

now under development.

As the site lies adjacent to discoveries of prehistoric settlement the results of an archaeological field evaluation will be expected to be provided as part of any planning application. This will allow options for minimising or avoiding damage to the remains to be considered and reflects national advice in PPG16 'Archaeology and Planning'. Policy NE.12 seeks to protect natural features such as trees, hedgerows, stone walls and watercourses from the adverse effects of development. Should the proposal potentially cause harm to such natural features, mitigation and compensatory measures would be determined as part of any planning application.

Any planning application will need to comply with Policy ES.5 which will ensure that adequate provision is made for sustainable foul and surface water sewerage infrastructure and that foul or surface water problems on or off site are resolved. Other issues such as design, layout, impact on the surroundings, dwelling type and noise mitigation will also be addressed in detail at the planning application stage. However, the buffer between the site and the bypass will be retained as will the existing grass verges south of Wellow Lane.

The objection raises no new issues warranting a

Chapter C1. Green Belt

Modification: M/C1/2 - Green Belt

Ref:	3948/J5	(1) Green Belt land is provided with statutory protection and the legislation provides strict controls on when development is permitted on Green Belt land. The inspector's report specifically states that "Land should only be removed from the Green Belt where there are exceptional circumstance to justify its release". This is done at the planning stage and not as a matter of policy before the University Masterplan is prepared and has been subjected to public scrutiny. The Inspector's report should have objected to this statement of policy of removing Green Belt land without a cast-iron guarantee of using it only for a purpose that is clearly an exceptional circumstance, since neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore the current legislation; nor do Government education targets repeal extant legislation (regardless of how inconvenient that might be), or provide exceptional circumstances ahead of any Masterplan. The inspector's acceptance of building on open land outside the current green belt boundary to avoid building on land currently inside the green belt boundary is both perverse and open to ridicule.	Disagree. The issue of redefining the Green Belt boundary at the University of Bath to allow expansion to accommodate the University's estimated spatial requirements was discussed fully at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector's overall conclusion was that circumstances are sufficiently exceptional to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt (north of The Avenue and west of Norwood Avenue). A full and detailed assessment of the appropriate development capacity of the campus, including the land to be excluded from the Green Belt, will be undertaken a part of a Masterplan which will developed within the scope of Policy GDS.1/B11.	No change.
Location	University of Bath Bath			

It should also be noted that the inspector's opinion of the worthiness of land currently in the Green Belt is irrelevant: if it is Green Belt, then the law protects it. I also note that the University has made no specific commitment to build according to its aspirations, so there are currently no exceptional circumstances. A statement of intent along the lines of "If it proves necessary to consider using Green Belt land to meet the building targets in the Masterplan when approved, then this will be done only after all other options not involving Green Belt land have been taken up", might be acceptable, but the proposed wording in the Local Plan is unlawful. Once land is removed from the Green Belt it is impossible to reserve it for the purpose intended, so Green Belt boundaries should never be moved ahead of a specific planning application.. See my comment on M/C1/9 (Para C1.10G) where I offer some acceptable elbow room.
(2) Change "are proposed" to "could be considered if exceptional circumstances can be shown".

Modification: M/C1/8 - Green Belt

Ref: 3948/J6

Location University of
Bath
Bath

(I) Green Belt land is provided with statutory protection and the legislation provides strict controls on when development is permitted on Green Belt land. The inspector's report specifically states that "Land should only be removed from the Green Belt where there are exceptional circumstance to justify its release". This is done at the planning stage and not as a matter of policy before the University Masterplan is prepared and has been subjected to public scrutiny. The Inspector's report should have objected to this statement of policy of removing Green Belt land without a cast-iron guarantee of using it only for a purpose that is clearly an exceptional circumstance, since neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore the current legislation; nor do Government education targets repeal extant legislation (regardless of how inconvenient that might be), or provide exceptional circumstances ahead of any Masterplan. The inspector's acceptance of building on open land outside the current green belt boundary to avoid building on land currently inside the green belt boundary is both perverse and open to ridicule. It should also be noted that the inspector's opinion of the worthiness of land currently in the Green Belt is irrelevant: if it is Green Belt, then the law protects it. I also note that the University has made no specific commitment to build according to its aspirations, so there are currently no exceptional circumstances. A statement of intent along the lines of "If it proves necessary to consider using Green Belt land to meet the building targets in the Masterplan when approved, then this will be done only after all other options not involving Green Belt land have been taken up", might be acceptable, but the proposed wording in the Local Plan is unlawful. Once land is removed from the Green Belt it is impossible to reserve it for the purpose intended, so Green Belt boundaries should never be moved ahead of a specific planning application..
(2) Delete the entire paragraph.

Disagree. The issue of redefining the Green Belt boundary at the University of Bath to allow expansion to accommodate the University's estimated spatial requirements was discussed fully at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector's overall conclusion was that circumstances are sufficiently exceptional to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt (north of The Avenue and west of Norwood Avenue). A full and detailed assessment of the appropriate development capacity of the campus, including the land to be excluded from the Green Belt, will be undertaken a part of a Masterplan which will developed within the scope of Policy GDS.1/B11.

No change.

Modification: M/C1/9 - Green Belt

Ref: 3948/J7	<p>(1) Green Belt land is provided with statutory protection and the legislation provides strict controls on when development is permitted on Green Belt land. The inspector's report specifically states that "Land should only be removed from the Green Belt where there are exceptional circumstance to justify its release". This is done at the planning stage and not as a matter of policy before the University Masterplan is prepared and has been subjected to public scrutiny. The Inspector's report should have objected to this statement of policy of removing Green Belt land without a cast-iron guarantee of using it only for a purpose that is clearly an exceptional circumstance, since neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore the current legislation; nor do Government education targets repeal extant legislation (regardless of how inconvenient that might be), or provide exceptional circumstances ahead of any Masterplan. The inspector's acceptance of building on open land outside the current green belt boundary to avoid building on land currently inside the green belt boundary is both perverse and open to ridicule. It should also be noted that the inspector's opinion of the worthiness of land currently in the Green Belt is irrelevant: if it is Green Belt, then the law protects it. I also note that the University has made no specific commitment to build according to its aspirations, so there are currently no exceptional circumstances. A statement of intent along the lines of "If it proves necessary to consider using Green Belt land to meet the building targets in the Masterplan when approved, then this will be done only after all other options not involving Green Belt land have been taken up", might be acceptable, but the proposed wording in the Local Plan is unlawful. Once land is removed from the Green Belt it is impossible to reserve it for the purpose intended, so Green Belt boundaries should never be moved ahead of a specific planning application..</p> <p>(2) Start the paragraph with "The council considers that when the University's masterplan has been discussed and approved, it might contain sufficient exceptional circumstances , as defined in Green Belt legislation, to justify changing the green belt boundary to accommodate them".</p>	Disagree. The issue of redefining the Green Belt boundary at the University of Bath to allow expansion to accommodate the University's estimated spatial requirements was discussed fully at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector's overall conclusion was that circumstances are sufficiently exceptional to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt (north of The Avenue and west of Norwood Avenue). A full and detailed assessment of the appropriate development capacity of the campus, including the land to be excluded from the Green Belt, will be undertaken a part of a Masterplan which will developed within the scope of Policy GDS.1/B11.	No change.
---------------------	---	--	------------

Modification: M/C1/11 - Green Belt

Ref: 3948/J31	<p>(I) Green Belt land is provided with statutory protection and the legislation provides strict controls on when development is permitted on Green Belt land. The inspector's report specifically states that "Land should only be removed from the Green Belt where there are exceptional circumstance to justify its release". This is done at the planning stage and not as a matter of policy before the University Masterplan is prepared and has been subjected to public scrutiny. The Inspector's report should have objected to this statement of policy of removing Green Belt land without a cast-iron guarantee of using it only for a purpose that is clearly an exceptional circumstance, since neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore the current legislation; nor do Government education targets repeal extant legislation (regardless of how inconvenient that might be), or provide exceptional circumstances ahead of any Masterplan. The inspector's acceptance of building on open land outside the current green belt boundary to avoid building on land currently inside the green belt boundary is both perverse and open to ridicule. It should also be noted that the inspector's opinion of the worthiness of land currently in the Green Belt is irrelevant: if it is Green Belt, then the law protects it. I also note that the University has made no specific commitment to build according to its aspirations, so there are currently no exceptional circumstances. A statement of intent along the lines of "If it proves necessary to consider using Green Belt land</p>	Disagree. The issue of redefining the Green Belt boundary at the University of Bath to allow expansion to accommodate the University's estimated spatial requirements was discussed fully at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector's overall conclusion was that circumstances are sufficiently exceptional to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt (north of The Avenue and west of Norwood Avenue). A full and detailed assessment of the appropriate development capacity of the campus, including the land to be excluded from the Green Belt, will be undertaken a part of a Masterplan which will developed within the scope of Policy GDS.1/B11.	No change.
----------------------	---	--	------------

to meet the building targets in the Masterplan when approved, then this will be done only after all other options not involving Green Belt land have been taken up”, might be acceptable, but the proposed wording in the Local Plan is unlawful. Once land is removed from the Green Belt it is impossible to reserve it for the purpose intended, so Green Belt boundaries should never be moved ahead of a specific planning application.. See my comment on M/C1/9 (Para C1.10G) where I offer some acceptable elbow room.
(2) Delete the entire paragraph.

Modification: M/C1/12 - Green Belt

Ref:	3948/J12	(I) Green Belt land is provided with statutory protection and the legislation provides strict controls on when development is permitted on Green Belt land. The inspector's report specifically states that "Land should only be removed from the Green Belt where there are exceptional circumstance to justify its release". This is done at the planning stage and not as a matter of policy before the University Masterplan is prepared and has been subjected to public scrutiny. The Inspector's report should have objected to this statement of policy of removing Green Belt land without a cast-iron guarantee of using it only for a purpose that is clearly an exceptional circumstance, since neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore the current legislation; nor do Government education targets repeal extant legislation (regardless of how inconvenient that might be), or provide exceptional circumstances ahead of any Masterplan. The inspector's acceptance of building on open land outside the current green belt boundary to avoid building on land currently inside the green belt boundary is both perverse and open to ridicule. It should also be noted that the inspector's opinion of the worthiness of land currently in the Green Belt is irrelevant: if it is Green Belt, then the law protects it. I also note that the University has made no specific commitment to build according to its aspirations, so there are currently no exceptional circumstances. A statement of intent along the lines of "If it proves necessary to consider using Green Belt land to meet the building targets in the Masterplan when approved, then this will be done only after all other options not involving Green Belt land have been taken up", might be acceptable, but the proposed wording in the Local Plan is unlawful. Once land is removed from the Green Belt it is impossible to reserve it for the purpose intended, so Green Belt boundaries should never be moved ahead of a specific planning application. See my comment on M/C1/9 (Para C1.10G) 2. Delete the entire paragraph.	Disagree. The issue of redefining the Green Belt boundary at the University of Bath to allow expansion to accommodate the University's estimated spatial requirements was discussed fully at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Inspector's overall conclusion was that circumstances are sufficiently exceptional to justify the removal of land from the Green Belt (north of The Avenue and west of Norwood Avenue). A full and detailed assessment of the appropriate development capacity of the campus, including the land to be excluded from the Green Belt, will be undertaken a part of a Masterplan which will developed within the scope of Policy GDS.1/B11.	No change.
Location	University of Bath Bath			

Modification: M/C1/13 - Green Belt

Ref:	3441/J31	(1) In her Report on the emerging Local Plan, the Inspector is clear that there remain areas of the present built campus with unexploited development potential. The Council's supporting Statement of Decisions accepts that these, together with the land recommended to be released from Green Belt restrictions, can accommodate the University's development requirement (upon which its case for the release of Green Belt land was centred), but immediately casts doubt upon its judgement by supporting an assessment of 'whether the full quantum of the required development can be acceptably accommodated'. This is inconsistent, and undermines the rationale for the release of Green Belt land. (2) Delete the words 'whether and' from Modification M/C1/13.	It is not considered that inclusion of the words 'whether and' undermines the case for removal of land from the Green Belt. The 'exceptional circumstances' justifying the Green Belt boundary change which were agreed by the Inspector remain i.e. meeting national government priorities for higher education, estimated spatial requirement of the University's expansion and the lack of alternative options for accommodating this expansion requirement. The objective should still be	No change.
Location	University of Bath			

to meet as much of the estimated spatial requirement as is possible 'on-campus' including the land removed from the Green Belt. However, this should be achieved in a way that is acceptable and appropriate and similar issues.

