a comparable methodological approach to supply assumptions should be applied to both Intermediate and Social Rent when modelling net housing requirements.

8. It would be inappropriate to seek to impose affordable housing tenure split requirements through the Planning Obligations SPD (as referred to in proposed change SPC180); this applies not only if the tenure split sought is evidentially unjustified, but also on the basis that seeking to impose additional burdens outside of the Plan making process is contrary to the NPPF paragraphs 153 and 174. Affordable housing tenure split is clearly a matter of significant importance and which is capable of having a significant impact upon the viability of the Council's assumed housing land supply and the Council's ability to fully meet an objectively assessed housing need. It is a matter which should be addressed through Plan policy on the basis of objective and credible SHMA evidence.

Furthermore, the 'Viability Testing Local Plans: Advice for Planning Practitioners' report provided by the Local Housing Delivery Group (Chaired by Sir John Harman – "Harman report") published during June 2012The Harman report cautions that:

"Because of the key role of the viability assessment in identifying the cumulative impact of policies, once the plan is in place, additional costs to development should not be introduced that will alter the viability equation and potentially render the plan-wide test redundant."
(page 40)

The Harman report states that additional costs resulting from subsequent SPD policies materially affecting Local Plan viability should be subject to robust viability review – such a process will also be necessary where policies are introduced via DPD, and the report appears to assume that this will be required as part of the Independent review of such policies. This re-confirms the need to ensure that affordable housing tenure split targets / other standards sought are viability tested in the context of cost of implementing all of the policy requirements proposed within the draft Core Strategy.

Lifetime Homes / Wheelchair Housing Requirements

9. The draft SHMA does not present analysis of BANES specific requirements in terms of older person or specialist housing requirements, and refers to non-BANES specific studies. Where any standards are to be sought by the Council through policy these should be based on an objective assessment of the need for such accommodation – as this is not provided within the draft SHMA the Council does not currently have an up to date assessment of the need for such requirements and it would be inappropriate to seek to impose additional requirements through the Planning Obligations SPD referred to in proposed change SPC180 (not only on the basis of a lack of evidential justification, but also on the basis of the practice of seeking to impose additional burdens outside of the Plan making process being contrary to the NPPF paragraphs 153 and 174). See the comments on the Harman report above.

SUMMARY

10. The draft SHMA findings suggest that 80% of additional affordable housing is required with 1 and 2 bedrooms. Whilst the conclusions will be impacted upon by the methodological concerns raised in respect of the draft SHMA review of affordable housing tenure requirements, this conclusion aligns with the analysis of the WESHMA. Draft Policy CP9 should reflect this position.

11. The 2013 SHMA remains in draft form, draws broad conclusions based on a convoluted array of variables, does not present SHMAPG2 compliant conclusions, and is open to question in terms of its ability to provide an objective assessment to inform policy approaches to housing tenure requirements over the next 20 years.

Change to the policy requested:

Proposed Changes SPC178 to SPC180 / SPC183 – SPC185 and draft CP9 wording and CP9 Supporting Text:

Whilst it is agreed that an up to date evidence base should be referred to and assist with the development of the policy approach to affordable housing the above review of the draft SHMA suggests that its conclusions in respect of affordable housing need (in terms of tenure split, the requirements of specific groups, and the overall levels of affordable housing sought) do not represent an objective credible assessment of the housing needs arising within BANES. There are also concerns in respect of the methodological soundness of the overall housing requirements conclusions within the draft SHMA.

The Proposed Change SPC180 is objected to (on the basis of the comments in the explanatory text in the above section of this form) and should be deleted.

The second paragraph under the 'Property Size and Mix' heading within draft CP9 should be amended to align with the available evidence as follows:

The type and size profile of the affordable housing will be guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other local housing requirements but the Council will aim for at least 60% of the affordable housing to be family houses including some large 4/5 bed dwellings.

Respondent Number: 2563 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Guinness Trust

Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC178

Plan Reference: Para 6.75

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC178 and SPC179: Description and Interpretation of Updated SHMA

As set out above these revisions to the text are misleading and inaccurate. It is a contradiction in terms for a SHMA to principally “assess” a “local market”. SPC178 nowhere refers to this merely being an update of an earlier core document.

The reference to an increasing proportion of the housing stock being “private rented” in B&NES is not disputed but on its own this fact is of no particular consequence to the current and future affordable housing needs of the District.

The reference to “around 36%” of the housing requirement being for affordable housing appears to have been manufactured to fit the affordable housing targets proposed. As explained above, the both the overall housing requirements and the affordable housing needs have been substantially underestimated; and demand upward revision.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref. SPC179****Plan Ref.:** Para 6.76**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent Number:** 170 **Comment Number:** 18 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick**Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC179

Plan Reference: Para 6.76

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Pegasus have raised a number of concerns about the SHMA and the assumptions and that it does not fulfil the requirements of the NPPF para 158 – 159 or the address the Inspector’s concerns in ID/28 para 5 and para 1.1. The SHMA has only been produced for BANEs area and does not address housing need arising in the Housing Market Area which covers 4 authorities. It is noted that the Draft SHMA February 2013 referred to “a full SHMA review is planned” and we are aware that a brief has been published for consultation by the four West of England Authorities, however this will not form part of the evidence base for the Proposed Changes as the first results will not be available until the winter of 2014. Please see attached separate paper which is a critique of the SHMA.

Change to the policy requested:

The SHMA should be revised in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF para 158 – 159

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 180 **Comment Number:** 23 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton**Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC179

Plan Reference: Para 6.76

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Pegasus have raised a number of concerns about the SHMA and the assumptions and that it does not fulfil the requirements of the NPPF para 158 – 159 or the address the Inspector’s concerns in ID/28 para 5 and para 1.1. The SHMA has only been produced for BANEs area and does not address housing need arising in the Housing Market Area which covers 4 authorities. It is noted that the Draft SHMA February 2013 referred to “a full SHMA review is planned” and we are aware that a brief has been published for consultation by the four West of England Authorities, however this will not form part of the evidence base for the Proposed Changes as the first results will not be available until the winter of 2014.

Please see attached separate paper which is a critique of the SHMA

Change to the policy requested:

The SHMA should be revised in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF para 158 – 159

Change Ref. SPC180**Plan Ref.: Para 6.77****Development Location:** Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Respondent Number:** 4560 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** IM Properties Ltd & Linden Homes**Agent ID:** 39 **Agent Name:** GVA**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC180

Plan Reference: Para 6.77

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

- Paragraph 6.77 (Document reference SPC180 – Affordable Housing)

IM Properties and Linden Homes acknowledge that the Council will provide further guidance on the tenure which will be sought by the Council within the Planning Obligations SPD and reserve the right to respond on this issue, at that time.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: This paragraph should set out an indicative timescale of when the Planning Obligations SPD will be updated and revised, to reflect the above

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 300 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson**Respondent Organisation:** Curo**Agent ID:** 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC180

Plan Reference: Para 6.77

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

4.4 Whilst there is a degree of uncertainty in respect of tenure mix whilst a Planning Obligations DPD is prepared Curo support the change at SPC180 for the tenure mix to be flexible and responsive to changes over the plan period.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent** 300 **Comment** 11 **Respondent** Mark Hodgkinson
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent** Curo
Organisation:**Agent ID:** 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC180

Plan Reference: Para 6.77

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

4.4 Whilst there is a degree of uncertainty in respect of tenure mix whilst a Planning Obligations DPD is prepared Curo support the change at SPC180 for the tenure mix to be flexible and responsive to changes over the plan period.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref.** SPC181**Plan Ref.:** Para 6.78**Development Location:** Comment on general development locations**Respondent** 170 **Comment** 19 **Respondent** Mr. Phil Hardwick
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent** Robert Hitchins Limited
Organisation:**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC181

Plan Reference: Para 6.78

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Proposed Changes should in para 6.78 and para 6.79 make reference to the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans" June 2012. The key issue is that plans must be deliverable, development viability must not be threatened, and the cumulative burden of infrastructure requirements and housing policies must be such that cumulatively they provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer so that the development is deliverable (para 173 – 175 of the NPPF). This is also endorsed by the Sir John Harman Report Viability Testing of Local Plans (June 2012). The Sir John Harman Report (June 2012) referred to above sets out a number of key principles to which regard should be had when assessing the viability of the Core Strategy and its policies. Consideration of viability is a key factor. Plans need to be realistic and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as a whole should be such that the plan is deliverable.

Change to the policy requested:

The Proposed Changes should make reference to the Sir John Harman Report.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Respondent** 180 **Comment** 24 **Respondent** Mike Kerton
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent** J S Bloor Ltd
Organisation:**Agent ID:** 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC181

Plan Reference: Para 6.78

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Proposed Changes should in para 6.78 and para 6.79 make reference to the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Local Plans” June 2012. The key issue is that plans must be deliverable, development viability must not be threatened, and the cumulative burden of infrastructure requirements and housing policies must be such that cumulatively they provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer so that the development is deliverable (para 173 – 175 of the NPPF). This is also endorsed by the Sir John Harman Report Viability Testing of Local Plans (June 2012).

The Sir John Harman Report (June 2012) referred to above sets out a number of key principles to which regard should be had when assessing the viability of the Core Strategy and its policies. Consideration of viability is a key factor. Plans need to be realistic and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as a whole should be such that the plan is deliverable.

Change to the policy requested:

The Proposed Changes should make reference to the Sir John Harman Report .

Respondent Number: 234	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Taylor Wimpey
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: 160 **Agent Name:** Pioneer Property Services Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC181

Plan Reference: Para 6.78

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

It is welcomed that BANES has recognised the need to update the BANES Viability evidence base, and have proposed a reduction in the affordable housing policy target in some parts of BANES based on this evidence (i.e. to 30% in respect of Keynsham).

However, the ‘2012 Viability Update’ referred to within proposed amendment SPC181 does not appear to have been prepared in consultation with stakeholders / been made available for comment prior to publication within the evidence base. It is therefore unclear that it will be able to reflect the viability of housing land in real terms having regard to the input of landowners and developers in the area.

Given the lack of prior opportunity to comment on the 2012 Viability Update it is reasonable for the following concerns to be raised during this consultation and to request that these be taken into consideration.

The following paragraphs provide a brief overview of the 2012 Viability Update (although it is suggested that more in-depth consultation with Stakeholders would be appropriate to ensure that the assessment of housing land viability can be amended to ensure it reflects ‘real world’ viability outcomes on the basis of Developer / landowner feedback):

It is unclear what assumptions have been applied in the 2012 Viability Update in terms of the proportion of uplift in land value (unfettered by planning obligations) above Existing Use Value that will be sought by landowners to release land for housing development. Where an insufficient landowner share in the unfettered uplift has been assumed this will impact adversely on the release of land for housing development.

This matter should be read in the context of the recent appeal (APP/X0360/A/12/2179141) ‘Land at The Manor, Shinfield, Reading RG2 9BX’ - the Inspector concluded the appellant’s approach (which assumed a competitive return to be midway between the existing use land value and the value of the land with a residential permission unfettered by planning obligations – i.e. 50% of the unfettered land value uplift) to be reasonable.

Reference should also be made to ‘Viability Testing Local Plans: Advice for Planning Practitioners’ report provided by the Local Housing Delivery Group (Chaired by Sir John Harman – “Harman report”) published during June 2012. The Harman report provides a definition of viability which sets out that:

“An individual development can be said to be viable if, after taking account of all costs, including central and local government policy and regulatory costs and the cost and availability of development finance, the scheme provides a competitive return to the developer to ensure that development takes place and generates a land value sufficient to persuade the land owner to sell the land for the development proposed. If these conditions are not met, a scheme will not be delivered.”

(page 14)

It is acknowledged that for land to be released for development there must be a ‘willingness and ability’ for developers to implement a development, in conjunction with investment by lenders and the willingness of land owners ‘to sell land at an acceptable return’.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change to the policy requested:**

Proposed Changes SPC181 – SPC185

These matters need to be addressed within the Council's viability evidence base and the evidence base needs to be consulted on with Stakeholders to ensure the appropriateness of the assumptions being made. The viability evidence base also needs to be updated to reflect current thinking in respect of viability assessment.

Change Ref. SPC183**Plan Ref.: New Table 8a****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC183

Plan Reference: New Table 8a

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC 46
 SPC 85
 SPC 150
 SPC 171
 SPC 183
 SPC 184
 and to the omission of Planning Policies NE.1 and NE.2 from the list of "Saved Policies" from the 2007 Local Plan

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4532 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Silverwood Partnership Ltd / JE Sheppard & Sons

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC183

Plan Reference: New Table 8a

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Policy CP9 – Affordable Housing

It is clear from past delivery rates of affordable housing as set out in the Council's Viability Study (June 2010) that the percentage of affordable housing is nowhere near being met and therefore to propose a requirement of 35% would be setting an unachievable target.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Required

The level of affordable housing sought by Policy CP9 is unrealistic and is unlikely to be met based on past delivery rates. The level should be reduced.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent** 4564 **Comment** 10 **Respondent** Ms Julia Adams
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent**
Organisation:**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC183

Plan Reference: New Table 8a

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Objection

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent** 4642 **Comment** 14 **Respondent** Mrs Deborah Bensley
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent**
Organisation:**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC183

Plan Reference: New Table 8a

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Objections

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch****Respondent** 251 **Comment** 7 **Respondent**
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent** Bovis Homes
Organisation:**Agent ID:** 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC183

Plan Reference: New Table 8a

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

9.5 We also question the mix of affordable housing sought. Policy CP9 currently states that, "the type and size profile of the affordable housing will be guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other local housing requirements but the Council will aim for at least 60% of the affordable housing to be family houses including some large 4/5 bed dwellings".

9.6 However, the SHMAA indicates the mix of housing required to meet needs based upon the low trend migration scenario at Figure 60. This indicates that of the 3,200 affordable homes to be provided over the period 2011-2031;

- 1,500 dwellings (50%) are required to be 1 bedroom;
- 900 dwellings (30%) are required to be 2 bedrooms;
- 500 dwellings (17%) are required to be 3 bedrooms; and
- 100 dwellings (3%) are required to be 4 bedrooms plus.

9.7 The SHMAA therefore suggests that about 74% of the affordable housing requirement should be provided as 1 and 2 bed units. The policy requirement to provide at least 60% affordable housing as family housing is therefore not justified by

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

the Council's own SHMAA and is therefore unsound.

