

-----Original Message-----

From: Janice Nicholls-O'Hara [REDACTED]

Sent: 09 December 2017 14:38

To: Local Plan

Subject: Plan to build additional houses in the Whitchurch area

To whom it may concern,

I fully understand the need for additional houses in the uk However it is important to use common sense to ensure that those who currently live in the area and new residents are able to access services, roads, schools, hospitals and shops within the plan.

Currently the Wells Rd., originally designed to transport light vehicles, is already bumper to bumper with heavy duty vehicles and cars trying to get in and out of the city of Bristol. Apart from the frustration for commuters there is also high levels of pollution. This surely will increase!

There also appears to be no plan to increase access to Keynsham or the Bath Rd. (currently accessible down country lanes)!

Have these matters been considered?

Yours sincerely Jan O'Hara

From: mark.osullivan

Sent: 10 January 2018 20:06

To: Planning Policy

Subject: Consultation on Issues and Options for the Local Plan: response by M O'Sullivan

Dear Sirs

1 I believe that the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document as it stands is unsatisfactory on the following grounds:

- The calculated housing requirements are faulty in the following respects: they take insufficient account of the potential for commuting from Wales (especially following the planned abolition of tolls on the Severn Bridge in December 2018) and from Wiltshire; they fail to question the use of DWP data as a proxy for housing affordability, and take insufficient account of the distinction between affordable housing and social housing; they take insufficient account of the congestion and air pollution impact of existing and already proposed housing development; they take insufficient account of housing mix, and in particular of the difficulty which local planning authorities evidently experience in their development control function in insisting on housing meeting the growing requirement for small rather than larger households; they take insufficient account of the need to provide in significant new developments for local infrastructure, especially social infrastructure. I think that the overall figures could be reduced, especially given the dominance of protected landscapes in B&NES, but if driven to choose between the three housing options on pages 11 and 12 of the document I would opt for Options 1 or 2, provided that additional development in the city of Bath itself was not approved.
- The economy-focused policies are faulty in underplaying the vital economic and employment importance to the West of England of tourism (both domestic and from overseas), and in particular the very significant impact on local tourism of the conservation and enhancement of the natural and cultural heritage, not only in protected areas such as the World Heritage Site, the AONBs, the Conservation Areas, listed buildings and monuments, and the settings of these, but more widely in areas of note, especially at skylines, and in the open countryside.

2 I support:

- The “critical issue” *High quality natural, built & historic environment requiring protection and enhancement*. In this context I suggest that the Plan should by reference incorporate into the Development Plan the relevant Landscape Strategies and Guidelines developed and approved for the Cotswolds AONB by the Cotswolds Conservation Board, and the Management Plan developed and approved for the Mendip Hills AONB by the Mendip Hills AONB Partnership and its five local authorities.
- The “critical issue” *Threat to environment & need for and maintenance of additional green infrastructure arising from development & other pressures* (page 6). I note that much new development within the city of Bath in recent years has paid insufficient attention to green infrastructure (for example, the extensive area of barren paving at the corner of Lyncombe Hill and Claverton Street, which is very suitable for laying out largely as greensward or shrubs). I would argue that there are strong arguments for green

infrastructure to be prompted and supported at community level if it is be put to fullest use for maximum benefit, and in this context we note that, when the Core Strategy was under consideration, *Greenway!* submitted a fully reasoned and documented proposal for an NPPF Local Green Space in the area between Greenway Lane and Devonshire Buildings, which was summarily rejected by the Council on the arbitrary grounds that the land was in educational use; I ask that this proposal now be reconsidered and approved as part of the current Local Plan process.

- The “critical issues” listed under Transport and Infrastructure. To this end I urge a strong focus on reducing the impact of non-electric vehicles in Bath, especially in terms of congestion and air pollution. A strong transport policy for the city commanding wide support is essential, including an Eastern Park and Ride (possibly in Wiltshire). Opportunities to relieve traffic between Bath and M4 J18 should be reconsidered, perhaps including a new Junction 18A under the Cotswold escarpment, and a new park & ride or park & share service at the disused South Gloucestershire car park at J18.

Best wishes

Mark O'Sullivan