The Inspector does indeed conclude that the development potential within the existing built-up part of the campus needs to be re-assessed in terms of density, massing, scale but still concluded that additional land is needed to be removed from the Green Belt. She considered that areas at the eastern end of the main spine had unexploited potential and that re-assessment may yield further development potential at the western end of the campus. The Inspector also acknowledged that there is uncertainty as to how much additional potential would be identified through this re-assessment. Without knowing the results of this re-assessment or the detailed assessment of the capacity of land to be excluded from the Green Belt the Council can not be certain that the quantum of development that represents the University's estimated spatial requirement can be acceptably accommodated. Therefore, in order to ensure that development does not take place that would have an unacceptable impact e.g. on the skyline. the qualification set out in para C1.10K is necessary.

In suggesting that the University's requirement for development up to 2011 can be accommodated on the two campus areas identified by the Inspector as requiring re-assessment the objector is prejudging the conclusions of this re-assessment. In addition national policy requires that the Green Belt should endure over the long term (i.e. beyond 2011) and therefore, in defining the amended boundary in the Local Plan the longer term development requirements of the University are rightly considered.

Ref:	564/J50 /s	We support the inclusion of a new paragraph C1.10 K insisting on the preparation of a Master Plan for the whole campus, and look forward to this happening.	Support noted.	No change.
Location	University of Bath Bath			

Ref: 3343/J92	(1) I object to the inclusion of the words "whether and" in the final sentence of the proposed additional paragraph.	In response to this objection it is not considered that inclusion of the words 'whether and'	No change.
Location University of Bath Bath	<p>They introduce an unacceptable element of doubt as to whether it will be possible to accommodate the development that is claimed to be required and which underpinned the University's whole case for the loss of 40 acres (originally 55 acres) of Green Belt in the first place.</p> <p>In her report (para.9.24) the Inspector concluded that the shortfall in floorspace that the university claimed at the public inquiry could not be accommodated on non-Green Belt land amounted to 46,250 sq m, including residential accommodation for a further 1,750 students on-campus. However, she accepted (para.9.20) that 'only 60-70 per cent will be completed during the plan period to 2011'.</p> <p>So, 160,000 sq m (40 acres) of precious Green Belt will have been lost forever to accommodate a maximum of 32,000 sq m of floorspace (e.g. a typical three-storey building with a footprint of around 11,000 sq m).</p> <p>Further, the Inspector agreed with objectors (paras 9.25 and 9.26) that two sizeable areas of the existing campus 'could yield further development potential' and are 'worthy of more ambitious and comprehensive consideration, perhaps including some rearrangement of land uses'. Here, she refers to little-used areas of the campus around the large east and west car parks. Either of these areas could easily accommodate well over 32,000 sq m of floorspace with no impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Inclusion of the words "whether and" constitutes an unacceptable let-out clause and the removal of any commitment on the part of the university, having now secured the loss of a large area of the Green Belt, to build anything like the number of student residences it claimed it needed at the inquiry and which it argued would ease Bath's student housing problem.</p> <p>(2) Delete "whether and" from the proposed additional paragraph.</p> <p>(1) Proposed Modification M/C1/1 3 claims "To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.7".</p> <p>Recommendation R9.7 does not propose the inclusion of the additional paragraph C1 .10K and so Modification MICIII3 can only represent a partial acceptance of the Inspector's recommendation.</p> <p>(2) Include Recommendation R9.7 in the "List of recommendations from the Inspector's Report on the Local Plan that B&NES Council do not intend to accept or intend to only partially accept" and amend the "Council's Reasons for the Modification" against Modification M/CII1 3 accordingly.</p>	<p>undermines the case for removal of land from the Green Belt. The 'exceptional circumstances' justifying the Green Belt boundary change which were agreed by the Inspector remain i.e. meeting national government priorities for higher education, estimated spatial requirement of the University's expansion and the lack of alternative options for accommodating this expansion requirement. The objective should still be to meet as much of the estimated spatial requirement as is possible 'on-campus' including the land removed from the Green Belt. However, this should be achieved in a way that is acceptable and appropriate and similar issues.</p> <p>The Inspector does indeed conclude that the development potential within the existing built-up part of the campus needs to be re-assessed in terms of density, massing, scale but still concluded that additional land is needed to be removed from the Green Belt. She considered that areas at the eastern end of the main spine had unexploited potential and that re-assessment may yield further development potential at the western end of the campus. The Inspector also acknowledged that there is uncertainty as to how much additional potential would be identified through this re-assessment. Without knowing the results of this re-assessment or the detailed assessment of the capacity of land to be excluded from the Green Belt the Council can not be certain that the quantum of development that represents the University's estimated spatial requirement can be acceptably accommodated. Therefore, in order to ensure that development does not take place that would have an unacceptable impact e.g. on the skyline. the qualification set out in para C1.10K is necessary.</p>	
		<p>In suggesting that the University's requirement for development up to 2011 can be accommodated on the two campus areas identified by the Inspector as requiring re-assessment the objector is prejudging the conclusions of this re-assessment. In addition national policy requires that the Green Belt should endure over the long term (i.e. beyond 2011) and therefore, in defining the amended boundary in the Local Plan the longer term development requirements of the University are rightly considered.</p>	

Modification: M/C1/14 - Green Belt**Ref:** 3948/J4**Location** SW Keynsham
Keynsham

(1) Green Belt land is provided with statutory protection and the legislation provides strict controls on when development is permitted on Green Belt land. This is done at the planning application stage and not as a matter of policy before the application is prepared. The Inspector's report should have objected to this statement of policy of building on Green Belt land, since neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore the current legislation; nor do Government housing targets repeal extant legislation, however inconvenient this might be to the inspector. A statement of intent along the lines of "If it proves necessary to consider using Green Belt land at Keynsham to meet the building targets in the JRSP, then this will be done only after all other options not involving Green Belt land have been taken up", might be acceptable, but the proposed wording in the Local Plan is unlawful so far ahead of any specific requirement to build that demonstrates exceptional circumstance to justify its release.

(2) The words deleted by the inspector's recommendation should be reinstated.

The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.

No change.

The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development

requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.

Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.

The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Modification: M/C1/16 - Green Belt

Ref: 2601/J50	<p>The Local Plan Inquiry the Council proposed that the employment site at Lays Farm be excluded from the Green Belt (albeit that it was not proposed to be incorporated within the housing development boundary) this alteration to the Green Belt boundary was justified on the basis that this established and well developed site now no longer served an important green belt function we would concur with this and support the removal of the site from the green belt.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Inspector makes it clear that an established Green Belt boundary should be only modified in exceptional circumstances and although the JRSP allows for an alteration of the Green Belt boundary at Keynsham to meet the housing requirements, in her opinion, did not mean the release of other land from the Green Belt. She concluded there were no very special circumstances to support a change in the Green Belt boundary to exclude Lays Farm.</p>	No change.
Location (None) Keynsham	<p>However, following the Inspectors Report and the Inspector's recommendation to the council the council now propose to retain the Green Belt boundary as currently set therefore leaving the Lays Farm employment site within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open PPG2 sets out five purposes of including land within Green</p>		

Belts to check unrestricted sprawl of built up areas prevent coalescence safeguard the countryside from encroachment preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and to assist in urban regeneration.

The Lays Farm employment site does not serve any of these functions. Given the circumstances of the site and having regard to guidance in PPG2, we are of the opinion that the site no longer serves a valuable Green Belt purpose and as such the site given its location adjacent to the existing urban area should be removed from the Green Belt.

Modification: M/C1/17 - Re-instate Green Belt boundary at Newbridge

Ref:	3948/J18 /s	I fully support this recommendation. There never was a specific need to change the Green Belt boundary, and as the inspector points out: "Land should only be removed from the Green Belt where there are exceptional circumstance to justify its release."	Support noted.	No change.
Location	(None)			
Ref:	3901/J3 /s	CPRE is keen to avoid proliferation and expansion of Park and Ride schemes where these have an adverse effect on our countryside. However it is recognised that the removal of para C1.10A (which referred to a proposed alteration to the Green Belt boundary at Newbridge) and GDS.1/B1A are to be welcomed. Concern is however expressed at the proposed expansion of the existing park and ride facility at Newbridge, the proposals for which will be reviewed when available. The reasoning behind Park and Ride expansion has been overtaken by developments in national transport policy towards demand management including road user charging which will necessitate the review of the local authority's Park and Ride policy.	Support noted.	No change.
Location	Newbridge (land at) Bath			

Modification: M/C1/20 - Modify Green Belt boundary at SW Keynsham to exclude site K2

Ref:	686/J210	Policies HGS.6.7.8.9.10 and 14 have all been deleted or substantially amended.□ The view of the Trust, and CPRE, is that development in the Green Belt should be avoided. We have seen the rationale put forward in the modifications for sighting the additional housing in Keynsham rather than elsewhere in the authority's area. However, we would question whether Keynsham does indeed have the infrastructure to cope with 700 houses more anywhere; the A4 and A37 are beyond capacity, the train service to Bath and Bristol is less than ideal. There is no employment potential for 700 households, and thus there will be an increase in people travelling into Bath and Bristol. There appears to be a risk that Keynsham and its environs will be turned into a convenient dumping ground for extra housing and, as there is insufficient space within Keynsham, they will just have to keep moving into the Green Belt, which we oppose. The Parish Councils have, to our knowledge, been given not opportunity to express their views at meetings. We are keen to be involved in discussions on the siting of further housing in the B&NES area and in particular the challenges around sustainable development to balance the employment, transport, housing and countryside in the area. Above all, the Parish Councils should be given a bigger part in the planning process, they are democratically elected. ("This is not nimbyism it is democracy", Simon Jenkins).	The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.	No change.
Location	SW Keynsham Keynsham			
			The Inspector has assessed the various sites being	

put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 1568/J24</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	<p>The Trust objects to this reinstatement of the exclusion of two pieces of allocated land, adjoining the Trust's Abbots Wood, from the Green Belt. Development on these sites will adversely affect the Trust's adjoining 8 hectare woodland creation site, which was designed and planted with funding and support from both the Millennium Commission and the local community. In addition the site lies within the Forest of Avon community forest, designated specifically to increase the level of woodland cover in the area.</p> <p>Reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At present, the proposed development area to the west of Abbots Wood is our only point of vehicle management access. Clear provisions for alternative access arrangements have not been provided. 2. There is no provision for significant buffer zones (minimum 50m) to protect the integrity of the wood from a development (and vice versa) that post-dates it, particularly in terms of safety and nuisance issues, nor are there clear statements on public access points (which should be limited to two on either side of the wood). 3. The physical presence of buildings next to woodland can have an adverse effect on bird and insect life via night time noise and light intrusion. 4. Significant boundary intensification of human and pet activity is likely to cause disturbance to habitats of breeding birds, vegetation damage, litter/garden waste and fire damage. 5. Construction of roads and buildings can result in boundary tree root damage through severance or soil compaction, with increased tree safety hazards from consequently diseased or dying trees. 6. Development can alter the site hydrology in terms of both interrupted below ground water flows and increased surface water run-off, together with new pollution/contamination risks. 7. Boundary trees overhanging any new development are frequently subject to indiscriminate lopping, causing reduction of the woodland canopy, and increased tree safety concerns for the Trust. Increased public safety issues relating to trees near public areas and buildings will compromise the longer term retention of wood edge specimens. 8. Houses built on the edge of woods typically result in garden tipplings into the wood and disguised boundary encroachments into Woodland Trust property over time. 9. Increased accessibility of woodland to vehicles as a result of development often results in motorbike/4X4 damage to the structure of the wood and a diminution of the local community's enjoyment. 10. This modification conflicts with the protection against development offered by Policies NE4 and NES of the Local Plan as drafted, as the proposed development sites will 	<p>Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.</p> <p>The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at</p>	No change.

inevitably have an adverse impact on the wildlife, landscape and amenity value of this community wood in the Forest of Avon.
Changes
We would therefore like to see these two sections of land returned to the Green Belt.