9.8 We also note that the SHMAA concludes that there is no requirement for additional Intermediate affordable housing over the period 2011 to 2031, however the information to justify this conclusion is unclear and we therefore query whether this is justified and sound. We also note that the 2012 Viability Study Update does not test the viability of developments based on an affordable requirement of 100% social rented housing.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson

Respondent Organisation: Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC183

Plan Reference: New Table 8a

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Curo support the identified geographical split for affordable housing based on schemes of 10 or more units and where the suggested policy indicates that 40% affordable housing should be sought on schemes in Affordable Housing Area 1 and 30% affordable housing should be sought in Affordable Housing Area 2 (with the exception of Chew Valley – see below).

Furthermore, having considered the Council's viability studies from 2010 and 2012, we question the validity of regarding Chew Valley as one area for the purposes of the affordable housing target. We note that the 2010 viability study suggests a 40% affordable housing target for the Chew Valley Higher Value area and a 30% target for the Chew Valley Lower Value area. In the 2012 Viability update we note that both areas have been included within the 30% affordable housing target without any explanation for this change.

Change to the policy requested:

From our own experience we consider that there is scope within Chew Valley for a higher affordable housing target in parts of the Chew Valley and suggest the Higher Value area is included within the 40% affordable housing bracket to optimise the delivery of affordable housing across the District.

Change Ref. SPC184

Plan Ref.: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Respondent Number: 4560 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: IM Properties Ltd & Linden Homes

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

• Policy CP9 (Document reference SPC184 – Affordable Housing)

IM Properties and Linden Homes strongly object to the contents of policy CP9 and introduction at this late stage in the plan making process (without any evidence/justification) to a 40% affordable housing as a threshold should be applied to all sites in Bath. More pertinent, the supporting text to this policy as drafted fails to substantiate or justify this position.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

There is insufficient flexibility within Policy CP9 as drafted to allow for site by site consideration to take place, specifically in relation to previously development sites. The policy needs to recognise the need for interpretation of the policies to be informed by the site's context, site specific issues and character of the area/supporting infrastructure.

Furthermore, the proportional requirement of 40% is particularly stringent and inflexible. In the current economic climate such thresholds are failing to be delivered on any sites in the Greater Bristol Area (green field or previously development) with few sites delivering 30% without recourse to Housing Grant. This policy is a substantive barrier to delivering the Council's five year housing land supply targets. Furthermore, we consider that this will actually be detrimental to the overall ability for the property sector to deliver the provision of affordable housing in the city leading to further pressure on Greenfield sites outside of the city boundary. Such a policy approach will further stagnate development opportunities in the city and impact on the ability for the Council to deliver the housing requirements set out in Policy CP9.

In addition, we object to the Council's removal of reference to the consideration of Affordable Rent, which will be considered in lieu of social rent where proven necessary to improve viability. This is directly contrary to national guidance on the delivery of affordable units.

The adopted Local Plan requires a proportional requirement of 35% affordable housing, even at this adopted level, the Council have struggled to deliver affordable housing targets and therefore the increase to 40% is not supported. Furthermore, it is widely acknowledged by the Government that unrealistic Section 106 agreements negotiated in differing economic conditions can be an obstacle to house building.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: Policy CP9 should be revised to take a more flexible approach to affordable housing, reverting to the established proportional requirement of 35% and recognising any affordable housing provision is subject to viability testing to be considered on a site by site basis in order to ensure the Council's five year housing land supply is not unnecessarily stifled by such a prescriptive policy stance.

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 270 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Blue Cedar Homes

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Policy CP9 – Affordable Housing

It is clear from past delivery rates of affordable housing as set out in the Council's Viability Study (June 2010) that the percentage of affordable housing is nowhere near being met and therefore to propose a requirement of 35% would be setting an unachievable target.

A requirement of 35% affordable housing is considered to be too high. In practice it is likely to result in the open market element of any development coming forward under this policy comprising large family dwellings in order to subsidise the affordable housing. This will not deliver the smaller dwellings that is required of these settlements in order to allow elderly people to downsize into smaller units. As a result elderly people will continue to occupy family housing that is needed by younger families.

The nature of retirement development means that they are generally incompatible with the provision of on site affordable housing being designed with the specific needs of the elderly in mind and offer the opportunity to live in a development with people of a similar age and interests.

A requirement for the on site provision of affordable housing will result in younger people living within a development that has not been designed with them in mind. This would severely impact on the marketability of retirement schemes and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

would discourage developers from attempting to provide much needed retirement housing in the District.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Required

The level of affordable housing sought by Policy CP9 is unrealistic and is unlikely to be met based on past delivery rates. The level should be reduced. The policy should also recognise that where a proposed development addresses a specific local need e.g. retirement housing this would be an appropriate contribution which could seek an alternative to on site provision financial contribution).

Respondent Number: 4508 **Comment Number:** 16 **Respondent Name:** Nigel Roberts

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

SPC 46
 SPC 85
 SPC 150
 SPC 171
 SPC 183
 SPC 184
 and to the omission of Planning Policies NE.1 and NE.2 from the list of "Saved Policies" from the 2007 Local Plan

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4564 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Ms Julia Adams

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Objection

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 4642 **Comment Number:** 15 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Deborah Bensley

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Objections

Change to the policy requested:**Development Location:** Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Respondent Number:** 4690**Comment Number:** 1**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Savills**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: Comment on Land adjoining Odd Down**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

We are extremely concerned that the affordable housing policy is not founded upon robust and credible viability evidence and is not therefore justified.

The viability evidence which has informed the policy position appears to have adopted very simplistic and unduly optimistic assumptions in relation to a number of the important viability inputs. The evidence is also inconsistent with key elements of the helpful cross-sector guidance in 'Viability Testing Local Plans'.

Our principal concerns in relate to the evidence relate to the following:

- Threshold / Benchmark Land Value;
- Development Costs;
- Site Coverage;
- Code for Sustainable Homes;
- Viability Buffer; and
- Planning Risk.

Threshold / Benchmark Land Value

There is very little commentary or explanation within either the original June 2010 Viability Study or the update in December 2012 regarding the appropriate 'threshold' or 'benchmark' land value against which development viability should be judged. Reference is made in paragraphs 3.52 – 3.55 to residential and industrial benchmark land values across the south west from the Property Market Report, however, there appears to be no explanation as to how these have been taken into account in the viability testing process and what, if any, premium has been attached to existing value to incentivise a landowner to dispose of land.

It is extremely important that this information is provided in order that it can be properly tested to ensure that the hypothetical residual land values derived from the viability testing process are sufficient to incentivise the release of land, consistent with the provisions of paragraph 173 of the NPPF.

Development Costs

The Viability Study incorporates a very simplistic approach to development costs. Appendix 3 of the evidence confirms that the build costs are based on BCIS data and, in response to comments made at the stakeholder workshop, an uplift has been applied to reflect the cost of building within Bath and North East Somerset. This appears to be a reasonable approach to base build costs as the requirements for design quality and materials in Bath in particular often result in significantly higher than the average. However, no allowance appears to have been made to cover site service costs, infrastructure requirements or abnormal development costs.

BCIS provides average build costs based upon a cleared and serviced development plot. As the guidance in 'Viability

Testing Local Plans' explains (see Appendix B), the cost indices "rarely provide data on the costs associated with providing serviced housing parcels, i.e. strategic infrastructure costs, which are typically in the order of £17,000 - £23,000 per plot for large scale schemes". There does not appear to have been any allowance made within the viability testing process to take into account the infrastructure costs associated with residential development other than an allowance for Section 106 contributions. Section 106 costs are separate and in addition to the site infrastructure works which are necessary to enable a developer to "open up" a site for development.

Furthermore, there is no allowance within the viability testing for any abnormal costs which may be associated with, for example, demolition, remediation, flood risk mitigation, strategic landscaping etc. It is important to note that whilst these costs are often referred to as 'abnormal', they are only abnormal in the sense that they are not incorporated into standard cost assumptions. They are not abnormal in the sense that they are uncommon, or the exception to the rule. Abnormal costs are extremely prevalent in Bath, particularly given the reliance upon the redevelopment of previously developed sites within the urban area in delivering the strategic housing requirement. Indeed, many of the sites within the central area and on the river corridor will require demolition and on-site flood mitigation measures as a minimum.

The inclusion of an allowance for non-standard development costs is endorsed by the RICS Professional Guidance entitled 'Financial Viability in Planning' (2012). This states at paragraph E.3.2.4.1 that:

"a typical viability assessment includes provisions for exceptional costs. This might include an unusual sewerage connection facility, high levels of site contamination and the need for extensive remedial works, flooding, site boundary and stabilisation works, particularly if there are substructure obstacles to overcome.

These exceptional site costs, or 'abnormals', inflate costs as well as adding to the timeframe for the delivery of a scheme. Historic costs may also be reasonable and appropriate."

Given the nature of abnormal costs in Bath, in order to provide sufficient and robust evidence of viability across the Authority area, we consider that the viability evidence should reflect the economics of development, incorporating an allowance for non-standard development costs.

This concern is exacerbated by the fact that there is also no allowance within the viability evidence of any contingency on the build costs. We have assessed a number of viability studies produced to inform the production of Local Plans and CIL Charging Schedules and the general approach is to include a 5% build cost contingency in the analysis of residential developments. For example, the GVA report (June 2012) for Swindon Borough Council and the BNP Paribas (August 2012) report for Wiltshire Council both include a 5% contingency.

In our experience this is a relatively standard assumption and one we would fully expect to be included in the Viability Evidence in addition to an allowance for 'abnormal' development costs.

Site Coverage

The methodology used in the viability evidence tests only a notional one hectare site and smaller development site case studies. In so doing, it fails to recognise the difference between gross and net site areas and to incorporate an appropriate allowance to reflect the coverage of larger sites.

Appendix B of Viability Testing Local Plans is again helpful in this regard. Here it states that:

"in all but the smallest redevelopment schemes, the net developable area is significantly smaller than the gross area that is required to support the development, given the need to provide open space, play areas, community facility sites, public realm, land for sustainable urban drainage schemes. The net area can account for less than 50%, and sometimes as little as 30% on larger sites, of the sites to be acquired. Failure to take account of this difference can result in flawed assumptions and inaccurate viability studies".

The difference between the gross area of land which a developer needs to purchase for the development and the net developable area from which they can extract profit, is extremely important. In order to properly test the viability within an area it is therefore necessary to make an appropriate allowance in order to take this factor into consideration.

Code for Sustainable Homes

Reference is made in both the original Viability Study and the 2012 Update to the impact of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Despite clearly recognising the implications for build costs that the introduction of Code Level 4 would have, the evidence simply dismisses this rather than acknowledging the implications in the viability evidence and making robust assumptions based upon forthcoming changes to the energy and sustainability requirements for new development.

Furthermore, the evidence completely ignores the Government's commitment to achieving zero carbon development by 2016 and the implications that this would have on build costs which will come into effect in less than three years.

The approach to testing viability over time is addressed on page 26 of 'Viability Testing Local Plans' (June 2012). In general it concludes that current costs and values should be used in viability testing, however, there is one exception to this rule. On this matter it states:

"The one exception to the use of current costs and current values should be recognition of significant national regulatory changes to be implemented, particularly during the first five years, where these will bring a change to current costs over which the developer or local planning authority has little or no control. A key example of this is the forthcoming change to Building Regulations arising from the Government's zero carbon agenda."

Since the additional costs of Code Level 5 for all developments will come into effect in such a short period of time it is, in our view, reasonable to include this within the Viability Evidence. This approach accords with this guidance in 'Viability Testing Local Plans' and provides a far more reasonable position than relying upon viability evidence which will be out of date at such an early point in the plan period.

The approach adopted in the viability evidence is quite clearly contrary to the guidance within 'Viability Testing Local Plans' and does not provide any justification as to why it is preferable to ignore the implications of tightening energy and sustainability requirements rather than address these within the viability evidence.

Viability Buffer

The Viability Evidence draws its conclusions based upon evidence which uses average assumptions. Very few development sites will however ever come forward with costs which are the same as those within the viability evidence, or revenues the same as the average. It follows therefore that only those sites where the assumptions are equal to or in combination are more profitable than the average will be achievable.

There will inevitably be a large number of sites which come forward within Bath & North East Somerset where the average figures are not achievable and thus the affordable housing policy requirement presents a significant risk to the delivery of the strategic housing requirement. In order to overcome this it is necessary to build into the methodology a 'viability buffer' which reduces the residual land value to be tested against the threshold figure.

We strongly advocate the inclusion of a suitable viability buffer within the methodology used in the Viability Evidence to ensure that the affordable housing policy requirement is not set at the maximum achievable for an average scheme within the authority area.

Planning Risk

The developer profit included in the Viability Evidence makes not allowance for the cost of risk inherent in the planning process. Whilst a developer would expect a return of circa 20% of GDV for immediate development opportunities, where there remains a risk in the planning process, for example in the promotion of strategic sites through the development plan process, then a significantly higher profit level is required to offset this risk.

This approach is endorsed in Viability Testing Local Plans which addresses this matter on pages 31 and 32. The guidance concludes that the planning risk should be accounted for in the treatment of the threshold land value. Whether planning risk is accounted for through threshold land values or the profit margin is not important. What is important is that the financial cost of the planning risk is taken into account at some point in the process.

Conclusion

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

For the reasons set out above we not consider that the viability evidence produced on behalf of the Council in support of the proposed affordable housing targets provides a sufficiently robust and credible understanding of the economics of residential development across Bath & North East Somerset.

Change to the policy requested:

The evidence is not in our view sufficient to demonstrate that the policy approach adopted is sound and robust and we therefore strongly advocate an immediate review of the evidence in advance of the Local Plan Examination.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 244 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Home Builders Federation

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Affordable Housing

Please refer to our previous submissions. The proposed Modifications SCP184 to SCP189 Policy CP9 refer to affordable housing provision. Modifications SPC184 and SCP185 addresses the Inspectors concerns expressed in Paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of ID/30 for a split provision of affordable housing across the BANES area.

However the BANES Council Viability Study Update dated December 2012 by Andrew Golland Associates does not allay our previous concerns on whether or not appropriate viability appraisals have been undertaken to justify the proposed affordable housing provision. If the CS is to be compliant with the NPPF, the Council needs to satisfy the requirements of Paragraphs 173 and 174 whereby development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that viability is threatened.

With reference to Paragraph 4.13 of the Updated Viability Study this approach is contrary to the advice contained in the publication "Viability Testing Local Plans Advice for Planning Practitioners" chaired by Sir John Harman and published in June 2012. On page 26 the following is stated "The one exception to the use of current costs and current values should be recognition of significant national regulatory changes to be implemented, particularly during the first five years, where these will bring a change to current costs over which the developer or local authority has little or no control. A key example of this is the forthcoming change to Building Regulations arising from the Government's zero carbon agenda".

The Council should also refer to the following document "DCLG Cost of Building to Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) Updated Cost Review 2011". Table 2 of this document shows that the cost of building to Code 5 represents an increase of 28-31% on build costs dependant on the type of site and its location. As the energy efficiency / CO2 emission reduction costs account for 80% of the cost of the CfSH, this report gives a clear indication of the significant cost increases associated with the proposed changes to Building Regulations (Part L), which are a mandatory policy obligation. Moreover the omission of these costs from the viability appraisals is inconsistent with Modification SPC155 Policy CP2, which sets out compliance with the Government's Zero Homes programme as policy within the CS.

The Update report lacks transparency and so it is difficult to assess whether or not an accurate assessment of viability has been concluded. The report refers to the use of BCIS build cost figures. As cited on page 34 of the Harman Report BCIS costs do not include external structural and local site works such as roads and sewers, provision of mains services, setting out public open spaces, site abnormalities, S278 highway improvement works, sustainable urban drainage schemes, flood protection, etc. nor the communal areas for apartment developments.

On the worked example on page 32 of the Update report. There is no allowance for site acquisition costs such as land agents fees (1-2% of land value), legal fees (about 0.75%-1.5%) and stamp duty (4% of site value plus VAT for values over £500,000).

The sales and marketing costs used are set at the lowest percentage of 3%, which is unlikely in the current challenging market.

It is not obvious if the £15,000 S106 / CIL allowance is sufficient to cover the cost of all policy requirements as set out in the submitted CS and its subsequent modification document. In particular the identified key district wide infrastructure requirements, Modification SPC157 Policy CP4 for Combined Heat & Power systems, The Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document and Modification SPC167 Policy CP6(1)b requiring a "good" Building for Life standard.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Modification SPC167 Policy CP6(1)b is out of date in referring to Building for Life. The scheme referred to was revoked in September 2012 and replaced by a new scheme Building for Life 12. The new scheme is not a score based system so it is no longer possible to achieve a “good” standard. Building for Life 12 provides guidance to facilitate a discussion between the Council, local communities and developers. The Council should refer to the section entitled “How to use Building for Life 12” in the Design Council CABE, HBF and Design for Homes document “The sign of a good place to live : Building for Life 12”. The proposed modification and policy should be removed from the CS.

The Update report does not define whether gross or net site areas have been used. As stated in the Harman report “One error that has a very large impact on the outcome of viability testing is overlooking the distinction between the gross site area and the net developable area (ie. the revenue-earning proportion of the site that is developed with housing). The net area can account for less than half of the site to be acquired (that is, the size of the site with planning permission) once you take into account on-site requirements such as formal and informal open space, sustainable urban drainage systems, community facilities and strategic on site infrastructure etc. On larger sites, sometimes the net area can be as little as 30%. Applying an average density to the gross area can also give a very misleading result”.

Finally the worked example includes a payment for the affordable social housing units. This assumption is overly optimistic as grants may not be readily available to Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) in the future. A viability appraisal with no grant inclusion may have drawn different results on the level of affordable housing provision.

Change to the policy requested:

No Comment

Respondent Number: 249	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Royal Mail Group Ltd
Agent ID: 31	Agent Name: BNP Paribas Real Estate UK		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Royal Mail objects to the proposed split of affordable housing percentage targets and in particular to the raising of the affordable housing percentage target for the identified higher value areas to 40%. This is unsound because every site should be assessed on its individual circumstances and merits having regard to the viability of the proposed scheme and the other public benefits arising from it.

Policy 50 of the NPPF (third bullet point) guides that affordable housing policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time. The proposed changes to this Policy are not flexible and unduly prescriptive without a direct reference to the need for a viability assessment in each case, having regard to other public benefits arising from proposed developments.

“Prime Bath” is not defined in the proposed changes to this Policy or the Glossary and thus is unclear and open to different interpretation.

Change to the policy requested:

Royal Mail’s preference is for all of the proposed new wording to be deleted and all the original wording re-instated.

Failing that, Royal Mail requests that the words “subject to viability assessment and having regard to public benefits arising from proposed developments: “ should be added after the proposed new word “sought”. In addition “Prime Bath” should be defined either in the Policy or Glossary by reference to a plan.

Respondent Number: 249	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Royal Mail Group Ltd
Agent ID: 31	Agent Name: BNP Paribas Real Estate UK		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The final paragraph of the section on Viability as proposed for amendment is unclear.

It is not clear what "higher" is referring to. It is assumed that this is the proposed 45% figure.

Change to the policy requested:

The final paragraph of proposed changes to the section on viability should be amended to read as below. This assumes that Royal Mail's requested amendments in relation to Policy CP 9 (proposed change SPC 184) are incorporated.

"Higher (over 35%) and lower (under 35%) proportions of affordable housing may be appropriate where supported by an assessment of viability of the proposed development and having regard to other public benefits arising from the proposed developments."

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 12 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson**Respondent Organisation:** Curo**Agent ID:** 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

SPC184 : Impact of the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Affordable Housing Targets

4.10 On the basis of the updated viability evidence of 2012, inclusive of testing at current housing values, the proposed affordable housing targets of 40% and 30% are supported.

4.11 They are supported only in the context of a greater increase in the overall housing requirement as sought above. Without a more substantial overall increase, the Core Strategy will not facilitate the delivery of sufficient numbers of affordable housing.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 301 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** South West HARP Planning Consortium**Agent ID:** 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC184

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The affordable housing percentages proposed in Policy CP9 are more in line with the viability evidence and are supported on that basis. We consider, however, that the wording of this policy should be refined to make it clearer that the Council considers these percentages are to be treated as a minimum starting point for negotiation.

Change to the policy requested:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 2563 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Guinness Trust

Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

SPC184: Impact of the Proposed Changes to the Core Strategy Affordable Housing Targets

Our previous concerns about a blanket 35% affordable housing target that were accepted by the Inspector via ID/30 have been met in principle via the formulation of differentiated affordable housing targets.

On the basis of the updated viability evidence of 2012, inclusive of testing at current house prices, the proposed affordable housing targets of 40% and 30% are tentatively supported, subject to viability and site specific considerations.

Our support though is offered only in the context of a substantial increase in the overall housing requirement as sought above. Without this overall increase, the Core Strategy cannot practically facilitate the delivery of sufficient numbers of affordable housing.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 3152 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** Cllr Nicholas Coombes **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC184 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP9 Large sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

To bring the council in line with what was agreed at Full Council on 4th March, resolution 5c

Change to the policy requested:

Site specific designations for major development sites will have primacy over general designations. This is to deliver 40% affordable housing on the land adjoining Odd Down and Weston, plus all of the MoD sites

Change Ref. SPC185 **Plan Ref.:** Policy CP9 Small sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson **Respondent Organisation:** Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC185 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP9 Small sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

4.7 The affordable housing percentages proposed in Policy CP9 are more in line with the viability evidence and are

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

supported on that basis.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 2597	Comment Number: 1	Respondent Name: Mr Alastair Gibson	Respondent Organisation: Charlcombe Homes Ltd
--------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

Agent ID: 180 **Agent Name:** Affordable Housing Solutions Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC185

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Small sites

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

1.0 National Policy Issues and B&NES Viability Studies

1.1 The proposed 'blanket' requirement for 20% affordable housing in AH area 1, and 15% for AH area 2, does not reflect the evidence of variations in residential project viability across the district. Indeed, the Viability Study of 2010 prepared by Three Dragons, the Ark Housing Consultancy Validation of a Strategic Viability Study of 2011, and Andrew Golland Associates Viability Study update of 2012, all note the distinct market price zones in the B&NES geographic area, which they variously assess as numbering between five and nine distinct sub-markets. For example, the Ark report, (in paragraph 2.2.2), specifically noted that:

'...there does appear to be sufficiently distinctive pricing between the zones to confirm the need for separate appraisal of development in each area although this needs to be reviewed from time to time as the relative market appeal and cost drivers of different areas can and will change.'

1.2 It should also be noted that the Ark Housing Consultancy viability report fails to consider the issue small sites in its brief, although the Bath and North East Somerset District Council Viability Study of 2010 and the Update of 2012, prepared by Andrew Golland Associates, does make reference to small sites. Whilst the Update Study considers three policy options, in keeping with the previous report, it does appear to favour a small sites approach based on the distinct pricing zones across the Council's area. The Executive Summary paragraph 8 states:

'It is recommended that, given the great variance in residual values across the B&NES area, a split target approach is adopted to affordable housing delivery. The third option in the report (a five way split) would work, and, do so without impacting on the Council's draft CIL policy approach.'

1.3 Paragraph 3.14 confirms:

'The range of residual values shown in Figure 3.1 is large. The range has very important implications for how policy might be set.'

1.4 One of the 12 core planning principles of the NPPF is that plans should take into account market signals such as land prices and housing affordability (paragraph 17). The Framework goes on to make clear that "Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking". Furthermore, "to ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable"(para.173).

1.5 It is noted that in assessing the viability of smaller sites to support an affordable housing requirement, B&NES seek to apply a 'blanket' target of 20% affordable housing in AH area 1 and 15% for AH area 2, justifying this through sample based viability assessments from 2010, updated in 2012. In the circumstances described above, we would question whether such an approach meets the statutory tests for use of planning obligations set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) - particularly the requirements that they should be directly related to the development concerned, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development in each case.

122.—(1) This regulation applies where a relevant determination is made which results in planning permission being

granted for development.

(2) A planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is—

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

1.6 While a 'blanket' approach may be expedient in terms of the general planning process, it fails to take account of variations in local housing sub-markets, and key data as regards the existing use value of land. In addition, it may also be subject to 'fossilisation' of values which changing circumstances may mean are no longer relevant to changing economic conditions over the life of the plan.

1.7 In order to 'encourage not restrain' overall development on small sites account should always also be taken of the cumulative impacts of requirements of these kinds, and of site specific and other requirements to be addressed through planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy. The proposed small sites policy would appear to have undue effects on development viability that will inhibit delivery of new residential developments.

2.0 Small Site Financial Viability Assessments and Existing Use Value of Land

2.1 Development Appraisal models are, in essence, simple and can be summarised via the following equation:

Value of Development less Cost of Development less Profit = Residual Land Value

2.2 Residual Land Value – the sum that the developer will pay to the landowner to secure a site for development – will normally be the critical variable. If a proposal generates sufficient positive land value with a competitive return for the land owner, it will be implemented. If not, the proposal will not go ahead.

2.3 Ultimately, the landowner holds the key and will make a decision regarding implementing the project or not on the basis of return and the potential for market change and thus alternative developments. The landowner's 'bottom line' will be achieving a residual land value that sufficiently exceeds 'existing use value' to make development worthwhile. The extent of the premium over and above EUV is not fixed. It will depend on the landowners' circumstances.

2.4 Thus, for example, in a 'distressed' sale there may be little or no premium but where the landowner can wait for optimum market conditions, the premium may be higher (perhaps up to 50% in some circumstances). The industry 'norm', accepted for example in planning appeals and by Core Strategy Inspectors, is around 25%.

2.5 Existing use values are clearly as sensitive to location as residential values. Actual existing use values across the Council's area will vary considerably across the five to nine market price zones identified in the Council commissioned viability study. Furthermore, there will be other existing uses, such as car parks and other relatively low values uses, where the economic context for the delivery of affordable housing may vary from the average.

2.6 It should not, however, be automatically assumed that low existing use values make the delivery of target levels of affordable housing or commuted payments possible. For example, some low value sites may require decontamination, the cost of which may offset any savings on land purchase costs. Similarly, sites which require the re-provision of community uses may have low existing use values, but where the re-provision costs of the community facility will affect the extent to which affordable housing can be provided.

2.7 It is noted that the proposed change to the Core Strategy states that:

'The target level for these small sites will be 20% for AH area 1 and 15% for AH area 2, half that of large sites, in order to encourage delivery.'

2.8 Whilst the updated Viability Study of 2012 concerns itself with the residual values which might flow from various densities of development across the five sub markets it has identified, it is silent on the key issue as to what the relevant range of existing use land values now pertain in these locations. Thus, the vital 'comparator' valuation data against which the viability of a proposed scheme is to be judged is entirely missing from the Study.

2.9 A robust study may have included recent evidence in relation to the existing use value of industrial, commercial, and under developed residential plots, which would have informed the viability assessment conclusions, and without which it is suggested the proposed 'blanket' affordable housing policy is ill founded.

2.10 Consideration of a similar point in relation to 2010 Viability Study point again to a failure to investigate the range of existing use values of land across the district. There is no rigorous and systematic review of the existing use value of land, which we consider is necessary to underpin the small sites proposal. We have instead passing reference to the existing use value of industrial land. For example, paragraph 6.4 states:

‘ In a mid-market locations such as Chew Valley Higher, residual value is £2 million per hectare, double the next likely existing use value in industrial land.’

2.11 Interestingly, in paragraph 5.13, the 2010 Report does make some reference to the difficulties inherent in the delivery of affordable housing in relation to the replacement of existing residential schemes:

‘Where a single new house replaces an existing dwelling, as is the case in some instances, we would expect the economics to be difficult. Even at the top of the market such a scheme will only generate around £300,000 for a building plot – on the basis of a market unit. In most cases, we do not think this will be sufficient to cover the property acquisition costs for an existing dwelling, unless these are exceptionally favourable.’

2.12 In addition, it is clear that at least in some of the market areas, the proposed ‘blanket’ policy is not viable, and will therefore have the effect of restraining new development. For example, based on the B&NES provided cost data from the 2010 Viability Toolkit, linked to current average market values, the following assessment leads to an unviable output:

Affordable Housing Area 2

Affordable Housing Requirement: 15%

Development of 9 no 3 bed Houses

Site 0.25, Units 9, Sale 8, Affordable 1

Existing Use Value Comparator 250000

Unit NIA, 90 m2

Market Sale GDV 200000, 1600000

AH unit 80000, 80000

TOTAL, 680000

COSTS

S106 @ £15.000 per unit 120,000

Build 945 m2 765450

Fees 12% 91854

Finance 7.00% 53581.5

Marketing 3% 48000

Profit 20% 320000

Internal Overheads 5% 38272.5

TOTAL COST 1,437,158

RV 242,842

EUV-RV -7,158

3.0 Practical Considerations: Cost and Risk.

3.1 There are a number of practical issues which flow from the proposed small sites policy, which will have the effect of restraining small residential developments, and significantly increasing the cost and administrative burden for both the Applicant, and the Council.

3.2 From the Applicant’s viewpoint, the modest nature of small schemes may preclude the level of time and expenditure necessary to deploy a suitable viability based argument. The preparation of a scheme specific, robust, viability based case, together with the Applicants commitment to cover the Council’s own costs of assessing any viability submission, can significantly increase the level of risk capital required to submit a planning application.