South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.

Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.

The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Ref: 2472/J3

Location SW Keynsham
Keynsham

The proposed modification was not part of the local plan submitted to the inspector and thus has not been subject to proper enquiry since it would significantly alter green belt boundaries and since the transportation aspects, which would be a consequence of building 100 houses have not been addressed, an enquiry should be opened to public discussion.

The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages.

No change.

Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.

The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 - 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

Ref: 2572/J3		A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.	
Location SW Keynsham Keynsham	<p>1. The proposal to remove these two sites A and B from green belt and 'designate' them for development was both substantial and contentious back in 2002, when originally advanced as part of the Draft Plan to go to public inquiry. It was deleted from the Draft Plan prior to the inquiry process, and was therefore not the subject of any public scrutiny in the course of the Inquiry, or any scrutiny in the presence of the parties primarily concerned.</p> <p>2. The proposal continues to be both substantial and contentious. Indeed, all the more so given that the proposed number of housing units has now been increased from 500 to 700.</p> <p>3. On this ground alone, it is submitted that the Inquiry should be re-opened to allow public scrutiny of the Proposed Modification, in the presence of the parties primarily concerned. It would be quite wrong to allow a Modification of this scale to proceed without doing this. Substantive: General</p> <p>4. The author essentially adheres to the representations made by him in February 2002. He develops them as now set out in the paragraphs that follow.</p> <p>5. Although the principle of using some Green Belt land around Keynsham has been established, such land should still not be used until it has been clearly demonstrated that all suitable land of other types ("brownfield" or whatever) within BANES has been used. Even now, the Local Plan does not demonstrate this fact; there is no or no adequate evidence as to how the availability of the other sites previously proposed by BANES has been assessed. Even within the Keynsham area, there are other available (brownfield) sites which would be preferable on most or all counts, viz. St Johns Court and/or Somerdale.</p> <p>6. In selecting sites A and B for development (from those sites identified in the 1999 BANES Local Plan Issues report), the Proposed Modification would select the two sites which:</p>	<p>Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.</p> <p>The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use</p>	No change.

(1) Would create the most intrusion into the Green Belt;
 (2) Are the most remote from the transportation corridor;
 (3) Are the most remote from Keynsham town centre;
 (4) Would create the least satisfactory boundary for the town of Keynsham; and
 (5) Would offer the least integration into the existing town.
 Substantive: intrusion into the Green Belt
 7. As to 3(1) above, site B is in a particularly prominent and conspicuous position, such that development would impact on the surrounding Green Belt.
 8. Moreover, site B would have extraordinarily limited access. The only apparent means of access would be via Park Road — which is patently inadequate for this purpose.
 9. Development of sites A and B as separate sites would be uncoordinated and fragmented. If any development is to take place in this area, it should be on a single reduced, but coordinated site (viz. Site A), serviced by Chariton Road as its arterial link.
 (Charlton Road being patently inadequate for the purpose, but nonetheless the least inadequate road in the vicinity)
 10. If a further site really is necessary in this (remote) location in addition to site A, the alternative site identified in the 1999 Report at Lays Farm would be better suited to the desired objectives of the Local Plan — whether in substitution or in reduction of Sites A and B. It would be visually far less intrusive; access would be far better than for site B; it would provide a more coherent and unified development boundary. Alternatively, site A plus another site elsewhere should be used.
 Substantive: access and transportation
 11. As to 3(2) and (3) above:
 (1) Travel from the proposed development sites would require difficult journeys to Keynsham town centre; through Keynsham town centre; from Keynsham town centre to the A4.
 (2) The A4 road is already overloaded, to the severe detriment of all road users, including especially all bus services.
 (3) The existing train service is inadequate, unreliable, expensive and now in the process of steady reduction as to both frequency and capacity. Moreover, access to Keynsham railway station (whether on foot, by cycle or by car) is difficult and/or unsafe.
 (4) Bus services are slow and unreliable. They are subject to the vagaries of the traffic in both Bristol and Bath and along the A4.
 And yet the plans now put forward for the development of Keynsham contain no detailed proposals at all (beyond generalised statements) as to how transportation is to be improved. Indeed, it may be that adequate improvement is simply not possible, even with substantial expenditure. In practice, the proposed development would generate pro tanto increases in commuting traffic and congestion (presumably in a ratio of more than one vehicle per new housing unit). New housing should be proximate to the relevant work locations. In contrast, the overwhelming majority of residents on these proposed development sites would work in Bristol or Bath.
 12. Moreover, the proposals for mixed residential and commercial development (or whatever) are being advanced with no or no apparent regard to the fact that commercial development would itself generate additional traffic movement.
 13. In the result, sites A and B are now being proposed without any or any apparent consideration of the highway implications — both within Keynsham and

including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.

Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the

	<p>throughout the surrounding areas. Roads throughout the area are already subject to unsatisfactory levels of rat-running.</p> <p>Amendments sought to the Proposed Modification</p> <p>14. The author seeks:</p> <p>(1) Deletion of the Proposed Modification;</p> <p>(2) Alternatively, its restriction to site A.;</p> <p>(3) Reduction of the number of proposed housing units;</p> <p>(4) A re-opening of the Inquiry to permit due scrutiny of the Proposed Modification.</p>	<p>emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	
<p>Ref: 2682/J8</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	<p>6.1 In summary, the original objections to the Proposal SK2 allocations (February 2002) are sustained in relation to the Proposed Modifications, on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may still be alternative sites throughout B&NES that comply more closely with PPG3 and other national and development plan policy frameworks, and which should be allocated and developed first; • There may still be alternative sites in more sustainable locations in terms of accessibility to the existing transportation infrastructure and network; • The proposed Green Belt boundary would be very vulnerable to further development pressure. If land is to be allocated, a single coherent area from the Green Belt would be preferable; • Development of Site B would be (a) highly visible from and visually intrusive within the surrounding Green Belt area and (b) particularly inaccessible; • Transport Criteria 6, 7 and 8 continue to lack detail as to how and why associated pedestrian and cycle route enhancements, improvements to Keynsham Railway Station and improvements to bus services will be delivered; and, • The policy criteria still lack detail in terms of guiding the development proposals. They continue to fail to provide developers and the surrounding communities with adequate certainty as to how it is to be carried out and serviced. <p>6.2 For these reasons, the Residents of Chewton Keynsham:</p> <p>6.2.1 Request that a Modifications Inquiry be held into Policy GDS.1 Proposal SK2, to allow a full and open exploration of all these issues to take place, and to enable them to participate in this public process as they would have had the proposal been retained in the Revised Deposit Draft Plan;</p> <p>6.2.2 Reserve the option of legal challenge if the above course is not adopted;</p> <p>6.2.3 Submit that development of the proposal site (if any) should be restricted to Site A.</p> <p>6.2.4 Submit that any development of the proposal site should in any event be I subject to provision within the Policy for the local community to be formally included at every subsequent stage of the development process. More particularly, the Development Requirements paragraph of the Policy should be amended to include a passage to the following effect:</p> <p>'...development of the site will only be allowed to proceed on the basis of a co-ordinated strategy for a mixed use development, to involve full and extensive consultation with local stakeholders at every stage of the development process (through Masterplan, Development Brief, Outline and Detailed Planning Submissions), in accordance with the following principles....'</p>	<p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.</p> <p>The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 - 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3098/J68</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	<p>Modification M/C1/20: Paragraph C1.17-24 - Green Belt boundary changes</p> <p>1. We object to the proposed amendments to the Green Belt at South West Keynsham as it excludes Parkhouse Farm, a site needed to be incorporated into the K2 allocation to enable it to be planned in a cohesive and sustainable manner.</p> <p>2. The Green belt boundary at South West Keynsham should be amended to exclude the land at Parkhouse Farm from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Map attached.</p>	<p>A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.</p> <p>A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.</p> <p>Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3108/J4</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	<p>I object to the proposed development in South West Keynsham as it is on Green Belt Land. In my opinion, it will have a devastating affect on a very quiet and peaceful area. If the development goes ahead it will set a precedent for 'infill' between the two sites and further development in the future within the green belt . What is the point in having a Green Belt policy which can be overridden at will. The proposal modification should be withdrawn.</p>	<p>objection site as Abbots Wood and the land around and including Parkhouse Farm. The inspector had an opportunity to consider the separate constituent parts and recommended to retain the site within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to the meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.</p> <p>The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3108/J6</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	<p>I object to the proposed modification as I believe that this development will result in increased pressure on Council services, the emergency services, water electricity employment and recreation. These services are already under strain and if additional facilities are to be provided, this will result in further development threatened on the Green Belt areas around Keynsham.</p> <p>The amendment requires the withdrawal of this proposed development from the local plan.</p>	<p>A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.</p> <p>A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.</p> <p>Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.

The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4017/J2</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	<p>1. I don't think you should use greenbelt land for building when brownfield sites (Somerdale) are available 2. Little thought appears to have been given to access and transport.</p> <p>(a) K2 is over a mile from the station and further from the A4. People will not walk, they'll drive and cause additional congestion on Charlton Road</p> <p>(b) From K2B, the only access or exit will be through the already-congested Park Road or St Clements Rd into Albert Rd</p> <p>(c) any driver wishing to avoid central Keynsham will take Redlynch Rd into Chewton Keynsham, and turn left for access to the Wellsway along Chewton Rd. outside my house, two-way traffic is impossible, or at least impossible without slowing to a crawl, so this will lead to problems. Or they'll turn right for Bath and have to go through Compton Dando, which is also narrow, winding and difficult to pass</p> <p>(d) the rail services have already been downgraded this week with less capacity for the services out of Keynsham to Bristol. There are rumours of further cuts, so the Inspector's talk of good railway services rings hollow. Similarly, when she talks of fast road routes to Bristol and Bath, I find it difficult to believe she has ever driven the A4 or A37 at rush hour. And to use the A4 park and ride means new residents will have to drive through Keynsham centre to the Hicks Gate roundabout, already horribly congested.</p> <p>So, in summary,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - hands off the greenbelt! use brownfield, especially since its closer to station and A4 - do not use K2B without good road access - if you must have housing there, add Lays Farm instead, which has access to Charlton Rd - stop railway cuts if you're going to build 700 more houses in Keynsham - avoid adding to traffic through Chewton Keynsham and Compton Dando <p>and in any case, you should have an enquiry to allow people to voice an opinion: I spoke to 3 people living in Park Road/St Clements Rd area, and none had heard of the K2B proposal</p>	<p>likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.</p> <p>Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.</p> <p>The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement.</p>	No change.