3.3 As a consequence, the Applicant may face an untenable position. On the one hand the Council’s requirement to apply a ‘blanket’ target of 20% affordable housing in AH area 1 and 15% for AH area 2 may preclude many proposed schemes being developed because they are unviable. Equally, small projects of this nature will require additional risk capital headroom for an Applicant to pay for the preparation of professional cost and valuation reports in order to limit the B&NES requirement to a viable level. The resultant outcome may be a significant restraint on small site developments in many parts of the Council’s area, and/or a significant increase in the number of site based viability assessments submissions to the Council,

due to the inability of individual proposed schemes to support the required affordable housing contribution.

3.4 The B&NES commissioned viability Study of 2010 contain the following table [Please the the original representation as the table could nto be inputted into this schedule].

preparation of a scheme specific, robust, viability based case, together with the Applicants commitment to cover the Council's own costs of assessing any viability submission, can significantly increase the level of risk capital required to submit a planning application.

3.1 As a consequence, the Applicant may face an untenable position. On the one hand the Council's requirement to apply a 'blanket' target of 20% affordable housing in AH area 1 and 15% for AH area 2 may preclude many proposed schemes being developed because they are unviable. Equally, small projects of this nature will require additional risk capital headroom for an Applicant to pay for the preparation of professional cost and valuation reports in order to limit the B&NES requirement to a viable level. The resultant outcome may be a significant restraint on small site developments in many parts of the Council's area, and/or a significant increase in the number of site based viability assessments submissions to the Council, due to the inability of individual proposed schemes to support the required affordable housing contribution.

The B&NES commissioned viability Study of 2010 contain the following table [Please the the original representation as the table could nto be inputted into this schedule].

3.6 This analysis demonstrates that the proposed small sites policy would have delivered a maximum of 46 affordable housing units over the three year period in question, compared to the maximum of 452 which would have derived from larger sites. i.e. the small sites policy would have produced only 9.2% of the total affordable housing provision in the B&NES area.

3.7 By contrast, small sites planning applications would have comprised over half the total number of planning applications, based on application size averages. i.e. 38 applications out of a total of 71.

3.8 In addition, it should be noted that the average affordable housing unit production per application is significantly different between the large sites and the small sites. The large site producing 14 times the level of affordable housing per planning application, compared to the proposed small site policy.

3.9 On the basis of the above, it is clear that the introduction of the proposed small sites affordable housing would trigger a significant increase in the administrative burden of the Council in dealing with individual small site viability assessments, (perhaps double the current workload), in order to deliver only a fourteenth of the affordable housing output per planning application.

4.00 Commuted Sum Calculation

4.1 The proposed change to the submitted core strategy for small sites states that:

'In some instances the Council will accept commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision on small sites.'

4.2 In our opinion it is unlikely that local housing association would be prepared to accept the addition management and administrative costs associate with the output from small sites, where this amounts to one or two units remote from their core management areas. It therefore appears that the Council will commonly select the commuted sum route in many instances.

4.3 The application of the formula contained in table 2.1.1 of the B&NES SPD entitled 'Planning Obligations'(2009), to a recently completed four unit development in AH area 1, with a site area of 0.3HA, (and with a proposed on-site affordable housing requirement of 20%), would therefore be as follows:

Number of Homes Off-site = Number of Market Homes x 20/80

Where the number of homes for sale is 4 in number the above formula would translate the off-site requirement as follows:

Number of Homes Off-site = 4 x 20/80 = 1.0 Affordable Home

4.4 Table 2.1.3 states that the amount payable by an Affordable Housing Provider would be of the order of £90k per unit for a 4 bedroom social rented unit.

4.5 The AH area 1 site produced 4 new homes for sale, at an average price per unit of £1.3m each. We can therefore assume that the market value of the affordable home would be £1.3m. If we then apply the Council's commuted payment formula to this real situation the required sum payable to the Council would be calculated as follows:
£1,300,000 - £90,000 = The Commuted Sum of £1,210,000

4.6 It is understood that this recently completed scheme in a AH area 1 is comparable with many other small site projects undertaken by my client in recent years in the B&NES district. The overriding concern is that the application of the Council's proposed small sites policy linked to the published formula would have invariably resulted in these schemes becoming unviable. On this basis, it is clear that the effect of the Council's proposed 'blanket' policy will inhibit the delivery of future small site schemes.

4.7 This may be understood by considering the economics of provision in relation to this typical small scheme, as follows:

Project Ridge, Acre, HA

Site Area, 0.75, 0.3035145

GDV (4 units), £5,103,321

Land Price £1,150,000

EUV (say Land Price less 25%) £920,000

Construction Cost £2,547,150

Professional fees 12% £305,658

Profit 20% £1,020,664

Marketing 3% £153,100

Interest 7% £178,301

TOTAL COST £4,204,873

GDV - COST = Residual Land value (RV) £898,449

RV - EUV -£21,551

4.8 On the basis of the above typical small site scheme it can be seen that the project cannot provide any off-site commuted payment without becoming unviable, much less the sum of £1.21m required by the Council's proposed policy. A commuted sum formula based on the open market value of a unit therefore appears flawed. In our opinion, it may be more appropriate to consider a construction cost basis for the calculation of any commuted sum, rather than a value based approach.

4.9 We would also note that the application of the commuted sum formula to AH area 2 (with a proposed on-site affordable housing requirement of 15%), would result in exactly the same number of off-site homes as in AH area 1 for schemes featuring either 5 or 9 units once the output is rounded, (as the Council require), to the nearest whole number of affordable housing units. There is therefore no differentiation between AH areas 1 and 2 as regards off-site or commuted sum requirements for schemes of 4, 5, or 9 units. Furthermore, for schemes of 6, 7, and 8 units the off-site requirement for Area 1 is twice that as for area 2. This is clearly anomalous in policy terms.

5.00 Conclusions

In conclusion we would note that:

a) Every B&NES commissioned Viability Study since 2010 notes the distinct market price zones in the B&NES geographic area. These are variously assessed as numbering between five and nine distinct sub-market geographic areas. The existence of these price zones are not reflected in the proposed 'blanket' policy. We therefore question whether such a policy approach meets the statutory tests for use of planning obligations set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).

B) None of the Council's Viability Studies contain a rigorous assessment of the existing use values of land across the district. Without this key 'comparator' data in relation to the existing use value of land, there is no compelling evidence base to support the proposed change in the Core Strategy.

C) From the Applicant's perspective the proposed 'blanket' small site policy will place a disproportionate cost and risk burden on the development of individual small sites, and thus act as restraint to new development. Furthermore, the need to revert to site specific viability assessments will require the Council to significantly increase its administrative resources in return for, at best, modest gains in affordable housing numbers.

D) As regards the application of the proposed small sites policy, we have demonstrated that a typical small site

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

development cannot support the Council's required commuted sum payment without becoming unviable. Furthermore, the rounding effect of the Council's off-site formula results in the removal of any distinction in off-site requirement between AH area 1, and AH area 2 for schemes featuring either 4, 5 or 9 units; whilst schemes of 6, 7, and 8 units are required to deliver twice the number of off-site units in AH area 1 compared to the equivalent scheme in AH area 2. This is anomalous and will clearly act to inhibit small site development.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Ref. SPC186

Plan Ref.: Policy CP9 Viability

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Respondent Number: 4560 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: IM Properties Ltd & Linden Homes

Agent ID: 39 **Agent Name:** GVA

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC186

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Viability

Development Location: Comment on Extension to MoD Ensleigh

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

- Policy CP9 (Document reference SPC18 - Viability)

This text must acknowledge Clause 6 of the Growth and Infrastructure Act April 2013, which received Royal Assent last week, which intends to allow the modification or discharge of the affordable housing elements of section 106 planning gain agreements to make developments viable.

The clause states the test for viability "is that the evidence indicates that the current cost of building out the entire site (at today's prices) is at a level that would enable the developer to sell all the market units on the site (in today's market) at a rate of build out evidenced by the developer, and make a competitive return to a willing developer and a willing landowner.

Change to the policy requested:

RECOMMENDED CHANGES: Update text to reflect the advice set out in the Growth and Infrastructure Act.

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Respondent Number: 251 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Bovis Homes

Agent ID: 32 **Agent Name:** Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC186

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Viability

Development Location: Comment on Land at Whitchurch

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

9.5 We also question the mix of affordable housing sought. Policy CP9 currently states that, "the type and size profile of the affordable housing will be guided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other local housing requirements but the Council will aim for at least 60% of the affordable housing to be family houses including some large 4/5 bed dwellings".

9.6 However, the SHMAA indicates the mix of housing required to meet needs based upon the low trend migration scenario at Figure 60. This indicates that of the 3,200 affordable homes to be provided over the period 2011-2031;

- 1,500 dwellings (50%) are required to be 1 bedroom;
- 900 dwellings (30%) are required to be 2 bedrooms;
- 500 dwellings (17%) are required to be 3 bedrooms; and

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

- 100 dwellings (3%) are required to be 4 bedrooms plus.

9.7 The SHMAA therefore suggests that about 74% of the affordable housing requirement should be provided as 1 and 2 bed units. The policy requirement to provide at least 60% affordable housing as family housing is therefore not justified by the Council's own SHMAA and is therefore unsound.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 234 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Taylor Wimpey

Agent ID: 160 **Agent Name:** Pioneer Property Services Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC186 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP9 Viability

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Whilst the deletion of the first bullet point in proposed change SPC186 is welcomed the last paragraph in this proposed change remains of significant concern. Whilst the Council have deleted reference to 'up to 45%' the paragraph continues to suggest that a 'higher' proportion of affordable housing may be sought where supported by viability – this results in uncertainty within draft Policy CP9 and suggests that the Council will seek a viability assessment of proposals on a development by development basis regardless of whether the amended proportions of affordable housing proposed in changes SPC183 to SPC185 are proposed by applicants on the off chance that a higher level of affordable housing may prove to be viable.

This approach is contrary to the NPPF (paragraphs 153, 154, 173, and 174) which makes it clear: that matters such as the level of affordable housing to be sought are to be assessed by the local authority at the Plan making stage to ensure that Plans are deliverable; that policy wording should make it clear to decision makers how to react to development proposals (i.e. the policy wording provides certainty and clarity), and, that Plans can be reviewed in whole or in part to reflect changing circumstances as necessary.

Furthermore, it is not demonstrated by the 2012 Viability Study that in excess of the levels of affordable housing proposed within proposed changes SPC183 to SPC185 is deliverable.

Regardless of whether or not it is the Council's intention that a viability assessment will be sought on a development by development basis (i.e. regardless of whether the amended proportions of affordable housing proposed in changes SPC183 to SPC185 are proposed by applicants and on the off chance that a higher level of affordable housing may prove to be viable), the wording in the last paragraph of proposed change SPC186 is unsound and requires amendment.

Change to the policy requested:

It is proposed that on the basis of the concerns raised above the last paragraph of Proposed Change SPC186 should be amended as follows:

Where viable, A higher (up to 45%) proportion of affordable housing may be sought in line with the proportions set out within this policy where supported by the assessment of viability of the proposed development. or provision below the average of 35% may be accepted.

Homes that do not meet the above definition of affordable housing, such as "low cost market" housing, may not be considered as affordable housing for planning purposes."

Respondent Number: 249 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Royal Mail Group Ltd

Agent ID: 31 **Agent Name:** BNP Paribas Real Estate UK

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC186

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Viability

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The final paragraph of the section on Viability as proposed for amendment is unclear:

A higher (up to 45%) proportion of affordable housing may be sought where supported by the assessment of viability of the proposed development. or provision below the average of 35% may be accepted.

It is not clear what "higher" is referring to. It is assumed that this is the proposed 45% figure.

Change to the policy requested:**Respondent Number:** 4704**Comment Number:** 4**Respondent Name:** Warminster Road Developments**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** 165 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC186

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Viability

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

In relation to the MOD Warminster Road site, given its location, the draft policy requires the provision of 40% affordable housing, which is an increase of 5% above what is currently sought under the Local Plan (35%).

The wording of the policy, as currently drafted, allows viability to be taken into account in relation to:

- Whether grant or other public subsidy is available;
- Whether there are exceptional build or other development costs;
- The achievement of other planning objectives;
- The tenure and size mix of the affordable housing to be provided.

The policy then continues to state that a higher proportion of affordable housing may be sought where supported by the assessment of the viability of the proposed development.

WRD is encouraged that there is an element of flexibility in terms of the provision of affordable accommodation based on viability.

However, the policy explicitly states that the Council may seek a higher percentage of affordable housing if viability allows, but it should also state that a lower percentage of affordable housing can be considered as part of planning applications if the relevant viability evidence is provided

Change to the policy requested:

The policy should be more explicit in stating that provision of affordable housing under the policy requirement may be acceptable, subject to the provision of detailed viability evidence.

Change Ref. SPC187**Plan Ref.: Policy CP9 Tenure****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 234**Comment Number:** 5**Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Taylor Wimpey**Agent ID:** 160 **Agent Name:** Pioneer Property Services Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC187

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Tenure

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The deletion of text proposed in change SPC187 is supported as the proportions which were sought in the text are not evidentially justifiable on the basis of objective, credible, and up to date SHMA findings.

However, as stated in response to Proposed Change SPC180

It would be inappropriate to seek to impose affordable housing tenure split requirements through the Planning Obligations SPD (as referred to in proposed change SPC180); this applies not only if the tenure split sought is evidentially unjustified, but also on the basis that seeking to impose additional burdens outside of the Plan making process is contrary to the NPPF paragraphs 153 and 174. Affordable housing tenure split is clearly a matter of significant importance and which is capable of having a significant impact upon the viability of the Council's assumed housing land supply and the Council's ability to fully meet an objectively assessed housing need. It is a matter which should be addressed through Plan policy on the basis of objective and credible SHMA evidence.

It is of concern that the Council's updated evidence base does not provide an objective assessment of affordable housing tenure requirements; this prevents the inclusion of a soundly based affordable housing tenure split target in Policy at the Plan making stage (as required by the NPPF), and yet, contrary to the NPPF, the Council intend to introduce such a target through non-Plan SPD policy.

Change to the policy requested:

It is proposed that:

Whilst the deletion of text proposed in change SPC187 is supported draft Policy CP9 will be unsound on the basis of the tests at paragraph 182 of the NPPF if an objective affordable housing tenure split is not proposed within Policy wording and yet the Council intend to introduce such a target through SPD.

As the Council's updated evidence base does not provide an objective assessment of affordable housing tenure requirements the Council will be unable to soundly set out in Plan policy at this time an affordable housing tenure split target. This being the position, and should the Council want to apply an affordable housing tenure split through policy, it should be clearly stated that the Plan affordable housing policy will be reviewed immediately subsequent to an objective assessment having taken place and an appropriate tenure split having been determined– this matter should not be introduced outside of the Plan process through SPD.