In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.

Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4020/J1</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	Encroaching on Green Belt.	<p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the issues of housing supply again in detail at the Local Plan Inquiry and recommended that the Council should reinvestigate this site in order to meet the identified shortfall in housing in the District. The identification of sites reflects the locational sequence established in the Structure Plan: that is first Bath, then Keynsham, then Norton-Radstock and then the larger villages. Account has already been taken of the Brownfield site redevelopment opportunities. In light of the Government's priority on deliverability, the Inspector has emphasized that the sites should be both suitable for development and able to deliver housing by 2011. These options have been investigated taking into account the inspector's reasoning and recommendations, site constraints, the local plan strategy, corporate objectives, sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.</p> <p>The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.</p> <p>A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4022/J2</p> <p>Location SW Keynsham Keynsham</p>	<p>1. We object to urban sprawl for environmental reasons. The proposed plans for 'about' 700 houses on the outskirts of Keynsham would mean that about 1000 cars would be using Charlton Road and smaller country roads in the area. Charlton Road is already a 'rat run' to Bath and at times the 2 bridges near Chewton Place are congested. The views from the valley would also be spoilt at this point.</p> <p>2. Houses at Brownfield sites (Somerdale and St Johns Court) are close to all the amenities, including bus stops and the train station for commuters travelling to Bath, Bristol and beyond.</p>	<p>GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.</p> <p>A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.</p> <p>Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.</p> <p>The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	No change.

sustainability criteria and national planning advice, demand for alternative uses etc.

The Inspector has assessed the various sites being put forward by objectors in and around Keynsham and recommended the land at South West Keynsham (SWK) should be investigated for re-allocation as mixed use scheme for up to 700 dwellings. This site was previously allocated in the 2002 version of the Local Plan for a mixed use including 500 dwellings but was deleted when it was considered that there were sufficient alternative brownfield sites to meet the housing requirement. In light of the housing shortfall, it is proposed that this allocation is re-instated. The site will be required even if more rapid progress is made on the Bath Western Riverside site in the Plan period than anticipated and housing completions are at the higher end of the 450 – 600 range by 2011. The Inspector concluded that the provision of a substantial level of residential development through the release of a Green Belt site in Keynsham accords with Policy 16 of the JRSP and the site at South West Keynsham provides the location that best meets the criteria for the release of Green Belt land in the JRSP.

A Master Plan will be prepared to guide the comprehensive development of the site which will be subject to public consultation. Any developer will be required to comply with the 17 development requirements stipulated in the Local Plan (Site GDS.1/K2) which include improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the development; provision of a community meeting place, two convenience shops and a children's playing space on each of the two parts of the site. The Woodland Trust woodland will be protected. The development requirements reflect the need to integrate with the existing urban fabric as well as mitigate the impact of the development.

A traffic Study was undertaken for the Council prior to the original allocation of land for housing at South West Keynsham in 2002. This examined the likely impact of development on the road network between the sites and the A4 and A37, and it was demonstrated that with reasonable mitigation works development could be accommodated satisfactorily. In preparation for the proposed reinstatement of this allocation the original study has been updated

and its conclusion confirmed. Details of the necessary mitigation works will be included in detailed Transport Assessment which will have to accompany any future planning applications.

Whilst the allocation of SWK entails a change to the Green Belt, it provides the opportunity to develop a new residential community which exemplifies high quality of design and sustainable development principles. It complements the objectives of the emerging Keynsham Vision in supporting local services and supplying affordable housing.

The objection raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Modification: M/C1/21 - Return Lays Farm Keynsham to Green Belt

Ref: 2601/J51	The Local Plan Inquiry the Council proposed that the employment site at Lays Farm be excluded from the Green Belt (albeit that it was not proposed to be incorporated within the housing development boundary) this alteration to the Green Belt boundary was justified on the basis that this established and well developed site now no longer served an important green belt function we would concur with this and support the removal of the site from the green belt.	Disagree. The Inspector makes it clear that an established Green Belt boundary should be only modified in exceptional circumstances and although the JRSP allows for an alteration of the Green Belt boundary at Keynsham to meet the housing requirements, in her opinion, did not mean the release of other land from the Green Belt. She concluded there were no very special circumstances to support a change in the Green Belt boundary to exclude Lays Farm.	No change.
Location Lays Farm Industrial Estate Keynsham	However, following the Inspectors Report and the Inspector's recommendation to the council the council now propose to retain the Green Belt boundary as currently set therefore leaving the Lays Farm employment site within the Green Belt.		
	The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open PPG2 sets out five purposes of including land within Green Belts to check unrestricted sprawl of built up areas prevent coalescence safeguard the countryside from encroachment preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and to assist in urban regeneration.		
	The Lays Farm employment site does not serve any of these functions. Given the circumstances of the site and having regard to guidance in PPG2, we are of the opinion that the site no longer serves a valuable Green Belt purpose and as such the site given its location adjacent to the existing urban area should be removed from the Green Belt.		

Chapter C2. Natural Environment

Modification: M/C2/1 - Natural Environment

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 743/J45 /s Location (None)	The proposed amendment to diagram 10 is most strongly supported because it correctly shows the demarcation between landscape character areas 12 and 6 in Combe Hay Parish.	Support noted.	No change.
Modification: M/C2/3 - Natural Environment			
Ref: 3948/J8 Location (None)	1. I broadly agree with the specification by name of important hillsides, but the list should also include "Bath's Parks and Gardens", most of which are also important hillsides in built-up areas. 2. Add the words "As well as Bath's parks and gardens," before "a number of prominent..."	Para C2.9 provides a general introduction to the landscape setting of Bath. There is already reference to designed open spaces and therefore it is considered necessary to also refer specifically to Bath's parks and gardens. These are covered in more detail in Chapter C3: Built and Historic Environment.	No change.
Ref: 4036/J2 /s Location (None) Bath	1. I support the inclusion of M/C/3 in the modified local plan because the hillside green spaces of Bath are a vital part of its visual amenity and must be protected by planning policy. 2. M/C2/3 is a good modification. It would be of great benefit to the city's overall amenity if the council were to extend the proposed protection of M/C2/3 to include all parks and gardens in the City which occupy hillside terrain - such as Victoria and Hedgemoor Parks etc.	Support noted. Para C2.9 provides a general introduction to the landscape setting of Bath. There is already reference to designed open spaces and therefore it is not considered necessary to also refer specifically to Bath's parks and gardens. These are covered in more detail in Chapter C3: Built and Historic Environment.	No change.
Ref: 3781/J5 Location (None) Norton Radstock	This applies as much to natural hills such as the tumulus crowned hill in Kilmersdon Road behind Meadow View as to the batches at Tynning and Norton As stated above, we also depreciate the amendment which gives Bath hillsides protection, but not those in Norton Radstock.	Para C2.9 provides a general introduction to the landscape setting of Bath whilst the landscape setting of Norton Radstock is discussed in para C2.10.	No change.
Modification: M/C2/7 - Modifications to para C2.18 on Important Hillsides			
Ref: 3257/J319 Location (None)	The removal of policy NE.3 and the text preceding it is recommended by the Inspector. If this is done, not all the Important Hillsides in the Radstock area designated under policy NE.3 will be protected using other plan policies, but we consider that those in Bath will be. We consider that it is right to single out Bath and Radstock because Bath is a World Heritage City and Radstock is one of the best preserved mining towns, perhaps even the best, in England. Both have unique features and have tourist potential that could be jeopardised by inappropriate development that affects their landscape setting. The unique character of Radstock described in C2.18 (to be deleted) in relation to the convergence of the five valleys and the surrounding and penetrating prominent hillsides is not described in paragraph C2.10. Neither is it identified within the Rural Landscapes SPG, or in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment. As these are the primary documents through which policies NE.1 and BH.6 are applied, and the issue of distinctiveness is not adequately addressed, there is insufficient protection under those policies. There are a number of areas designated as Important Hillsides in Norton Radstock that do not fall within Landscape Character Areas, so are unaffected by policy NE.1. Their significance is not covered adequately in the text of the Radstock Conservation Area document, either specifically or generally. They are afforded no	This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be	No change.

protection in practice under Policy BH.6 because of inadequate identification of the broad distinctive features of the town of Radstock either in the Local Plan text preceding the policy or in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment, and inadequate coverage of the hillside features or their absence from the individual character area assessments within it. Although the Council will be re-assessing all the Conservation Areas in B&NES, it has fixed no date for re-appraisal of the Radstock area. Until such time, the Local Plan cannot be considered to protect all the hillsides currently designated under Policy NE.3.

Policy NE.12 also applies to landscape features, but it only applies to some of the Important Hillsides designated in policy NE.3, including those not adequately served by either NE.1 or BH. It does not appear that this policy would protect these hillsides in the Radstock area in respect of wildlife value, and there are no documents that adequately identify them as important for amenity or landscape value, the other criteria in the policy.

There is some inconsistency in the way that the Important Hillsides designation has been applied in Norton Radstock, particularly with regard to the role that the valley of the River Somer plays.

We consider that Inset 19b needs amending.

We believe that it is possible that, in drawing up the SPG and Conservation Area Assessments, attention was not properly paid to areas that were already seen as protected by plan policies, or to assessing the setting of Radstock as a whole, a subject that may have been perceived to be one that could or should be addressed through the Local Plan.

Reasoning:

Landscape qualities, and contribution to the character and setting of Bath and Norton Radstock are the issues governed by Policy NE. 3. The Important Hillsides within and around Bath have protection under World Heritage Site and Conservation Area designations. The rural setting of Bath referred to in C2.18 is adequately covered by the description in C2.9, which also flags up open spaces within its urban area, but does not specifically mention the role of prominent green hillsides within it in the character of the city. We consider that the protection afforded to them as part of a World Heritage Site (Policy BH.1) is partially dependent on the landscape setting in the text of C3.11 being taken to pertain to within the city as well as surrounding it, and also on the description and assessment in the relevant assessment documents for the city. The open spaces that lie within the built up area are described as part of Bath's landscape setting in C2.9. It is not ideal that the matter of setting is not dealt with immediately prior to the policy that specifies setting. However, as it does precede policy NE.1, the character and local distinctiveness of Bath will be taken to include the concept of 'setting' in the implementation of the policy. C2.9 also points to the landscape strategy, 'Cherishing Outdoor Places' as a source of additional support. In addition, almost all of them are also protected as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, which covers community/amenity value in addition to wildlife value.

Therefore, we consider that policies NE.1, NE.2, BH.1, BH.6 and NE.9 should be sufficient to protect Bath's Important Hillsides. We consider that the hills and valleys of Radstock are only partially covered by these policies, however.

The Landscape Character Assessments do not describe the Radstock convergence of five valleys, the contribution by this to its unique character of the town, or the significance of the prominent green hillsides in individual locations and penetration into the urban area, which is a distinctive feature of the town (RDDLP C2. 19, to be deleted). They mainly consist of a series of descriptions of what lies within the

permitted.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

area, character, with a few examples and with next to no assessment of the significance of the features or of which features lend distinctiveness to the areas. The Landscape Character Area 12 document is not particularly helpful. The Summary of Landscape Character includes in its list, "Moderately wide and steep river valleys, striking landform"; "Undulating valley sides"; "Valley has intimate enclosed quality provided by topography, trees within hedges and tree belts along brook and field boundaries"; "Open upper slopes"; and "Generally has a quiet and peaceful quality away from major road corridors". Landscape area 15 describes "relatively steep river valleys" which "give an enclosed feel to the landscape in contrast to the plateaux with their open views". There is no analysis of which characters make a particular contribution as distinctive features in relation to the area or of the towns and their setting. Unlike the text on Bath preceding policy NE.1, the text on other areas, including Radstock, does not flag up hillside settings as a consideration. Policy NE.3 deals with the character of the town of Radstock as a whole and its landscape setting, rather than applying to sections in isolation, as NE.1 does by design and BH.6 does by default.