In the interim, the tenure of affordable housing will be subject to negotiation having regard to local housing needs evidence and site specific circumstances (including site viability).

Change Ref. SPC188

Plan Ref.: Policy CP9 Other

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 234

Comment Number: 6

Respondent Name:

Respondent Organisation: Taylor Wimpey

Agent ID: 160 **Agent Name:** Pioneer Property Services Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC188

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Other

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Proposed change SPC188 wording does not reflect the definition of affordable housing provided within the NPPF Annex 2. The wording in the first sentence of this proposed change seeks to introduce additional requirements such as the recycling of receipts (as opposed to 'subsidy' as set out in the NPPF) and for recycled money to be spent only within BANES – the NPPF does not indicate that the expenditure of such recycled subsidy should be limited to a specific geographical area and it is unclear that to do so aligns with the emphasis in the NPPF and the Localism Act 2011 upon cross local authority border co-operation.

Change to the policy requested:

It is proposed that: The wording in Proposed Change SPC188 should be amended as follows:

All affordable housing delivered through this policy should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, in the event of any sales or staircasing affecting affordable housing unit(s) delivered through CP9 then an arrangement will be made to recycle the receipts/ or for the subsidy to be recycled for the provision of new alternative affordable housing provision located elsewhere within Bath and North East Somerset.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Affordable Housing should be integrated within a development and should not be distinguishable from market housing.

Change Ref. SPC189**Plan Ref.: Policy CP9 Delivery****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 234	Comment Number: 7	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Taylor Wimpey
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---

Agent ID: 160 **Agent Name:** Pioneer Property Services Ltd**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC189

Plan Reference: Policy CP9 Delivery

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Proposed change SPC189 retains wording which suggests that affordable housing proposals will be assessed by Decision Makers on the basis of whether they are 'in accordance with the Council's Housing Strategy or equivalent'.

The Housing Strategy or equivalent documents are not Development Plan documents and whilst it is appropriate for the Council to develop housing strategies having regard to the overarching policy framework provided by the Development Plan, it would be inappropriate for the Council to seek to impose matters such as affordable housing tenure and mix through a non-policy document (for the same reasons as already set out in response to Proposed Change SPC180).

Change to the policy requested:

It is proposed that: The wording in the first paragraph of Proposed Change SPC189 should either be deleted or be replaced as follows:

Affordable Housing proposals should assist the Council with achieving broad objectives set out within the Council's Housing Strategy or equivalent, and based on objective up to date evidence of affordable housing need.

Change Ref. SPC190**Plan Ref.: Policy CP10****Development Location:** Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 270	Comment Number: 6	Respondent Name:	Respondent Organisation: Blue Cedar Homes
-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	--

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC190

Plan Reference: Policy CP10

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Policy CP10 – Housing Mix

The principle of providing a mix of housing type and tenure is supported in principle having regard to the existing mix of dwellings in the locality and the character and accessibility of the location. However, within rural areas where local communities have indicated support for additional development consideration should be given to the view of these communities in terms of the housing mix that should be delivered from allocated site. However we object to the wording as the mixture of dwelling types and sizes does not take into account circumstances where it may not be appropriate to seek a mix of housing. For example where a proposed development addresses a specific local need e.g. retirement housing. The nature of retirement development is that they are designed with the specific needs of the elderly in mind and offer the opportunity to live in a development with people of similar age and interests. A requirement to provide a mix of housing would negatively impact on the marketability of retirement schemes and would discourage developers in attempting to provide much needed retirement housing in the District.

We believe that the elderly would fall within these residents which have specific housing requirements. Frequently older

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

residents are keen to stay in towns and villages where they have grown up / currently live in. This would not be possible if the locations of specialist housing for the elderly have to be primary focus within those villages identified as the main focus for housing development.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Required

Policy CP10 needs to be amended to include reference to the view of the local communities which would be in line with Policy RA1.

Respondent Number: 276 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Charles Hignett **Respondent Organisation:** Hignett Family Trust

Agent ID: 151 **Agent Name:** Matthew Macan

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC190 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP10

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Care for the Elderly and People with Disabilities:

The studies carried out by Tetlow King show that DCLG future demographic projections will lead to the majority of household growth coming from households aged 65 or above and approximately 13% for households aged 85 or above. This age group is the most vulnerable and typically has the highest level of care. This situation is supported by the findings in the SHMA.

In response to this, HFT are proposing that the New Neighbourhood at Odd Down should make provision for the care for the elderly including people with disabilities through the provision of a Care Village. HFT and their partner Guinness Trust have therefore made further representation through SPC186

HFT believe that the provision of the 'Care Village' within the New Neighbourhood at Odd Down will provide the means to provide and sustain in the long term, community and health facilities benefitting the wider community of South Bath as well as meeting the needs of the elderly and disabled. HFT agrees with the findings of the SA ref. 68C13479 September 2011 that Policy CP10 Housing Mix (as originally drafted in the dCS) and in the SPC 186 amendment is unsatisfactory as it does not make clear how or where housing that meets the needs of older people, disabled people and those with other special needs will be delivered. Therefore as well as addressing it within policy B3A, HFT will propose changes to policy CP10 to identify the broad location of a new Care Village on the Odd Down Plateau.

The New Neighbourhood will accommodate a Care Village which will probably be located at the eastern end of the plateau, near Southstoke Lane. This responds to the demands in the NPPF that the SHMA should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to require over the plan period which ...takes account of demographic change and...addresses the needs of older people, the Council will make specific provision for a Care Village as an integral part of the new community at South Bath. This will include provision of a substantial number of sheltered dwellings, a dementia care facility, a nursing care/cottage hospital and, if needed, an integral GP Surgery and Pharmacy. The likely footprint of this type of development is not insignificant. Estimates from HFT's advisors suggest upto 10 acres should be set aside to provide the appropriate setting including substantial open space and recreational facilities.

Policy CP10

Whilst the SPC 186 changes suggest that the Placemaking Plan should identify locations for such facilities this is impractical as there is simply no blocks of land in Bath of this scale, that are suitable and available for such use. Alternative sites on brownfield land are already identified for housing and employment . The evidence of the SHLAA work demonstrates little or no further availability in Bath.

Much of Central Bath lies within the flood zones that make it unsuitable for this type of development even if the land was available.

Other green space in Bath is again providing a key roles for recreation/sport as well as important ecological habitats or setting for the WHS and there is no evidence of availability of this land.

By its very nature, development of this type requires appropriate setting and scale so that residents have access to local amenities shops public transport , preferably on a level footprint to address DDA and good design.

Consequently, the only available land at Bath fitting this description is located in the Green Belt at the edge of the city. The

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Council has undertaken a comprehensive Green Belt review as part of the changes to the Core Strategy. That work also includes Level 1 /2 /3 Sustainability Appraisals that are available to assist in assessing appropriate locations for this type of use. Such scale of changes to the Green Belt are likely to be significant and as can be seen with housing, failure to provide clear policy on locations , will lead to planning by Appeal and provision of a patchwork of facilities without clear spatial planning. The development will need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to meet Green Belt tests and HFT believe these can be demonstrated now. Changes to Green Belt through the Placemaking Plan should be following the policy direction in the Core Strategy, confirming changes to the “general extent of the Green Belt at will be altered to accommodate a Care Village for”. This provides greater certainty and demonstrates positive planning policy, addresses Green Belt change, as required in all development plans following the NPPF.

The projections for the growth in numbers of elderly people in the B&NES area are provided in Tetlow King's Report App PC 1 at para 4.30. Experience in other Local Authorities clearly demonstrates that specialist accommodation and dedicated care provides the best and the most economic outcomes, benefitting both the elderly themselves , the wider community, provide local jobs and ensuring best value for money to the healthcare sector.

Change to the policy requested:

The Policy CP10 should be amended as shown in red , as follows:

SPC 186 Add the following text to the end of Policy CP10:

The general extent of the Green Belt on land adjoining Odd Down will be altered to accommodate a Care Village . The specific accommodation needs of older people will be addressed through the Placemaking Plan, including considering the allocation of other appropriate sites.

Respondent Number: 4532 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:**
Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Respondent Organisation: Silverwood Partnership Ltd / JE Sheppard & Sons

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC190 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP10

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Policy CP10 – Housing Mix

The principle of providing a mix of housing type and tenure is supported in principle having regard to the existing mix of dwellings in the locality and the character and accessibility of the location. However, within rural areas where local communities have indicated support for additional development consideration should be given to the view of these communities in terms of the housing mix that should be delivered from allocated site.

Change to the policy requested:

Change Required

Policy CP10 needs to be amended to include reference to the view of the local communities which would be in line with Policy RA1.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 300 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** Mark Hodgkinson

Respondent Organisation: Curo

Agent ID: 171 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC190 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP10

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The updated SHMA does not fully assess the need for specialist older people's housing. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF is clear that the housing needs of older people should be fully considered as part of this evidence base:

"The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which: - addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)".

Change to the policy requested:

Curo notes that the specific accommodation needs of older people will only be considered in the context of the Place Making DPD (SPC190). There may however be opportunities for this type of accommodation to be accommodated in the larger Strategic sites (Green Belt extensions). Opportunities for such inclusion appear to have been overlooked in changes SPC24, SPC54 and others relating to the newly identified locations in the Schedule.

The appropriateness of the evidence base is therefore questionable.

Respondent Number: 2563 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:**

Respondent Organisation: Guinness Trust

Agent ID: 43 **Agent Name:** Tetlow King Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC190

Plan Reference: Policy CP10

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

SPC 190: Housing Mix

Guinness is disappointed the Council has not taken the opportunity to fully assess the need for specialist older people's housing in its updated SHMA. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF is clear that the housing needs of older people should be fully considered as part of this evidence base:

"The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which: addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)"

In particular Guinness is disappointed that the specific accommodation needs of older people will only be considered in the context of the Place Making DPD (SPC190). This overlooks opportunities for this type of accommodation to be accommodated in the larger strategic sites via SPC24 and SPC 54. Odd Down is a prime opportunity in this regard.

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref. SPC192****Plan Ref.: Para 6.81****Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 2600 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Liz Richardson

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC192

Plan Reference: Para 6.81

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Para 6.81a – States ‘There are currently no permanent authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites within the District.’

This is correct, but I feel there ought to be reference to the fact that several ‘tolerated’ sites exist within the area, particularly at the Lower Bristol Road.

The Lower Bristol road is a large ‘tolerated’ site situated within Green Belt on the perimeter of the housing development boundary.

At the BaNES cabinet meeting, 12th Sept 2012, a motion was passed, item 60 resolution 5, ‘To AGREE that whilst the Council is progressing the DPD in light of the absence of any authorised permanent sites within the District the Council should progress a planning application at Lower Bristol Road for gypsy and traveller pitches.’

As a result of this resolution the site ought to be included within the core strategy, as a major development .

Change to the policy requested:**Change Ref.** SPC194**Plan Ref.:** Para 6.81b**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 1549 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mr J A Harvey**Respondent Organisation:** Stanton Drew Parish Council**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC194

Plan Reference: Para 6.81b

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The community has been asked to comment on changes to the core strategy not just specific development locations, although this has not been made clear in the consultation newspaper.

Stanton Drew Parish Council wishes to object to the usage of the word ‘now’ as its usage lacks clarity. When is ‘now’? When the core strategy is adopted or at the time of compiling amendment to the core strategy?

‘NOW’ negates proper community involvement in the consultation process as no specific sites are outlined for Gypsy & Traveller sites in the documentation, whereas they are in the housing proposals. Therefore the community cannot give adequate responses to Gypsy & Traveller policy & proposals. This could demonstrate a material consideration for lack of proper community involvement.

In the changes to the core strategy housing numbers, specific housing sites are identified for communities to comment upon, especially where there are changes to Green Belt policy/boundaries identified. This has not happened for Gypsy & Traveller amendments.

The use of ‘NOW’ also negates the opportunity to identify more suitable / more easily deliverable/superior sites to those under consideration because notation prevents the opportunity for further sites to be put forward as the community has no real idea what is under consideration at present.

As Gypsy & Traveller sites are not identified in the core strategy changes the community cannot decide if the sites are likely to comply with national & regional policy.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Removal of the word 'NOW' would allow for considered and appropriate site selection to be rolled out in a phased manner to meet Gypsy & Traveller needs over the plan time rather than in a rushed, incoherent manner. The Parish Council has a strong objection to the ORS report that constituted the needs assessment update (published December 2012) as it is 'a wish list' rather than a robust report substantiated by statistical and demographic evidence.

Usage of the word 'NOW' negates the possibility of proper monitoring & review of the Gypsy & Traveller provision over time as the opportunity for correction is prevented, therefore the rights and needs of the Gypsy, Traveller and settled communities are not regarded properly.

Communities across BaNES demonstrated that the Gypsy & Traveller DPD 2012 process was deeply flawed. The BaNES Council finally agreed. To this end Stanton Drew Parish Council, on behalf of its parishioners wishes to ensure that identification & selection of Gypsy & Traveller sites is carried out in an open, transparent, fair, robust and rigorous way and it calls for the amendments suggested are given due consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

Stanton Drew Parish Council requests that wording to the changes SPC New paragraph 6.81c be altered and the word 'now' removed.

Stanton Drew requests that technical & statistical evidence relating to the ORS Needs assessment be published in full for proper public scrutiny.

Stanton Drew Parish Council requests that BANES Council make known the sites that they have identified as available 'now' for proper scrutiny & consultation by the public.

Change Ref. SPC195

Plan Ref.: Para 6.81c

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 1549 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr J A Harvey **Respondent Organisation:** Stanton Drew Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC195

Plan Reference: Para 6.81c

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The community has been asked to comment on changes to the core strategy not just specific development locations, although this has not been made clear in the consultation newspaper.

Stanton Drew Parish Council wishes to object to the usage of the word 'now' as its usage lacks clarity. When is 'now'? When the core strategy is adopted or at the time of compiling amendment to the core strategy?

'NOW' negates proper community involvement in the consultation process as no specific sites are outlined for Gypsy & Traveller sites in the documentation, whereas they are in the housing proposals. Therefore the community cannot give adequate responses to Gypsy & Traveller policy & proposals. This could demonstrate a material consideration for lack of proper community involvement.

In the changes to the core strategy housing numbers, specific housing sites are identified for communities to comment upon, especially where there are changes to Green Belt policy/boundaries identified. This has not happened for Gypsy & Traveller amendments.

The use of 'NOW' also negates the opportunity to identify more suitable / more easily deliverable/superior sites to those under consideration because notation prevents the opportunity for further sites to be put forward as the community has no real idea what is under consideration at present.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

As Gypsy & Traveller sites are not identified in the core strategy changes the community cannot decide if the sites are likely to comply with national & regional policy.