The Landscape Character Areas do not apply to the Important Hillside in the area west of Church Street just south of Wells Road, the area west of Magdalene Road, and the area east of Coombend. The area south of Somervale Road to the housing boundary appears outside the boundary of Landscape Character area 12 on the proposals map, yet appears within it in the Rural Landscapes SPG Protection of these features depends on policy BH.6 (with the possible exception of the area to the south of Somervale road just west of Radstock centre), and thereby on the information in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment (1999). This describes the town as lying at the nexus of five steep-sided valleys. There is no specific reference in the general text to the distinctive and unique character of Radstock created by this land form, or of the penetration of the town by prominent hillsides, or the combination of this with the batches on the valley sides and in the valley bottoms, which make a vital contribution to the steepness of the inclines and the enclosed nature of the valleys. The Area 2 description says, "one of the unique features of Radstock is the way the open countryside comes close to the heart of the town" (4.3.1), but this does not refer specifically to the unique character as described in paragraph C2.19 covered by Policy NE.3, and is not the same. The Area 8 description refers to steep valley sides, and although it refers to the northern tip of the character area encroaching into the urban core of the town, and refers to the linear character of the former GWR site and enclosed nature, which implies that the penetration of the hillsides is an important feature, it again does not refer specifically to the penetration by prominent hillsides that is a feature of the Important Hillside designation.

The bulk of the references to landscape are contained within the separate area descriptions, but these are very specific, mostly describing the area feature by feature. They do not refer to all of the areas designated as important hillside in the RDDLP. The one south of Somervale road, directly west of Radstock centre in the Wellow Valley is not mentioned, and the enhancement objectives do not cover it either, being about built structures and historical integrity. In the Area 4 description, the importance of the hillside to the south and an amenity value area are flagged up, but there is no mention of the important hillside area in the west of Area 4, west of Church Street just south of Wells Road. The Area 3 description flags up the tip (RDDLP important hillside) as a focal point and Local Landscape /Nature Conservation Interest designation, but 'focal point' is rather vague and the designation is a Wansdyke Local Plan designation, which does not appear to have

any equivalent designation in the B&NES Local Plan.

It appears that policy NE.12 applies mainly to the river corridors in respect of their function as wildlife features, as most of the green hillsides are largely farmland and other rough land that has suffered significant ecological degradation due to modern farming practices. The potential for future value as wildlife resources, either incidentally or through enhancement as part of an initiative/scheme, is not covered by NE.12. A policy that protects them as important landscape setting features is important to bridge this gap in order that it is still possible to create a fully functioning ecological network to aid the process of an adequate response by the natural environment to climate change and thus avoid ecological degradation and destruction.

Many of the important hillsides around Radstock, in contrast to those in Bath, are not protected as SNCIs, so are afforded no protection under Policy NE.9.

If the Important Hillside designation is to remain, more consistency in its application should be considered. The tip west of Radstock Road, in Conservation Area 3, illustrated as Important Hillside, lies adjacent to another tip and also a SNCI hillside, which extends from Radstock right into Midsomer Norton, crossed by a road beside the 'important hillside' tip. Neither of these are designated as important hillsides. These prominent hillsides associated with the River Somer, a tributary of the Wellow, are important landscape features, but do not lie within the Midsomer Norton Conservation Area or within any Landscape Character Areas. They are, however, protected as SNCIs, with the exception of the more easterly of the two tips described above. The failure to designate these seems to be at odds with other designations of Important Hillsides. Although all the Important Hillsides are designated in association with Radstock, some of these hillsides extend across the top of Midsomer Norton. Although they are designated mainly outside the urban areas, they are not exclusively so in Radstock, and are all inside the urban area in Bath. Some of those to the North of Midsomer Norton are further away than the far end of the SNCI in the Somer valley. The valley of the river Somer plays a significant role in the landscape character of Radstock and Midsomer Norton, radiating as it does from Radstock into Midsomer Norton and forming one of the distinctive landscape features associated with the town of Radstock. Although it passes through an urban area, it is sizeable and prominent, and should be deemed to be as much part of Radstock's landscape setting as the important hillsides within Bath.

B&NES wants to retain the Important Hillsides designation, but not on the part within the GDS.1/NR2 site. The parcel lies inside the Radstock Conservation Area, and within Landscape Character Area 15 (Norton Radstock Southern Farmlands), so can be considered under both Policy BH.6 and Policy NE.1. We consider that the important hillside feature should remain within the NR2 site, extending down to the entrance to Meadow View, in order to be consistent with Policy BH.6. The grounds for this are its contribution to retention of the natural linear form flagged up in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment for Area 8. It is an integral part of the funnel-like linear element of the un-built part of the area, now an even more prominent characteristic since the removal of buildings on the track bed associated with the former Marcroft Wagon works. The document states, "the views into and out of the character area, and its natural linear form are important to its special character and need preserving". If the Important hillsides designation is to stay, we believe that this designation should be reinstated. We see no more problem with having SNCI or recreational policy designations within a site, as this one has, than with having an Important hillside designation within a site.

In addition, Inset I 9b does not display the full extent of all of the Important Hill-sides. If the designation stays, this should be addressed.

Conclusion:

We do not believe that it is right that a lack of protection of important features should come about because of the inadequacies of assessment documents, and believe that it would be preferable that Policy NE.3 should be retained, as it covers an important aspect of landscape protection that is not adequately covered by the combination of other plan policies, their associated text, or the primary documents through which the policies are implemented and to amend the plan itself would necessitate the inclusion of a level of detail that would be contrary to the aim of producing a succinct plan.

It seems to us that the only alternative to retaining the policy is to change the existing plan policies and text. However, this would necessitate the inclusion of detail that should more rightly be found in the assessment documents. It would need to include an account of the distinctive features of Radstock and surrounds and an account of the landscape setting of Radstock in the text preceding Policy NE.1 in sufficient detail to make up for the inadequacies of the SPG. We think that the reference in paragraph C2.10 is too weak, and is insufficient to properly set out what is absent from the Rural Landscapes SPG and the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment. It would also be necessary to make this text equally as important as the Rural Landscapes SPG. It would also be necessary to include the wording in paragraph C 2.19 in the text preceding policy BH.6 and to flag up features not included in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment, including the hillsides associated with the River Somer and the tips in its valley. The agreement by B&NES and the Inspector that the SPG is the primary document in application of NE.1 would have to be revisited and a proviso made with regard to the additional information. We do not believe that it is acceptable to wait for amendments to the SPG and a replacement Conservation Area document because some of these landscape features would be unprotected in the meanwhile.

Further, Policy NE.3 provides a replacement for the Local Landscape/Nature Conservation designation of the Wansdyke Local Plan where the nature conservation importance is not sufficient to warrant designation as a SSCI and for important hillsides in private ownership that have not been subject to surveys that would enable an

assessment to be made in this regard. The removal of the Important Hill-sides designation from part of the NR2 site is at odds with preserving or enhancing the character of Conservation Area 8, and Inset 19b needs to be amended to map the full extent of all of the Important Hill-sides.

Recommendations:

We recommend that Policy NE3 and the associated text should not be deleted. We also recommend that, for reasons of consistency, that the hillsides associated with the River Somer, an integral part of the distinctive landscape that forms the setting of the historic town of Radstock, are also designated as Important hillsides.

We further recommend that proposals map insert I 9b be amended to show the full extent of the areas designated as Important Hill-sides.

Modification: M/C2/9 - Natural Environment

Ref: 3257/J318

Location (None)

The removal of policy NE.3 and the text preceding it is recommended by the Inspector. If this is done, not all the Important Hillsides in the Radstock area designated under policy NE.3 will be protected using other plan policies, but we consider that those in Bath will be. We consider that it is right to single out Bath and Radstock because Bath is a World Heritage City and Radstock is one of the best preserved mining towns, perhaps even the best, in England. Both have unique features and have tourist potential that could be jeopardised by inappropriate development that affects their landscape setting.

The unique character of Radstock described in C2.18 (to be deleted) in relation to the convergence of the five valleys and the surrounding and penetrating prominent hillsides is not described in paragraph C2.10. Neither is it identified within the Rural Landscapes SPG, or in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment. As these are the primary documents through which policies NE.1 and BH.6 are applied, and the issue of distinctiveness is not adequately addressed, there is insufficient protection under those policies.

There are a number of areas designated as Important Hillsides in Norton Radstock that do not fall within Landscape Character Areas, so are unaffected by policy NE.1. Their significance is not covered adequately in the text of the Radstock Conservation Area document, either specifically or generally. They are afforded no protection in practice under Policy BH.6 because of inadequate identification of the broad distinctive features of the town of Radstock either in the Local Plan text preceding the policy or in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment, and inadequate coverage of the hillside features or their absence from the individual character area assessments within it. Although the Council will be re-assessing all the Conservation Areas in B&NES, it has fixed no date for re-appraisal of the Radstock area. Until such time, the Local Plan cannot be considered to protect all the hillsides currently designated under Policy NE.3.

Policy NE.12 also applies to landscape features, but it only applies to some of the Important Hillsides designated in policy NE.3, including those not adequately served by either NE.1 or BH. It does not appear that this policy would protect these hillsides in the Radstock area in respect of wildlife value, and there are no documents that adequately identify them as important for amenity or landscape value, the other criteria in the policy.

There is some inconsistency in the way that the Important Hillsides designation has been applied in Norton Radstock, particularly with regard to the role that the valley of the River Somer plays.

We consider that Inset 19b needs amending.

We believe that it is possible that, in drawing up the SPG and Conservation Area Assessments, attention was not properly paid to areas that were already seen as protected by plan policies, or to assessing the setting of Radstock as a whole, a subject that may have been perceived to be one that could or should be addressed through the Local Plan.

Reasoning:

Landscape qualities, and contribution to the character and setting of Bath and Norton Radstock are the issues governed by Policy NE. 3. The Important Hillsides within and around Bath have protection under World Heritage Site and Conservation Area designations. The rural setting of Bath referred to in C2.18 is adequately covered by the description in C2.9, which also flags up open spaces within its urban area, but does not specifically mention the role of prominent green hillsides within it in the character of the city. We consider that the protection afforded to them as part of a World Heritage Site (Policy BH.1) is partially

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

No change.

dependent on the landscape setting in the text of C3.11 being taken to pertain to within the city as well as surrounding it, and also on the description and assessment in the relevant assessment documents for the city. The open spaces that lie within the built up area are described as part of Bath's landscape setting in C2.9. It is not ideal that the matter of setting is not dealt with immediately prior to the policy that specifies setting. However, as it does precede policy NE.1, the character and local distinctiveness of Bath will be taken to include the concept of 'setting' in the implementation of the policy. C2.9 also points to the landscape strategy, 'Cherishing Outdoor Places' as a source of additional support. In addition, almost all of them are also protected as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, which covers community/amenity value in addition to wildlife value.

Therefore, we consider that policies NE.1, NE.2, BH.1, BH.6 and NE.9 should be sufficient to protect Bath's Important Hillside. We consider that the hills and valleys of Radstock are only partially covered by these policies, however.

The Landscape Character Assessments do not describe the Radstock convergence of five valleys, the contribution by this to its unique character of the town, or the significance of the prominent green hillsides in individual locations and penetration into the urban area, which is a distinctive feature of the town (RDDLP C2. 19, to be deleted). They mainly consist of a series of descriptions of what lies within the area, character, with a few examples and with next to no assessment of the significance of the features or of which features lend distinctiveness to the areas. The Landscape Character Area 12 document is not particularly helpful. The Summary of Landscape Character includes in its list, "Moderately wide and steep river valleys, striking landform"; "Undulating valley sides"; "Valley has intimate enclosed quality provided by topography, trees within hedges and tree belts along brook and field boundaries"; "Open upper slopes"; and "Generally has a quiet and peaceful quality away from major road corridors". Landscape area 15 describes "relatively steep river valleys" which "give an enclosed feel to the landscape in contrast to the plateaux with their open views". There is no analysis of which characters make a particular contribution as distinctive features in relation to the area or of the towns and their setting. Unlike the text on Bath preceding policy NE.1, the text on other areas, including Radstock, does not flag up hillside settings as a consideration. Policy NE.3 deals with the character of the town of Radstock as a whole and its landscape setting, rather than applying to sections in isolation, as NE. 1 does by design and BH.6 does by default.

The Landscape Character Areas do not apply to the Important Hillside in the area west of Church Street just south of Wells Road, the area west of Magdalene Road, and the area east of Coombend. The area south of Somervale Road to the housing boundary appears outside the boundary of Landscape Character area 12 on the proposals map, yet appears within it in the Rural Landscapes SPG Protection of these features depends on policy BH.6 (with the possible exception of the area to the south of Somervale road just west of Radstock centre), and thereby on the information in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment (1999). This describes the town as lying at the nexus of five steep-sided valleys. There is no specific reference in the general text to the distinctive and unique character of Radstock created by this land form, or of the penetration of the town by prominent hillsides, or the combination of this with the batches on the valley sides and in the valley bottoms, which make a vital contribution to the steepness of the inclines and the enclosed nature of the valleys. The Area 2 description says, "one of the unique features of Radstock is the way the open countryside comes close to the heart of the town" (4.3.1), but this does not refer specifically to the unique character as

described in paragraph C2.19 covered by Policy NE.3, and is not the same. The Area 8 description refers to steep valley sides, and although it refers to the northern tip of the character area encroaching into the urban core of the town, and refers to the linear character of the former GWR site and enclosed nature, which implies that the penetration of the hillsides is an important feature, it again does not refer specifically to the penetration by prominent hillsides that is a feature of the Important Hillsides designation.

The bulk of the references to landscape are contained within the separate area descriptions, but these are very specific, mostly describing the area feature by feature. They do not refer to all of the areas designated as important hillside in the RDDLP. The one south of Somervale road, directly west of Radstock centre in the Wellow Valley is not mentioned, and the enhancement objectives do not cover it either, being about built structures and historical integrity. In the Area 4 description, the importance of the hillside to the south and an amenity value area are flagged up, but there is no mention of the important hillside area in the west of Area 4, west of Church Street just south of Wells Road. The Area 3 description flags up the tip (RDDLP important hillside) as a focal point and Local Landscape /Nature Conservation Interest designation, but 'focal point' is rather vague and the designation is a Wansdyke Local Plan designation, which does not appear to have any equivalent designation in the B&NES Local Plan.

It appears that policy NE.12 applies mainly to the river corridors in respect of their function as wildlife features, as most of the green hillsides are largely farmland and other rough land that has suffered significant ecological degradation due to modern farming practices. The potential for future value as wildlife resources, either incidentally or through enhancement as part of an initiative/scheme, is not covered by NE.12. A policy that protects them as important landscape setting features is important to bridge this gap in order that it is still possible to create a fully functioning ecological network to aid the process of an adequate response by the natural environment to climate change and thus avoid ecological degradation and destruction.

Many of the important hillsides around Radstock, in contrast to those in Bath, are not protected as SNCIs, so are afforded no protection under Policy NE.9. If the Important Hillside designation is to remain, more consistency in its application should be considered. The tip west of Radstock Road, in Conservation Area 3, illustrated as Important Hillside, lies adjacent to another tip and also a SNCI hillside, which extends from Radstock right into Midsomer Norton, crossed by a road beside the 'important hillside' tip. Neither of these are designated as important hillsides. These prominent hillsides associated with the River Somer, a tributary of the Wellow, are important landscape features, but do not lie within the Midsomer Norton Conservation Area or within any Landscape Character Areas. They are, however, protected as SNCIs, with the exception of the more easterly of the two tips described above. The failure to designate these seems to be at odds with other designations of Important Hillsides. Although all the Important Hillsides are designated in association with Radstock, some of these hillsides extend across the top of Midsomer Norton. Although they are designated mainly outside the urban areas, they are not exclusively so in Radstock, and are all inside the urban area in Bath. Some of those to the North of Midsomer Norton are further away than the far end of the SNCI in the Somer valley. The valley of the river Somer plays a significant role in the landscape character of Radstock and Midsomer Norton, radiating as it does from Radstock into Midsomer Norton and forming one of the distinctive landscape features associated with the town of Radstock. Although it

passes through an urban area, it is sizeable and prominent, and should be deemed to be as much part of Radstock's landscape setting as the important hillsides within Bath.

B&NES wants to retain the Important Hillsides designation, but not on the part within the GDS.1/NR2 site. The parcel lies inside the Radstock Conservation Area, and within Landscape Character Area 15 (Norton Radstock Southern Farmlands), so can be considered under both Policy BH.6 and Policy NE.1. We consider that the important hillside feature should remain within the NR2 site, extending down to the entrance to Meadow View, in order to be consistent with Policy BH.6. The grounds for this are its contribution to retention of the natural linear form flagged up in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment for Area 8. It is an integral part of the funnel-like linear element of the un-built part of the area, now an even more prominent characteristic since the removal of buildings on the track bed associated with the former Marcroft Wagon works. The document states, "the views into and out of the character area, and its natural linear form are important to its special character and need preserving". If the Important hillsides designation is to stay, we believe that this designation should be reinstated. We see no more problem with having SNCI or recreational policy designations within a site, as this one has, than with having an Important hillside designation within a site.

In addition, Inset I 9b does not display the full extent of all of the Important Hillsides. If the designation stays, this should be addressed.

Conclusion:

We do not believe that it is right that a lack of protection of important features should come about because of the inadequacies of assessment documents, and believe that it would be preferable that Policy NE.3 should be retained, as it covers an important aspect of landscape protection that is not adequately covered by the combination of other plan policies, their associated text, or the primary documents through which the policies are implemented and to amend the plan itself would necessitate the inclusion of a level of detail that would be contrary to the aim of producing a succinct plan.

It seems to us that the only alternative to retaining the policy is to change the existing plan policies and text. However, this would necessitate the inclusion of detail that should more rightly be found in the assessment documents. It would need to include an account of the distinctive features of Radstock and surrounds and an account of the landscape setting of Radstock in the text preceding Policy NE.1 in sufficient detail to make up for the inadequacies of the SPG. We think that the reference in paragraph C2.10 is too weak, and is insufficient to properly set out what is absent from the Rural Landscapes SPG and the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment. It would also be necessary to make this text equally as important as the Rural Landscapes SPG. It would also be necessary to include the wording in paragraph C 2.19 in the text preceding policy BH.6 and to flag up features not included in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment, including the hillsides associated with the River Somer and the tips in its valley. The agreement by B&NES and the Inspector that the SPG is the primary document in application of NE.1 would have to be revisited and a proviso made with regard to the additional information. We do not believe that it is acceptable to wait for amendments to the SPG and a replacement Conservation Area document because some of these landscape features would be unprotected in the meanwhile.

Further, Policy NE.3 provides a replacement for the Local Landscape/Nature Conservation designation of the Wansdyke Local Plan where the nature conservation importance is not sufficient to warrant designation as a SNCI and for

important hillsides in private ownership that have not been subject to surveys that would enable an assessment to be made in this regard. The removal of the Important Hillsides designation from part of the NR2 site is at odds with preserving or enhancing the character of Conservation Area 8, and Inset 19b needs to be amended to map the full extent of all of the Important Hillsides.

Recommendations:

We recommend that Policy NE3 and the associated text should not be deleted. We also recommend that, for reasons of consistency, that the hillsides associated with the River Somer, an integral part of the distinctive landscape that forms the setting of the historic town of Radstock, are also designated as Important hillsides.

We further recommend that proposals map insert I 9b be amended to show the full extent of the areas designated as Important Hillsides.

Modification: M/C2/10 - Modifications to Policy NE.3 on Important Hillsides

Ref: 2310/J24

Location (None)

1. There is inadequate justification for an additional layer of protection which duplicates other policies. E.g.. World Heritage Site and Conservation Area Policies will protect Bath from harmful development without the need for superfluous policy.
2. There are no technical studies to support the Policy e.g. landscape appraisal
3. There is no guidance on how applications will be assessed, so the policy lacks clarity.

The Inspector's concern that this policy amounts to local landscape designation remains by retaining Policy NE3. The policy does not state it will not seek to protect the landscape qualities of the hillside as accepted by the Council.

The Inspector recommended the deletion of Policy NE.3 on grounds set out above. The proposed modification is therefore NOT in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation R.10.2

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

No change.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

			<p>The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	
Ref:	3126/J214 /s	Support the Council for the reasons it gives. Sometimes additional layers of protection are wise.	Support noted.	No change.
Location	(None)			
Ref:	3257/J317	<p>The removal of policy NE.3 and the text preceding it is recommended by the Inspector. If this is done, not all the Important Hillsides in the Radstock area designated under policy NE.3 will be protected using other plan policies, but we consider that those in Bath will be. We consider that it is right to single out Bath and Radstock because Bath is a World Heritage City and Radstock is one of the best preserved mining towns, perhaps even the best, in England. Both have unique features and have tourist potential that could be jeopardised by inappropriate development that affects their landscape setting.</p> <p>The unique character of Radstock described in C2.18 (to be deleted) in relation to the convergence of the five valleys and the surrounding and penetrating prominent hillsides is not described in paragraph C2.10. Neither is it identified within the Rural Landscapes SPG, or in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment. As these are the primary documents through which policies NE.1 and BH.6 are applied, and the issue of distinctiveness is not adequately addressed, there is insufficient protection under those policies.</p> <p>There are a number of areas designated as Important Hillsides in Norton Radstock that do not fall within Landscape Character Areas, so are unaffected by policy NE.1. Their significance is not covered adequately in the text of the Radstock Conservation Area document, either specifically or generally. They are afforded no protection in practice under Policy BH.6 because of inadequate identification of the broad distinctive features of the town of Radstock either in the Local Plan text preceding the policy or in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment, and inadequate coverage of the hillside features or their absence from the individual character area assessments within it. Although the Council will be re-assessing all the Conservation Areas in B&NES, it has fixed no date for re-appraisal of the Radstock area. Until such time, the Local Plan cannot be considered to protect all the hillsides currently designated under Policy NE.3.</p> <p>Policy NE.12 also applies to landscape features, but it only applies to some of the Important Hillsides designated in policy NE.3, including those not adequately served by either NE.1 or BH. It does not appear that this policy would protect these hillsides in the Radstock area in respect of wildlife value, and there are no documents that adequately identify them as important for amenity or landscape value, the other criteria in the policy.</p> <p>There is some inconsistency in the way that the Important Hillsides designation has been applied in Norton Radstock, particularly with regard to the role that the valley of the River Somer plays.</p> <p>We consider that Inset 19b needs amending.</p> <p>We believe that it is possible that, in drawing up the SPG and Conservation Area Assessments, attention was not properly paid to areas that were already seen as protected by plan policies, or to assessing the setting of Radstock as a whole, a</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting</p>	No change.
Location	(None)			

subject that may have been perceived to be one that could or should be addressed through the Local Plan. a further modification.