Removal of the word 'NOW' would allow for considered and appropriate site selection to be rolled out in a phased manner to meet Gypsy & Traveller needs over the plan time rather than in a rushed, incoherent manner. The Parish Council has a strong objection to the ORS report that constituted the needs assessment update (published December 2012) as it is 'a wish list' rather than a robust report substantiated by statistical and demographic evidence.

Usage of the word 'NOW' negates the possibility of proper monitoring & review of the Gypsy & Traveller provision over time as the opportunity for correction is prevented, therefore the rights and needs of the Gypsy, Traveller and settled communities are not regarded properly.

Communities across BaNES demonstrated that the Gypsy & Traveller DPD 2012 process was deeply flawed. The BaNES Council finally agreed. To this end Stanton Drew Parish Council, on behalf of its parishioners wishes to ensure that identification & selection of Gypsy & Traveller sites is carried out in an open, transparent, fair, robust and rigorous way and it calls for the amendments suggested are given due consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

Stanton Drew Parish Council requests that wording to the changes SPC New paragraph 6.81c be altered and the word 'now' removed.

Stanton Drew requests that technical & statistical evidence relating to the ORS Needs assessment be published in full for proper public scrutiny.

Stanton Drew Parish Council requests that BANES Council make known the sites that they have identified as available 'now' for proper scrutiny & consultation by the public.

Please expand this box or attach a separate sheet if you require more space.

Respondent Number: 3006 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Dr Chris Ree

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC195 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.81c

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Opinion Research Services GTAA dated 12/12 does not have a sound evidence base, but rather depends upon second hand 'reported' and 'alleged' information.

Examples of inadequate evidence are 3.69 - 3.71, 3.82, 3.96, 3.103

5 of 28 pitches are informed by 6.17 of a wish to move from 'Bricks and Mortar'. This figure was derived from second hand advices referred to in 3.71.

6.26. Interviews have only been conducted by telephone which exposes ORS to manipulation.

3.80 allowed personal preferences to be expressed by G&T representative recruited to assist BANEs with the DPD. Despite the site specified having been removed from DPD, these personal preference comments were accommodated in the full knowledge of her capacity as the planning agent for this privately owned site by a settled landowner. This is a clear conflict of interest.

The poor quality of evidence in this report is of concern.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The manner of the appointment of ORS to undertake the GTAA is concerning, having been advertised and contract awarded within a 7 working day window, so I understand. I fail to understand the requirement for such haste which effectively resulted in only ORS responding and being commissioned.

Whilst the Report was dated December 2012, BANES failed to release it to the public domain for consideration. It was alluded to at the Parish Liaison Meeting on 20/2/13 but the conclusions not disclosed within the G&T DPD update Agenda item, and was in fact withheld until 2/3/13 (when it was released to BANES website without notification to any interested parties), which was 48 hours before the Special Council Meeting on 4/3/13 to consider the proposed changes to the draft Core Strategy. The process has lacked transparency.

Change to the policy requested:

The GTAA should be revisited, properly procured, using a robust evidence base to inform needs.

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 2990 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Matthew Pierce **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC195 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.81c

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The ORS GTAA dated 12/12 does not have a sound evidence base. It depends upon second hand 'reported' and 'alleged' information, allows personal preference for sites to be expressed. To my mind this is beyond the remit of any kind of report.

All this despite the site in question having been removed from BANES DPD as part of an ongoing process to identify suitable, sustainable sites.

The manner of the appointment of ORS to undertake the GTAA is also concerning, having been advertised and contract awarded within a 7 working day window

Change to the policy requested:

The whole GTAA should be revisited, properly advertised for contract for a reasonable length of time, and procured using a robust evidence base to inform needs.

Respondent Number: 3000 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:** Karen Abolkheir **Respondent Organisation:**

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC195 **Plan Reference:** Para 6.81c

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

I object to the The Opinion Research Services GTAA dated 12/12. It does not have a sound evidence base, but rather depends upon second hand 'reported' and 'alleged' information as evidenced in paras 3.69 - 3.71, 3.82, 3.96, 3.103

Para 6.17 - 5 pitches identify as a need are a wish to move from 'Bricks and Mortar'. The figure was derived from second hand advice referred to in para 3.71.

Para 6.26 expresses surprise in respect of the alleged increase in volume (1 yard to 40 plots) needed for travelling showman. The interviews were telephone-based and could possibly be manipulated.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC195

Plan Reference: Para 6.81c

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Opinion Research Services GTAA dated 12/12 does not have a sound evidence base, but rather depends upon second hand 'reported' and 'alleged' information.

Examples of inadequate evidence are 3.69 - 3.71, 3.82, 3.96, 3.103

5 of 28 pitches are informed by 6.17 of a wish to move from 'Bricks and Mortar'. This figure was derived from second hand advices referred to in 3.71.

6.26 expresses surprise in respect of the alleged volume of need for travelling showman plots. Interviews have only been conducted by telephone which exposes ORS to manipulation.

3.80 allowed personal preferences to be expressed by G&T representative recruited to assist BANES with the DPD. Despite the site specified having been removed from DPD, these personal preference comments were accommodated in the full knowledge of her capacity as the planning agent for this privately owned site by a settled landowner. This is a clear conflict of interest.

I do not consider that the quoted Gypsy and Traveller needs are underpinned by sufficient evidence to render legally complaint and sound.

The manner of the appointment of ORS to undertake the GTAA is concerning, having been advertised and contract awarded within a 7 working day window, so I understand. I fail to understand the requirement for such haste which effectively resulted in only ORS responding and being commissioned. On the face of it, this would appear as 'lip service' to procedure, whilst enabling the use of a 'preferred' GTAA provider.

Whilst the Report was dated December 2012, BANES failed to release it to the public domain for consideration. It was alluded to at the Parish Liaison Meeting on 20/2/13 but the conclusions not disclosed within the G&T DPD update Agenda item , and was in fact with held until 2/3/13 (when it was released to BANES website without notification to any interested parties), which was 48 hours before the Special Council Meeting on 4/3/13 to consider the proposed changes to the draft Core Strategy. The process has lacked transparency.

Change to the policy requested:

The GTAA should be revisited, properly procured, using a robust evidence base to inform needs

Respondent Number: 4645 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Matthew Pierce

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC195

Plan Reference: Para 6.81c

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The ORS GTAA dated 12/12 does not have a sound evidence base. It depends upon second hand 'reported' and 'alleged' information, allows personal preference for sites to be expressed. To my mind this is beyond the remit of any kind of report.

All this despite the site in question having been removed from BANES DPD as part of an ongoing process to identify suitable, sustainable sites.

The manner of the appointment of ORS to undertake the GTAA is also concerning, having been advertised and contract awarded within a 7 working day window

Change to the policy requested:

The whole GTAA should be revisited, properly advertised for contract for a reasonable length of time, and procured using a robust evidence base to inform needs.

Change Ref. SPC196

Plan Ref.: New para 6.81d

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 3000	Comment Number: 4	Respondent Name: Karen Abolkheir	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC196

Plan Reference: New para 6.81d

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The revised words must include a reference to previously developed land within Green Belt. Planning Policy for Travellers states that sites within Green Belt are inappropriate development. The Equality Impact Assessment states the rationale for the removal of the word 'normally' from the preceding circulars, which is that settled communities perceive a more favoured approach to Gypsy Traveller development within the Green Belt.

In addition Planning Policy for Travellers acknowledges the vulnerability of rural areas and the policy states that Gypsy Traveller sites must not dominate the nearest settled community.

Change to the policy requested:

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that when considering the location of Traveller sites the LPA should attach weight to the effective use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land. Traveller sites on previously developed, untidy or derelict land within the Green Belt will be inappropriate development unless there are demonstrable Very Special Circumstances that do not outweigh harm to the Green Belt. Planning Policy for Travellers also states that development in the open countryside away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan should be strictly limited. It does recognise, however, that some rural areas may be suitable for traveller's sites providing the scale of these sites does not dominate the nearest settled community and avoid placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure

Respondent Number: 3025	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name: Simon Whittle	Respondent Organisation: Wansdyke Telecom Chew Valley Broadband
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC196

Plan Reference: New para 6.81d

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The revised words misrepresent the Planning Policy for Gypsies and Travellers in respect of previously developed, untidy or derelict land, and also that policy recognises the vulnerability of rural sites rather than expressly stating that 'rural areas may be suitable.' It also does not reflect the fact that development of such sites is "inappropriate in the Greenbelt".

Change to the policy requested:

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that when considering applications the Local Planning Authority should attach weight to effective use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land. It also states that development in the open countryside away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the DP should be strictly limited. Sites in rural areas must respect the scale of and not dominate the nearest settled community and avoid placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent** 3554 **Comment** 3 **Respondent** Ms SE Osborne
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent**
Organisation:**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC196

Plan Reference: New para 6.81d

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The revised words misrepresent the Planning Policy for Gypsies and Travellers in respect of previously developed, untidy or derelict land, and also the policy recognises the vulnerability of rural sites rather than expressly states 'rural areas may be suitable.'

Change to the policy requested:

Policy 6.81d should read

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that when considering applications the Local Planning Authority should attach weight to effective use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land. It also states that development in the open countryside away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the DP should be strictly limited. Sites in rural areas must respect the scale of and not dominate the nearest settled community and avoid placing an undue pressure on local infrastructure.

Change Ref. SPC197**Plan Ref.:** New para 6.82 (includes part of previous para 6.81c)**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent** 3554 **Comment** 5 **Respondent** Ms SE Osborne
Number: **Number:** **Name:****Respondent**
Organisation:**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC197

Plan Reference: New para 6.82 (includes part of previous para 6.81c)

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The changes are not sustainable and should be questioned as follows;

- a) There is no description of the target size of any site by number of pitches. There should be a clear definition of the maximum number of pitches that will be considered. (sub section c)
- b) There is no definition of a pitch, by maximum size, number of living vans, amenity buildings etc. This omission is detrimental to the proper consideration of any site proposed and is detrimental to the good management of any development by ensuring that occupation of any site does not exceed the level permitted by planning condition. (sub section c)
- c) Sites should be accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have manageable access by foot to buses and sustainable transport. (sub section a)
- d) The access to local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities and employment opportunities should be further defined by distance. The description of suitably located will ensure expensive litigation of interpretation. (sub section a)
- e) The definition "harm" should be reinstated. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability. (sub section d)
- f) The definition "harm" should be reinstated when considering the impact on health and well-being of occupiers and neighbours. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability. (sub section f)
- g) The definition of dominance over a local community should be further defined so that it can be measured. (sub section h)

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Given the subjective nature of CP11 criteria it is inappropriate to specify that permission "will be permitted".

Change to the policy requested:

Policy CP11

.....Proposals for sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation will be assessed against the following criteria:

a: the site is suitably..... should be safely accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have sustainable and safe access by foot to public transport (remove by sustainable modes of transport). Reasonable access is defined by 1.5 miles.

c: the site is large enough.....for on-site facilities and amenities, comprising, kitchens, bath and shower rooms, laundry rooms, toilets, living van parking, vehicle parking and manoeuvring, child play areas but must have a sustainable boundary so as to ensure that the number of pitches provided strictly complies with the planning permission provided.

d: the site is acceptably designed and landscaped and does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

f: the proposed use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities, health and well-being of occupiers of the site or neighbouring occupiers. (remove "as a result of the development")

h: the scale of the proposed development does not dominate the nearest settled community nor place any undue pressure or detrimental effect on the local infrastructure. Dominance is defined by considering the number of living vans permitted by the proposed development and comparing the number of dwellings in the nearest settled community. Generally dominance can be considered if the number of proposed living vans is in excess of 25% of the dwellings in the nearest settled community. The nearest settled community should be defined as the dwellings within 1000 metres of the proposed site

Change Ref. SPC198

Plan Ref.: Policy CP11

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 3006	Comment Number: 3	Respondent Name: Dr Chris Ree	Respondent Organisation:
Agent ID:	Agent Name:		
Further Information available in the original comment? <input type="checkbox"/>		Attachments sent with the comment? <input type="checkbox"/>	

Change Reference: SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The proposed changes are not sustainable

- 1) Access to local services (shops, schools) should be clarified as 'suitably located' is hopelessly vague and open to many interpretations which are not in the interests of transparency. A distance guide would be helpful
- 2) Clarification of the concept of dominance over a community is needed in the interests of all parties
- 3) Clarification of the concept of 'harm' in relation to health and well being of neighbours is required in order that objective assessment is possible
- 4) There must be further consideration and clarification of the issue of pitch size (in particular maximum size) and what can be reasonably accommodated on one pitch. There needs to be further detail on maximum number of pitches. These requirements are self evident in order to ensure planning rules are adhered to.
- 5) Adequate access is required by foot, cycle and by car

Change to the policy requested:

Policy CP11

The following criteria..... available and deliverable sites in the Development Plan Document (remove "or developable")

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

a: the site is suitably..... should be safely accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have sustainable and safe access by foot to public transport (remove by sustainable modes of transport). Reasonable access is defined by 1.5 miles.

c: the site is large enough.....for on-site facilities and amenities, comprising, kitchens, bath and shower rooms, laundry rooms, toilets, living van parking, vehicle parking and manoeuvring, child play areas but must have a sustainable boundary so as to ensure that the number of pitches provided strictly complies with the planning permission provided.

d: the site is acceptably designed and landscaped and does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

f: the proposed use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities, health and well-being of occupiers of the site or neighbouring occupiers. (remove "as a result of the development")

h: the scale of the proposed development does not dominate the nearest settled community nor place any undue pressure or detrimental effect on the local infrastructure. Dominance is defined by considering the number of living vans permitted by the proposed development and comparing the number of dwellings in the nearest settled community. Generally dominance can be considered if the number of proposed living vans is in excess of 25% of the dwellings in the nearest settled community. The nearest settled community should be defined as the dwellings within 1000 metres of the proposed site

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 2600 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** Mrs Liz Richardson

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

Policy CP11

There are some areas that ought to be defined.

1 – A maximum permissible size ought to be defined. This size ought to include a maximum number of pitches, and a generally accepted pitch size (the pitch maximum area, number of living vans, amenity buildings etc.). Based on research small family sized pitches are preferable. In addition all planning applications ought to clearly identify the proposed size based on the above. This definition would assist in proper consideration of any site proposed and its future potential for growth and control.