Reasoning:

Landscape qualities, and contribution to the character and setting of Bath and Norton Radstock are the issues governed by Policy NE. 3. The Important Hill-sides within and around Bath have protection under World Heritage Site and Conservation Area designations. The rural setting of Bath referred to in C2.18 is adequately covered by the description in C2.9, which also flags up open spaces within its urban area, but does not specifically mention the role of prominent green hillsides within it in the character of the city. We consider that the protection afforded to them as part of a World Heritage Site (Policy BH.1) is partially dependent on the landscape setting in the text of C3.11 being taken to pertain to within the city as well as surrounding it, and also on the description and assessment in the relevant assessment documents for the city. The open spaces that lie within the built up area are described as part of Bath's landscape setting in C2.9. It is not ideal that the matter of setting is not dealt with immediately prior to the policy that specifies setting. However, as it does precede policy NE.1, the character and local distinctiveness of Bath will be taken to include the concept of 'setting' in the implementation of the policy. C2.9 also points to the landscape strategy, 'Cherishing Outdoor Places' as a source of additional support. In addition, almost all of them are also protected as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, which covers community/amenity value in addition to wildlife value.

Therefore, we consider that policies NE.1, NE.2, BH.1, BH.6 and NE.9 should be sufficient to protect Bath's Important Hill-sides. We consider that the hills and valleys of Radstock are only partially covered by these policies, however.

The Landscape Character Assessments do not describe the Radstock convergence of five valleys, the contribution by this to its unique character of the town, or the significance of the prominent green hillsides in individual locations and penetration into the urban area, which is a distinctive feature of the town (RDDLP C2. 19, to be deleted). They mainly consist of a series of descriptions of what lies within the area, character, with a few examples and with next to no assessment of the significance of the features or of which features lend distinctiveness to the areas.

The Landscape Character Area 12 document is not particularly helpful. The Summary of Landscape Character includes in its list, "Moderately wide and steep river valleys, striking landform"; "Undulating valley sides"; "Valley has intimate enclosed quality provided by topography, trees within hedges and tree belts along brook and field boundaries"; "Open upper slopes"; and "Generally has a quiet and peaceful quality away from major road corridors". Landscape area 15 describes "relatively steep river valleys" which "give an enclosed feel to the landscape in contrast to the plateaux with their open views". There is no analysis of which characters make a particular contribution as distinctive features in relation to the area or of the towns and their setting. Unlike the text on Bath preceding policy NE.1, the text on other areas, including Radstock, does not flag up hillside settings as a consideration. Policy NE.3 deals with the character of the town of Radstock as a whole and its landscape setting, rather than applying to sections in isolation, as NE. I does by design and BH.6 does by default.

The Landscape Character Areas do not apply to the Important Hill-sides in the area west of Church Street just south of Wells Road, the area west of Magdalene Road, and the area east of Coombend. The area south of Somervale Road to the housing boundary appears outside the boundary of Landscape Character area 12 on the proposals map, yet appears within it in the Rural Landscapes SPG Protection of

these features depends on policy BH.6 (with the possible exception of the area to the south of Somervale road just west of Radstock centre), and thereby on the information in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment (1999). This describes the town as lying at the nexus of five steep-sided valleys. There is no specific reference in the general text to the distinctive and unique character of Radstock created by this land form, or of the penetration of the town by prominent hillsides, or the combination of this with the batches on the valley sides and in the valley bottoms, which make a vital contribution to the steepness of the inclines and the enclosed nature of the valleys. The Area 2 description says, "one of the unique features of Radstock is the way the open countryside comes close to the heart of the town" (4.3.1), but this does not refer specifically to the unique character as described in paragraph C2.19 covered by Policy NE.3, and is not the same. The Area 8 description refers to steep valley sides, and although it refers to the northern tip of the character area encroaching into the urban core of the town, and refers to the linear character of the former GWR site and enclosed nature, which implies that the penetration of the hillsides is an important feature, it again does not refer specifically to the penetration by prominent hillsides that is a feature of the Important Hillsides designation.

The bulk of the references to landscape are contained within the separate area descriptions, but these are very specific, mostly describing the area feature by feature. They do not refer to all of the areas designated as important hillside in the RDDLP. The one south of Somervale road, directly west of Radstock centre in the Wellow Valley is not mentioned, and the enhancement objectives do not cover it either, being about built structures and historical integrity. In the Area 4 description, the importance of the hillside to the south and an amenity value area are flagged up, but there is no mention of the important hillside area in the west of Area 4, west of Church Street just south of Wells Road. The Area 3 description flags up the tip (RDDLP important hillside) as a focal point and Local Landscape /Nature Conservation Interest designation, but 'focal point' is rather vague and the designation is a Wansdyke Local Plan designation, which does not appear to have any equivalent designation in the B&NES Local Plan.

It appears that policy NE.12 applies mainly to the river corridors in respect of their function as wildlife features, as most of the green hillsides are largely farmland and other rough land that has suffered significant ecological degradation due to modern farming practices. The potential for future value as wildlife resources, either incidentally or through enhancement as part of an initiative/scheme, is not covered by NE.12. A policy that protects them as important landscape setting features is important to bridge this gap in order that it is still possible to create a fully functioning ecological network to aid the process of an adequate response by the natural environment to climate change and thus avoid ecological degradation and destruction.

Many of the important hillsides around Radstock, in contrast to those in Bath, are not protected as SNCIs, so are afforded no protection under Policy NE.9. If the Important Hillside designation is to remain, more consistency in its application should be considered. The tip west of Radstock Road, in Conservation Area 3, illustrated as Important Hillside, lies adjacent to another tip and also a SNCI hillside, which extends from Radstock right into Midsomer Norton, crossed by a road beside the 'important hillside' tip. Neither of these are designated as important hillsides. These prominent hillsides associated with the River Somer, a tributary of the Wellow, are important landscape features, but do not lie within the Midsomer Norton Conservation Area or within any Landscape Character Areas. They

are, however, protected as SNCIs, with the exception of the more easterly of the two tips described above. The failure to designate these seems to be at odds with other designations of Important Hillside. Although all the Important Hillside are designated in association with Radstock, some of these hillsides extend across the top of Midsomer Norton. Although they are designated mainly outside the urban areas, they are not exclusively so in Radstock, and are all inside the urban area in Bath. Some of those to the North of Midsomer Norton are further away than the far end of the SNCI in the Somer valley. The valley of the river Somer plays a significant role in the landscape character of Radstock and Midsomer Norton, radiating as it does from Radstock into Midsomer Norton and forming one of the distinctive landscape features associated with the town of Radstock. Although it passes through an urban area, it is sizeable and prominent, and should be deemed to be as much part of Radstock's landscape setting as the important hillsides within Bath.

B&NES wants to retain the Important Hillside designation, but not on the part within the GDS.1/NR2 site. The parcel lies inside the Radstock Conservation Area, and within Landscape Character Area 15 (Norton Radstock Southern Farmlands), so can be considered under both Policy BH.6 and Policy NE.1. We consider that the important hillside feature should remain within the NR2 site, extending down to the entrance to Meadow View, in order to be consistent with Policy BH.6. The grounds for this are its contribution to retention of the natural linear form flagged up in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment for Area 8. It is an integral part of the funnel-like linear element of the un-built part of the area, now an even more prominent characteristic since the removal of buildings on the track bed associated with the former Marcroft Wagon works. The document states, "the views into and out of the character area, and its natural linear form are important to its special character and need preserving". If the Important Hillside designation is to stay, we believe that this designation should be reinstated. We see no more problem with having SNCI or recreational policy designations within a site, as this one has, than with having an Important Hillside designation within a site.

In addition, Inset I 9b does not display the full extent of all of the Important Hillside. If the designation stays, this should be addressed.

Conclusion:

We do not believe that it is right that a lack of protection of important features should come about because of the inadequacies of assessment documents, and believe that it would be preferable that Policy NE.3 should be retained, as it covers an important aspect of landscape protection that is not adequately covered by the combination of other plan policies, their associated text, or the primary documents through which the policies are implemented and to amend the plan itself would necessitate the inclusion of a level of detail that would be contrary to the aim of producing a succinct plan.

It seems to us that the only alternative to retaining the policy is to change the existing plan policies and text. However, this would necessitate the inclusion of detail that should more rightly be found in the assessment documents. It would need to include an account of the distinctive features of Radstock and surrounds and an account of the landscape setting of Radstock in the text preceding Policy NE.1 in sufficient detail to make up for the inadequacies of the SPG. We think that the reference in paragraph C2.10 is too weak, and is insufficient to properly set out what is absent from the Rural Landscapes SPG and the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment. It would also be necessary to make this text equally as important as the Rural Landscapes SPG. It would also be necessary to include the wording in

paragraph C 2.19 in the text preceding policy BH.6 and to flag up features not included in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment, including the hillsides associated with the River Somer and the tips in its valley. The agreement by B&NES and the Inspector that the SPG is the primary document in application of NE.1 would have to be revisited and a proviso made with regard to the additional information. We do not believe that it is acceptable to wait for amendments to the SPG and a replacement Conservation Area document because some of these landscape features would be unprotected in the meanwhile. Further, Policy NE.3 provides a replacement for the Local Landscape/Nature Conservation designation of the Wansdyke Local Plan where the nature conservation importance is not sufficient to warrant designation as a SNCI and for important hillsides in private ownership that have not been subject to surveys that would enable an assessment to be made in this regard. The removal of the Important Hillsides designation from part of the NR2 site is at odds with preserving or enhancing the character of Conservation Area 8, and Inset 19b needs to be amended to map the full extent of all of the Important Hillsides.

Recommendations:
 We recommend that Policy NE3 and the associated text should not be deleted. We also recommend that, for reasons of consistency, that the hillsides associated with the River Somer, an integral part of the distinctive landscape that forms the setting of the historic town of Radstock, are also designated as Important hillsides. We further recommend that proposals map insert I 9b be amended to show the full extent of the areas designated as Important Hillsides.

Ref: 4266/J1
Location (None)

We object most strongly to the proposal to build on Radstock’s hillsides. This idea could only have come from someone who doesn't know Radstock. The valley of Radstock is beautiful. To destroy it by building over the hillsides is an act of crude vandalism, which will choke the town below. All towns need breathing spaces. Radstock more than others. It must be seen that we cannot take any more housing. More housing means more cars. Our road system simply cannot cope with many more cars. If NRRRC build their 210 dwellings this will be enough for Radstock to deal with. We can only hope that some sense will prevail over the disgusting proposal to build over our hillsides and that the plan is ditched before it is started. We have been reliably informed that Bath has been designated a very tiny amount on its hillside. Why is it that Radstock has to take the lion share? This to our mind shows utter contempt for our beautiful valley and this we will not tolerate.

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature

No change.

conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Modification: M/C2/11 - Policy NE.3 - Deletion of Important Hillsides from Proposals Map

Ref: 241/J16

This council also deplores the removal of categories important hillsides, parks and gardens of local historical interest and visually important open space.