2 - Dominance over a local community, a maximum permitted percentage ought to be stated to ensure it can be measured. For example a maximum % regarding number of people in the nearest settled community, or, a maximum % regarding homes in the nearest settled community. This ought to be lower in Rural Areas to protect small hamlets and villages, for example 4% in rural areas.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 3000 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Karen Abolkheir

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The changes are not sustainable and should be questioned as follows;

1. There should be a clear definition of the maximum number of pitches that will be considered on a site, Westminster briefing suggests that 5 pitches is considered large and 3 is ideal.
2. There should be a definition of a pitch, by maximum size, number of living vans, amenity buildings etc. This omission is detrimental to the proper consideration of any site proposed and is detrimental to the good management of any development by ensuring that occupation of any site does not exceed the level permitted by planning condition.
3. Sites should be accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have manageable and safe access by foot to buses and other sustainable transport.
4. The access to local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities and employment opportunities should be further defined by distance. The description of suitably located will ensure expensive litigation of interpretation.
5. The definition "harm" should be reinstated. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability.
6. The definition "harm" should be reinstated when considering the impact on health and well-being of occupiers and neighbours. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability.
7. The definition of dominance over a local community should be further defined so that it can be measured to ensure that post-planning permission the site does not 'grow' and dominate a local community.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy CP11

The following criteria..... available and deliverable sites in the Development Plan Document (remove "or developable")

- a) the site is suitably..... should be safely accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have sustainable and safe access by foot to public transport (remove by sustainable modes of transport). Reasonable access is defined by 1.5 miles.
- b) Safe and satisfactory means of access can be provided and the existing highway network is appropriate to service the site
- c) the site is large enough.....for on-site facilities and amenities, comprising, kitchens, bath and shower rooms, laundry rooms, toilets, living van parking, vehicle parking and manoeuvring, child play areas but must have a sustainable boundary so as to ensure that the number of pitches provided strictly complies with the planning permission provided. The maximum number of pitches should be 15 per site in a built up area and the maximum number of pitches should be 5 in a rural area although ideally 3.
- d) the site is acceptably designed and landscaped and does not harm and has no unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- e) adequate services including utilities, foul and surface water and waste disposal can be provided as

Respondent Number: 3025 **Comment Number:** 4 **Respondent Name:** Simon Whittle**Respondent Organisation:** Wansdyke Telecom
Chew Valley Broadband**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The changed section focusses on defining a site which is can provide all of the necessary facilities for the G&T community, which implies that for this to be cost-effective and deliverable, any sites must be large. The changed section does not fully address the potential impact, in terms of reduced amenity and dominance of the settled community of such sites.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

The section should include clear quantitative definition of, for example, distances to facilities, number of pitches, pitch size, number of residents or number of vehicles.

The definition of "harm" should be reinstated and the definition of dominance over a local community should be further defined so that it can be measured.

The inclusion of "live/work" pitches implies that sites will be used for business use, which is likely to be inappropriate in rural sites, and may cause harm to settled near-neighbours.

"Traditional lifestyles" must be clearly defined, as these are very different for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and any activities must show full respect for planning and other laws and for the existing settled community.

Change to the policy requested:

Policy CP11

The assessment criteria should include: safe access by "foot, cycle or public transport", rather than the subjective "sustainable".

Whilst the site will require all appropriate facilities, sites should have clearly-defined and enforceable boundaries to prevent unapproved expansion. Additionally, pitch size should be constrained, by appropriate site design, such that uncontrolled internal expansion cannot take place.

The words "if required to enable traditional lifestyles" should be removed from sub-section c)

The word "unacceptable" should be removed from sub-section d)

Respondent Number: 3368 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Clarke Osborne

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The changes are not sustainable and should be questioned as follows;

- a) There is no description of the target size of any site by number of pitches. There should be a clear definition of the maximum number of pitches that will be considered. (sub section c)
- b) There is no definition of a pitch, by maximum size, number of living vans, amenity buildings etc. This omission is detrimental to the proper consideration of any site proposed and is detrimental to the good management of any development by ensuring that occupation of any site does not exceed the level permitted by planning condition. (sub section c)
- c) Sites should be accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have manageable access by foot to buses and sustainable transport. (sub section a)
- d) The access to local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities and employment opportunities should be further defined by distance. The description of suitably located will ensure expensive litigation of interpretation. (sub section a)
- e) The definition "harm" should be reinstated. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability. (sub section d)
- f) The definition "harm" should be reinstated when considering the impact on health and well-being of occupiers and neighbours. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability. (sub section f)
- g) The definition of dominance over a local community should be further defined so that it can be measured. (sub section h)

Change to the policy requested:

Policy CPII

The following criteria..... available and deliverable sites in the Development Plan Document (remove "or developable")

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

a: the site is suitably should be safely accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have sustainable and safe access by foot to public transport (remove by sustainable modes of transport) . Reasonable access is defined by 1.5 miles.

c:the site is large enoughfor on-site facilities and amenities, comprising,kitchens, bath and shower rooms, laundry rooms, toilets, living van parking, vehicle parking and manoeuvring, child play areas but must have a sustainable boundary so as to ensure that the number of pitches provided strictly complies with the planning permission provided.

D: the site is acceptably designed and landscaped and does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area .

F: the proposed use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities, health and well-being of occupiers of the site or neighbouring occupiers . (remove "as a result of the development")

h:the scale of the proposed development does not dominate the nearest settled community nor place any undue pressure or detrimental effect on the local infrastructure . Dominance is defined by considering the number of living vans permitted by the proposed development and comparing the number of dwellings in the nearest settled community . Generally dominance can be considered if the number of proposed living vans is in excess of 25% of the dwellings in the nearest settled community . The nearest settled community should be defined as the dwellings within 1000 metres of the proposed site

Respondent Number: 3554 **Comment Number:** 6 **Respondent Name:** Ms SE Osborne

Respondent Organisation:

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The changes are not sustainable and should be questioned as follows;

- a) There is no description of the target size of any site by number of pitches. There should be a clear definition of the maximum number of pitches that will be considered. (sub section c)
- b) There is no definition of a pitch, by maximum size, number of living vans, amenity buildings etc. This omission is detrimental to the proper consideration of any site proposed and is detrimental to the good management of any development by ensuring that occupation of any site does not exceed the level permitted by planning condition. (sub section c)
- c) Sites should be accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have manageable access by foot to buses and sustainable transport. (sub section a)
- d) The access to local community services and facilities including shops, schools and health facilities and employment opportunities should be further defined by distance. The description of suitably located will ensure expensive litigation of interpretation. (sub section a)
- e) The definition "harm" should be reinstated. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability. (sub section d)
- f) The definition "harm" should be reinstated when considering the impact on health and well-being of occupiers and neighbours. The definition of no unacceptable adverse impact is open to an opinion of acceptability. (sub section f)
- g) The definition of dominance over a local community should be further defined so that it can be measured. (sub section h)

Given the subjective nature of CP11 criteria it is inappropriate to specify that permission "will be permitted ".

Change to the policy requested:

Policy CP11

.....Proposals for sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation will be assessed against the following criteria:

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

a: the site is suitably..... should be safely accessible by foot, cycle and motor vehicles and should have sustainable and safe access by foot to public transport (remove by sustainable modes of transport). Reasonable access is defined by 1.5 miles.

c: the site is large enough.....for on-site facilities and amenities, comprising, kitchens, bath and shower rooms, laundry rooms, toilets, living van parking, vehicle parking and manoeuvring, child play areas but must have a sustainable boundary so as to ensure that the number of pitches provided strictly complies with the planning permission provided.

d: the site is acceptably designed and landscaped and does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

f: the proposed use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities, health and well-being of occupiers of the site or neighbouring occupiers. (remove "as a result of the development")

h: the scale of the proposed development does not dominate the nearest settled community nor place any undue pressure or detrimental effect on the local infrastructure. Dominance is defined by considering the number of living vans permitted by the proposed development and comparing the number of dwellings in the nearest settled community. Generally dominance can be considered if the number of proposed living vans is in excess of 25% of the dwellings in the nearest settled community. The nearest settled community should be defined as the dwellings within 1000 metres of the proposed site

Respondent Number: 4224 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Keynsham Action Group
Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC198 **Plan Reference:** Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

The changes that are proposed are not sustainable and need to be reviewed:

1. Needs a clearer definition of pitch. What is the max size, amenities required etc.
2. There does not appear to be any target size stated for any site. It should clearly state the number of pitches that are to be considered.
3. Accessibility of the sites should be considered
 - a. The use of public transport.
 - b. Shops
 - c. Schools
 - d. Doctors etc

Communities across BaNES demonstrated that the Gypsy & Traveller DPD 2012 process was deeply flawed. The BaNES Council finally agreed and all of the communities involved wish to ensure that identification & selection of Gypsy & Traveller sites is carried out in an open, transparent, fair, robust and rigorous way and it calls for the amendments suggested are given due consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

- 1) The site is large enough for all necessary on site facilities. This to include:
 - a. Manoeuvring of vehicles
 - b. Kitchens
 - c. Bathrooms
 - d. Laundry Rooms
 - e. Toilets
- 2) The proposed use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities, health of the site of any neighbouring occupiers.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Respondent Number:** 4231 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:** Mr Jonathan Burbage**Respondent Organisation:****Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The changes that are proposed are not sustainable and need to be reviewed:

1. Needs a clearer definition of pitch. What is the max size, amenities required etc.
2. There does not appear to be any target size stated for any site. It should clearly state the number of pitches that are to be considered.
3. Accessibility of the sites should be considered
 - a. The use of public transport.
 - B Shops
 - c. Schools
 - d. Doctors etc

Communities across BaNES demonstrated that the Gypsy & Traveller DPD 2012 process was deeply flawed. The BaNES Council finally agreed and all of the communities involved wish to ensure that identification & selection of Gypsy & Traveller sites is carried out in an open, transparent, fair, robust and rigorous way and it calls for the amendments suggested are given due consideration

Change to the policy requested:

- 1) The site is large enough for all necessary on site facilities. This to include:
 - a. Manoeuvring of vehicles
 - b. Kitchens
 - c. Bathrooms
 - d. Laundry Rooms
 - e. Toilets
- 2) The proposed use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities, health of the site of any neighbouring occupiers.

Respondent Number: 4739 **Comment Number:** 1 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Keynsham Action Group**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC198

Plan Reference: Policy CP11

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The changes that are proposed are not sustainable and need to be reviewed:

- 1) Needs a clearer definition of pitch. What is the max size, amenities required etc.
- 2) There does not appear to be any target size stated for any site. It should clearly state the number of pitches that are to be considered.
- 3) Accessibility of the sites should be considered
 - a. The use of public transport.
 - b. Shops
 - c. Schools
 - d. Doctors etc
- 4) Communities across BaNES demonstrated that the Gypsy & Traveller DPD 2012 process was deeply flawed. The BaNES

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Council finally agreed and all of the communities involved wish to ensure that identification & selection of Gypsy & Traveller sites is carried out in an open, transparent, fair, robust and rigorous way and it calls for the amendments suggested are given due consideration.

Change to the policy requested:

Suggestions:

1) The site is large enough for all necessary on site facilities. This to include:

- a. Manoeuvring of vehicles
- b. Kitchens
- c. Bathrooms
- d. Laundry Rooms
- e. Toilets

2) The proposed use of the site must have no harmful impact on the amenities, health and well being of the site of any neighbouring occupiers.

Change Ref. SPC202

Plan Ref.: Para 6.101

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 837 **Comment Number:** 11 **Respondent Name:** David Redgewell **Respondent Organisation:** South West Transport Network

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC202

Plan Reference: Para 6.101

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

The Bath package makes no ref to the bus priority measures such as the new bus gate in Dorchester street or the need for bus priority measures with the 9 showcase bus routes such as Lower Bristol Road.

Page 57

Rail Transport 3

No reference is made Saltford Parkway Station, or Bathampton Station or Corsham station on the new Metro West Great Bristol metro protest between Frome/ Warminster. Westbury wiltsh Trowbridge Bradford on Avon, Avoncliffe, Freshford, Bath Spa Interchange Station Oldfield Park Keynsham and Saltford Parkway.

Change to the policy requested:

Object to the debate of new park and ride site to the East of Bath.

The core strategy needs to make reference to a Rail and Bus based park and ride at Bathampton as part of the Greater Bristol Metro Metro West buses B1.4 makes reference to improved train services on the Greater Bristol Metro as part of 19.7 Million pound package for the Metro West produced and Intercity Electrification by DP Network Rail Western.

Change Ref. SPC203

Plan Ref.: Para 7.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 170 **Comment Number:** 20 **Respondent Name:** Mr. Phil Hardwick **Respondent Organisation:** Robert Hitchins Limited

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Change Reference:** SPC203

Plan Reference: Para 7.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The Proposed Changes to the Plan are unsound. The changes to para 7.05 refer to the review of the Core Strategy, but it is not clear what should be reviewed and when. This was one of the issues raised at the last Hearing Sessions - the Core Strategy should be more explicit about what would be reviewed/when and what might trigger a contingency or review of the Core Strategy. It is not clear how paras 178 – 181 of the NPPF which refer to the duty to co-operate will be implemented and effective in the review of the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Changes need to be made to para 7.05 which explicit sets out the mechanisms for review and in particular how the strategic issues will be addressed which cross the district boundary eg reference to the West of England SHMA Project Brief consultation.

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 3 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol**Agent ID:** 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC203

Plan Reference: Para 7.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Whilst the principle of the District Wide Spatial Strategy is supported, objections are lodged to a number of criteria namely 1(d), 2 and the monitoring timescales.

With regards criterion 1d, support is given to the principle of development being located in the rural areas at settlements with a good range of local facilities. This is in line with the advice in NPPF Paragraph 55 which states:

“To promote sustainable development in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the viability of rural communities. For example where there are groups of smaller settlements development in one village may support services in villages nearby...”

Objections are lodged on the basis that there is no definition of ‘good access to public transport’, neither is there any acknowledgement that development will sustain and improve existing services, facilities and public transport. The criterion needs to be amended to recognise that new development can sustain and improve public transport and other facilities within settlements in the Rural Areas.

With regards to criterion 2, objections are lodged to the proposed net housing increase of 12,700 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029

The NPPF makes it clear in paragraph 47 that Local Plan should meet the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. Even if it cannot do so because of the exception in NPPF unmet needs must be objectively assessed so as to identify any unmet needs that should be sought in adjoining areas.

One of the main reasons for RSS abolition was to remove top down imposition of housing requirements. However, this needs to be considered in the context of a clear parallel message for Government that it expects to see an acceleration in house building through a planning system which proactively supports growth and views housing development positively as set out in the NPPF. Increasing house building is a frequently stated Government priority and the Ministerial Statement dated 6th September 2012 on “Housing and Growth” which stated:

“The Localism Act has put the power back in the hands of communities but with this power comes responsibilities: a responsibility to meet their needs for development and growth and to deal quickly and effectively with proposals that will deliver homes, jobs and facilities.”

The move towards abolition of the RSS has not been made to facilitate reduced housing provision solely on the basis of community consultation which is what this Local Plan is seeking to do.

Indeed it should be remembered that in June 2012 the Core Strategy inspector published his preliminary conclusions on strategic matters in respect of the submitted Core Strategy. With specific regard to housing land the inspector concluded that: -

“There is a lack of National Planning Policy Framework compliant assessment of the housing requirements given the unsuitability of the Council’s methodology.”

The inspector concluded that there was a: -

- i. Need to make up the shortfall of 850 dwellings and 2,006 under the existing adopted Local Plan;
- ii. Need for a 20% buffer to be applied to the 5 year housing land supply and calculation;
- iii. Lack of flexibility to accommodate any delay in bringing forward proposals.
- iv. Student accommodation should not form part of the Council’s supply or completion figures unless the future requirement for such accommodation is also taken into account.

Indeed the issue of housing land provision in the District together with a 5 year land supply position was the subject of considerable debate at the Sleep Lane, Whitchurch appeal in October 2012. Of particular relevance are the following conclusions of the appeal inspector:-

“There are a series of other considerations that require analysis. The first is that as that, as it readily accepts, the Council is nowhere near being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Moreover, there is an acknowledgement that there has been a record of persistent under- delivery of housing. All this is laid bare in the preliminary conclusions of the inspector dealing with the draft Core Strategy Examination, which have led to the suspension of proceedings. It is evident that the failure in terms of the delivery of affordable housing is especially acute with 565 units having been supplied between 2001 and the latest Annual Monitoring Report, against a requirement of 5,047 units between 2002 and 2009.

The inspector went on to conclude in Paragraph 24 that: -

“... it is very clear that the draft CS will have been subject to radical changes. In particular, there may be a need to identify land for up to 16,000 houses. According to the Council, this will require a number of major urban extensions and Whitchurch is a likely option that, it is suggested, could be prejudiced if planning permission was given for housing on the appeal site.”

At the Whitchurch appeal the Council led with evidence that the housing provision would be increased to some 16,000 new dwellings. This however is clearly not what has resulted in the now published Core Strategy with a suggested new housing provision of 12,700 new dwellings between 2011 and 2029. It is considered that the Council’s methodology is still significantly flawed. They have not adequately addressed the failings identified by the Core Strategy inspector. In view of the above, the Core Strategy is not sound in that it is not backed up by evidence rather the actual evidence indicates that a substantially higher housing provision should be adopted in excess of 16,000 new dwellings in the period 2011-2029. It is considered that the actual housing provision is in the region of 21,500 new dwellings.

Turning to the delivery of housing, objections are lodged to the lack of identified housing sites in the Local Plan. It appears that the identification of potential sites for housing and employment is being left to either the Site Allocations DPD or the production of Neighbourhood Plans. It is considered that the lack of site identification is contrary to guidance in NPPF which seeks to boost the supply of housing and provide certainty to developers and landowner on the release of land for housing. This is especially important in this District where the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing has been evident for a number of years and recognised at appeals in Farmborough and Whitchurch where both inspectors recognised the chronic shortfall in the Council’s 5 year supply of housing. The preparation of Site Allocations DPD or Neighbourhood Plan will take some time to complete which consequently will produce a ‘lag’ in the delivery of housing sites. Indeed there is no certainty that Neighbourhood Plans will be produced in a realistic timescale. It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan be amended to specifically identify a number of strategic sites for both housing and employment. The objectors control land at Clutton the site is immediately available and suitable for development.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Furthermore there are no technical or environmental constraints which would prohibit their release. Accordingly, this land should be identified within the Local Plan.

It is therefore recommended that the Local Plan specifically identify a number of strategic housing and employment sites which includes amongst others land at Clutton.

Finally we object to the suggested monitoring timetable level the Core Strategy will be reviewed around five yearly intervals. We consider that this timetable is too long in that given the consistent poor delivery performance of housing in the area. Accordingly we consider that a more realistic period would be say 2 years.

It is therefore recommended that: -

a)Additional growth in rural areas can help sustain existing services and facilities;

b)Clarify certain terminology such as good access to public transport.

C)The level of housing provision is too low and should be increased to at least 23,500 new dwellings and take account of the actual need for development and the poor historic performance.

D)That the monitoring period be amended to say 2 years;

e)That additional sites be identified for housing in the rural areas e.g. land at Clutton.

Change to the policy requested:

Respondent Number: 269 **Comment Number:** 14 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Barratt Homes Bristol
Agent ID: 162 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group
Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC203 **Plan Reference:** Para 7.05
Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

- 1.83 Paragraph 7.05 states that the Core Strategy is anticipated to be reviewed 'about every 5 years after adoption'.
- 1.84 This is a direct contradiction to proposed change SPC22 which states that an early review of the Core Strategy will take place in 2016, to co- ordinate with the other West of England authorities.
- 1.85 An early review, by 2016 is essential. Bristol's Core Strategy must be reviewed by 2016 and it is vital that the four West of England authorities work together to properly address housing needs within the West of England HMA.
- 1.86 Paragraph 7.05 goes on to state that the review process will commence around 2 to 3 years in advance of the review date. In order to undertake a review by 2016 the process would therefore need to start now. Given the West of England SHMA which will produce first results by 2014 and will feed into Bristol's review of its Core Strategy by 2016, it therefore clearly advisable that the BANES Core Strategy is taken forward as a full Local Plan prepared in conjunction with the other West of England authorities utilising the results of the planned joint SHMA.
- 1.87 The monitoring Framework set out by Chapter 7 and Table 9 of the Core Strategy places a large reliance upon the five year housing land supply and economic growth rates to determine if the targets set out by the Core Strategy are being achieved an remain appropriate. A wider assessment of housing need is required to truly establish such, particularly given that the SHMA model used to inform the growth targets assumes that recession based trends continue.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

1.88 The monitoring framework must as a minimum make reference to the outputs of the joint West of England SHMA which is scheduled to provide results by 2014. If the results of the joint SHMA show a higher housing need than currently planned for then the Strategy must be reviewed.

Change to the policy requested:

The BANES Core Strategy housing target must be reviewed by 2016, in line with Bristol's commitment to review its housing target in 2016 and therefore take account of the results of the joint West of England SHMA. The monitoring framework must acknowledge that results of a West of England joint SHMA will be available in 2014 and must be fed into the BANES Core Strategy target.

Respondent Number: 270 **Comment Number:** 2 **Respondent Name:** **Respondent Organisation:** Blue Cedar Homes

Agent ID: 36 **Agent Name:** D2 Planning Limited

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC203 **Plan Reference:** Para 7.05

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:Support:

Finally we object to the suggested monitoring timetable level the Core Strategy will be reviewed around five yearly intervals. We consider that this timetable is too long in that given the consistent poor delivery performance of housing in the area. Accordingly we consider that a more realistic period would be say 2 years.

It is therefore recommended that: -

- a) Additional growth in rural areas can help sustain existing services and facilities;
- b) Clarify certain terminology such as good access to public transport.
- C) The level of housing provision is too low and should be increased to at least 23,500 new dwellings and take account of the actual need for development and the poor historic performance.
- D) Within the overall housing provision there should be a specific quantum or target to meet the growing and identified needs of the elderly. The policy should also include a specific housing requirement to be provided where a local need exists and not primarily focused within those villages identified as the main focus for housing development.
- E) That the monitoring period be amended to say 2 years;
- f) That additional sites be identified for housing in the rural areas e.g. land at Church Lane East Harptree.

Change to the policy requested:

Delivery Paragraphs 7.05a-7.05b

We have already lodged objections in relation to the proposed monitoring requirement in relation to Policy DW1. The suggested review period of 5 years is too long before a review is undertaken. A more realistic period would be 2 years given the consistent delivery problems within this District.

Recommendation

Amend monitoring period from 5 years to 2 years.

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.

Respondent Number: 184 **Comment Number:** 5 **Respondent Name:** Mr Paul Davis **Respondent Organisation:** Persimmon Special Projects

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC203 **Plan Reference:** Para 7.05

Development Location: Comment on new development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Whilst we are supportive of requirements to regularly review Plans, this is on the basis that the Plan is fit for purpose. There are still a number of deficiencies in this Plan and we consider a comprehensive Local Plan backed up by an evidence base which includes a SHMA with a proper objective assessment of housing needs and a comprehensive Green Belt Review is required.

Change to the policy requested:

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 180 **Comment Number:** 25 **Respondent Name:** Mike Kerton **Respondent Organisation:** J S Bloor Ltd

Agent ID: 19 **Agent Name:** Pegasus Planning Group

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC203 **Plan Reference:** Para 7.05

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

The Proposed Changes to the Plan are unsound. The changes to para 7.05 refer to the review of the Core Strategy, but it is not clear what will be reviewed and when. This was one of the issues raised at the last Hearing Sessions - the Core Strategy should be more explicit about what would be reviewed/when and what might trigger a contingency or review of the Core Strategy. It is not clear how paras 178 – 181 of the NPPF which refer to the duty to co-operate will be implemented and effective in the review of the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Changes need to be made to para 7.05 which explicit sets out the mechanisms for review and in particular how the strategic issues will be addressed which cross the district boundary eg reference to the West of England SHMA Project Brief consultation.

Respondent Number: 248 **Comment Number:** 10 **Respondent Name:** Jonathon Callcutt **Respondent Organisation:** Crest Strategic Projects and Key Properties Ltd

Agent ID: 30 **Agent Name:** RPS Planning & Development

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC203 **Plan Reference:** Para 7.05

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

1) For the reasons set out in the objections to Policy DW1, it is wholly unacceptable for there to be no context for a review until after five years from adoption.

Change to the policy requested:

The CS is unsound for a host of reasons. If it were to be found sound then it can only be done so on the basis for an immediate review as part of the wider West of England SHMA process.

Schedule of Comments on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted Core Strategy: Sorted by Change Reference.**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

The adverse impact on listed buildings cause by double glazing has been part of the assessment of listed building applications for many years, ever since the now superseded PPG15 was issued in 1994 and advised against it, and this position has been consistently upheld by Planning Inspectors considering appeals. Double Glazing should not therefore be promoted for listed buildings in the Core Strategy.

Change to the policy requested:

Number of Listed Building Consents issued annually for installation of insulation, secondary glazing, solar photovoltaic cells, new boilers, wood burners and heat pumps

Change Ref. SPC207**Plan Ref.:** Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 265 **Comment Number:** 32 **Respondent Name:** Mr Patrick Hutton**Respondent Organisation:** Bath Heritage Watchdog**Agent ID:** **Agent Name:****Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC207**Plan Reference:** Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Government policy is never static, and the Core Strategy should retain some flexibility in targets, particularly when immigration controls are being reviewed and the demand for new housing might reduce as a consequence.

Change to the policy requested:

Deliver 12,700 homes by 2029, or any lower target should Government policy change.

Change Ref. SPC208**Plan Ref.:** Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Respondent Number:** 4712 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:****Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd**Agent ID:** 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants**Further Information available in the original comment?** **Attachments sent with the comment?** **Change Reference:** SPC208**Plan Reference:** Table 9 Monitoring of Strategic Objectives**Development Location:** No comment on Development Locations**Comment made on the Proposed Change:**Support:

Without prejudice to assessment of SPC23 Support in principle Change reference SPC208 (Page No. 137 of the Draft Core Strategy) to amend 'Target for Strategic Objective 5 (policy B1) as follows:

'Rural Areas – Deliver 1,000 homes between 2011 and 2029' – Amends RC57.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC209**Plan Ref.:** Table 9

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Respondent Number: 4712 **Comment Number:** 9 **Respondent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants **Respondent Organisation:** Environ Country Homes Ltd

Agent ID: 169 **Agent Name:** Alder King Planning Consultants

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC209 **Plan Reference:** Table 9

Development Location: No comment on Development Locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

Support Change reference SPC209 (Page No. 136 of the Draft Core Strategy) to amend 'the target column for the respective indicator for strategic objective 5 and Policy DW1 to read...Around 80% of new housing provided between 2011 and 2029 should be on previously developed land' – Updates FPC28.

Change to the policy requested:

N/A

Change Ref. SPC212 **Plan Ref.:** Appendix 1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 246 **Comment Number:** 7 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE **Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC212 **Plan Reference:** Appendix 1

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

To correct typographical errors.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 212 – for HG.1 read ET.1

Change Ref. SPC213 **Plan Ref.:** Appendix 1 and 2

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 246 **Comment Number:** 8 **Respondent Name:** Mr Peter Duppa-Miller OBE **Respondent Organisation:** Combe Hay Parish Council

Agent ID: **Agent Name:**

Further Information available in the original comment? **Attachments sent with the comment?**

Change Reference: SPC213 **Plan Reference:** Appendix 1 and 2

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change: **Support:**

To correct typographical errors.

Change to the policy requested:

SPC 213 – for HG.1 read ES.1

Change Ref. SPC220

Plan Ref.: Glossary

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 228
Comment Number: 5
Respondent Name: Mr Nigel Websper

Respondent Organisation: Pulteney Estate Residents' Association

Agent ID: Agent Name:

Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment?

Change Reference: SPC220

Plan Reference: Glossary

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

(b) SPC57, SPC220, and SPC221 – Flooding Sequential Test

The site of the Recreation Ground, the Leisure Centre, and Bath Rugby, is part of the River Valley Flood Plain and should be subject to the “sequential’ test for development (Policy CP5). BANES has not submitted any adequate justification for development at this location.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES should provide evidence of the sequential test carried for the Recreation Ground. Unless a thorough sequential test has been carried out any proposal for development at the Recreation ground is considered UNSOUND.

Change Ref. SPC221

Plan Ref.: Glossary

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Respondent Number: 228
Comment Number: 6
Respondent Name: Mr Nigel Websper

Respondent Organisation: Pulteney Estate Residents' Association

Agent ID: Agent Name:

Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment?

Change Reference: SPC221

Plan Reference: Glossary

Development Location: Comment on general development locations

Comment made on the Proposed Change:

Support:

(b) SPC57, SPC220, and SPC221 – Flooding Sequential Test

The site of the Recreation Ground, the Leisure Centre, and Bath Rugby, is part of the River Valley Flood Plain and should be subject to the “sequential’ test for development (Policy CP5). BANES has not submitted any adequate justification for development at this location.

Change to the policy requested:

BANES should provide evidence of the sequential test carried for the Recreation Ground. Unless a thorough sequential test has been carried out any proposal for development at the Recreation ground is considered UNSOUND.