Location (None)

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

No change.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3126/J215</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Retain important hillsides on Proposals Map as the Policy itself is substantially being retained.</p>	<p>character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Ref: 3630/J2</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Agree with the councils objection to the Inspector's report. The policy on important hillsides should be retained as they are not properly covered by any other specific wording elsewhere in the Proposed Plan. Development could be allowed under other Policy recommendations.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 3825/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Proposed Modification M/C2/1 1; Policy NE.3 (Important hillside at Norton We wish to register strong objection to the proposal to the removal of the hillsides around Radstock from their present 'Amenity/Visually Important' designation. We further object to them being 'downgraded'. It is vital that these very beautiful hillsides that surround our town are preserved in their natural state.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		<p>development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	
<p>Ref: 3903/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>With regard to 'The Proposed Modification No M/C2/11 Policy NE3 (Important Hillside at Norton Radstock)' I wish to lodge my objections to the new proposals to remove the 'Amenity/Visually Important' designation from the hillsides around Radstock.</p> <p>It makes me very sad to think of the impact this would have on our beautiful countryside where we now take our children, grandchildren, dogs for walks and also to look at the wonderful wildlife, trees and fauna in this area. It is just an amazing place so close to home to be able to get away from all the noise and pollution of our cities and roads — please don't take this away from us.</p> <p>It will also be devastating for the birds and wildlife if building is allowed on these hillsides and we all, surely, have a duty to do all we can to protect them as they cannot protect themselves.</p> <p>This is already a well built-up area with many commuters using the roads daily to Bath, Bristol, Wells, Glastonbury, Street, Shepton Mallet, Frome etc. With more building bringing in more people how are the roads going to take the extra traffic? I have to drive through Radstock every time I go to work and back, want to go to Bath shopping, and already it is extremely busy, time consuming and difficult to get through at peak times. It is just horrendous to think about even more people and traffic all trying to get to work in the mornings and home again in the evenings. The pollution levels here are probably already extremely high because of the</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

volume of daily traffic so I ask that this is also taken into consideration before more building is allowed which will, inevitably mean more pollution because of even more vehicles on the roads. The health of everyone in this area will be affected by this so please think of all the children around here who are walking to school five days a week and already breathing in these foul fumes without being subjected to even more.

Please consider all these things and don't let this nightmare happen here — please protect us and our children, our wonderful countryside and our wildlife. This is a relatively poor area where a lot of people live who cannot afford to live in or near Bath — for many of us the only enjoyment we get is looking at the countryside here and going for nature walks, bike rides etc. Please don't allow this to be taken away from us.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillside are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Ref: 3936/J1

Location (None)

Having read in the local newspaper about the proposal to build upon the surrounding hillside around Norton Radstock, I feel I have to write to you objecting to this ideal for it would ruin the natural landscape surrounding the inner towns of Norton Radstock. The balance of buildings and countryside is perfect as it is.

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillside make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

No change.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3937/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>I wish to protest strongly against any proposal to downgrade the protection of the Hillside, shown as shaded areas in the Map 19B that relates to Norton Radstock (East).</p> <p>I applaud BANES for opposing the Inspectors suggestion that sufficient protection already exists for these important Hillside within BANES. I believe however, that the (reported) less assertive stance adopted by BANES Authority in relation to Norton Radstock hillside as compared to those around Bath is unacceptable.</p> <p>Also included supporting map.</p>	<p>Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillside are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillside make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillside are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3938/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Please specify clearly (1) your reasons for objecting to or supporting the Proposed Modification and (2) the amendments you are seeking to the Proposed Modification</p> <p>The suggestion that the hillsides around Radstock should have their important hillsides notation removed is a retrograde proposal which must be removed from the suggested plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Radstock is a very precious place which has a distinctive heritage in both natural and built environment terms. The hills which surround this historic town are an intrinsic part of the intermeshing of the natural and built environment. Anyone visiting Radstock, and of course, those of us fortunate enough to live there, is struck by the way in which this town has been protected by its green hills 2. We are not only responsible for our environment as it is today and in our lifetimes. We, and particularly legislators and public bodies in general, are the custodians of the country for future generations. It is inconceivable that the beauty and natural environmental plusses of the hillsides which energise and inform Radstock's character as an exceptionally well-preserved mining town and cultural community, could be other than damaged by a diminution of the protection offered to the hills against the threats of building and further development. 3. By removing the Important Hillsides notation, the plan will lay open the whole of the area to simply becoming a commuter belt around Bath. 4. Once undertaken, building and other development can never be undone 5. Bath and North East Somerset is a cynical exploiter of Radstock and yet again reveals that it doesn't have any determination to preserve or commitment to the sensitive protection and limited development of what it regards as a blot on the Georgian and Roman splendour of Bath itself. A council responsible for a culturally mixed and rich area like BANES should realise that all areas need to be protected for their individual intrinsic characteristics 6. The proposal flies in the face of current environmental and planning thinking e.g.. Last week's debates about how cities should shoulder the bulk of future development since that is the most appropriate response to the current and future needs of the British population. 7. I wish only to add that I shall be making representations to the appropriate bodies on the ridiculous assumptions underlying the procedural aspects of this current consultation process. Many of us have very busy and demanding jobs and lives, many will have found it difficult to access the information. Publicity has been limited and, as usual, one cannot avoid the sense of incompetence at the least, with an accompanying lack of transparency and inclusiveness in all aspects of this latest set of dubious proposals; at worst the most cynical could be excused for asking what the real agenda of this current activity is. Certainly makes a mockery of the suggestion that it makes BANES a better place to live work and visit. <p>I wish to oppose the deletion of the Important Hillsides Notation as per M/C2/1 I (RIO.3; Policy NE.3).</p>	<p>a further modification.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 3939/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>I am writing to register objections to the proposed modification No M/C2/1 I which has the effect of deleting the "Amenity/Visually Important" designation from hillsides around Norton Radstock. Such a change of designation is necessary for development of the land. The area to be re-designated is more than 100% of the built over area of Norton Radstock. I object on the following grounds:</p> <p>Visual Impact. The area, despite development in the valleys, is basically rural and visually attractive. There are far reaching rural views with development</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

predominantly hidden in the valleys. Even a modest level of development on the hillsides will have a significant visual impact. The areas to be re-designated are extensive and, based upon the map provided, would increase the built-on area by approximately 100%. Development on this scale would blight the area visually. Inadequate Road Infrastructure. The area suffers poor road infrastructure which results in severe congestion at rush hour on roads out of the area in the direction of Bath or Bristol. The queue of traffic entering Bath on the A367 every workday morning exceeds a mile in length. The 7 mile journey from Radstock to Bath routinely takes 40+ minutes in the morning. You have to allow 75 minutes to get to the M4 (17 miles) during the morning commute. The journey to Central Bristol at rush hour takes 2 hours. There is no alternative route westwards to the MS because the roads are minor and there are bottlenecks. Getting to Bristol Airport (about 18 miles) takes 50 minutes. The problem has got noticeably worse in the last 10 years with new housing estates at Midsomer Norton and Peasedown St John. The Radstock double roundabout is a notorious traffic black spot. Because road communication is poor the area is not attracting much industrial investment. In fact the area is haemorrhaging industrial jobs partly for macro-economic reasons but also because Norton-Radstock is not a logical place to locate a business unless you only trade locally
Green Issues/Unnecessary Commuting.

Why not build the new houses nearer to where the jobs are and reduce traffic and greenhouse gas emissions. Industry is contracting in the Norton Radstock area and looks likely to continue to do so. The result is that people who live in Norton Radstock, and especially those that move into the area, do not work here; they typically work in Bath or Bristol. The additional extensive redevelopment that re-designation allows can only immediately accentuate congestion and car usage.
Social Impact.

Development of the areas to be re-designated would change the community radically. The area will become a dormitory for Bristol which is where the jobs will be. We already have serious youth unemployment and anti-social behaviour in Norton Radstock. The addition of many new households with children will just increase the number of youngsters leaving local schools and finding no work in the local area.

Lack of Public Consultation.

The proposed changes, which will affect the entire population of Norton Radstock and are of keen interest to many, appear not to have been subject to the level of public consultation appropriate considering their significance. BANES appears not to have diligently performed its public duty in consulting the public (I only found out by chance). Whether intentional or not, this planning change appears shrouded in secrecy. A decision should not be taken until the matter is publicized and the implications of the proposed change explained to the public. The public can then make representations directly or through their elected representatives.

OTHER COMMENTS

I acknowledge that more homes are required due to demographic changes (smaller households and immigration).

Development in the region (Somerset, BANES, and North Somerset) needs to be planned on a regional basis. The building of new housing needs to take account of where the jobs are, or will be, in the future. These are unlikely to be in Norton Radstock and towns like Shepton Mallet whilst the roads remain so poor. Further contraction in manufacturing employment appears inevitable.

Major expansion in housing needs to go hand in hand with attracting new

This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

employers into the area or providing better road links to where the jobs currently are. The sort of project required is a dual carriageway linking the M5 and the M4 running south of Bristol (e.g. Chippenham to Weston-Super-Mare). A project of this scale would transform the economy of all of the small country towns south of the River Avon and east of the M5 whilst reducing congestion in Bristol and Bath. I appreciate that BANES is just one player of several in planning at this scale. There are still a lot of brownfield sites in the Norton Radstock area. We should be developing these sites before building over the countryside. Piecemeal development is likely to result from the proposed re-designation. A disproportionately large share of new housing for BANES could end up being shoe homed into one community which is already experiencing economic and social problems. Such a development is likely to have serious environmental and social repercussions. The Government needs to be challenged over the matter of inadequate transport infrastructure investment and major developments should be contingent upon the necessary investment being made. With improved infrastructure and regional planning, the necessary expansion in housing could be spread more widely thereby avoiding one community being overwhelmed with a disproportionate share.

Ref: 3940/J1

Location (None)

I strongly object to the proposal to re-designate or downgrade the fields around Radstock for other uses.

This area has always been regarded as a traditional mining town, it would be a sacrilege to destroy the old tradition of the town and bury the natural beauty under a concrete slab. The roads through Radstock are already heavily congested without a further large increase to the traffic which would cause even more horrendous bottlenecks.

I am finding it difficult to express my horror at the proposed destruction of this small mining town.

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

No change.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the

Ref: 3941/J1

Location (None)

In regard to the redesignation of the hillside around Radstock. I am opposed to the downgrading of the green belt (under any circumstance) around Radstock, due to the amount of traffic that this will generate.
 We have lost most of our employment in this area, which means that the biggest majority of the people being housed will have to migrate to other parts to find employment.
 This will add to our already congested inadequate country roads and this will lead to more global warming.

need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

No change.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

<p>Ref: 3942/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>The proposal to downgrade these hillsides from Amenity/Visually Important is, in general, wrong because they are visually important. Radstock has a strange settlement pattern with concentrations of housing on the top of the hills where the old pitheads were (Tynning, Clandown. Writhlington, Haydon and Westfield) and less in the centre where the old railways converged. Unlike Bath, we cannot safeguard our skyline: it is already built on. We do not have an historic town centre, but we do have easy access to open countryside. We have partially safeguarded that with the Greenway and NCN24. We also can always look out onto some greenery, needed to balance the visual impact of the dense housing in the area. Some of this land is 'gruffy' i.e. subject to subsidence from previous mining The meadows along the Snails Brook between Haydon and Westfield are used a lot for amenity value.</p> <p>I am a director of the Norton Radstock Regeneration Company, whose application for 210 dwellings along the old railway line to Frome is pending. In general, I am in favour of bringing more people into the centre of Radstock. But regeneration is meant to improve an area, not remove its virtues. Much of the land proposed for downgrading should be kept in the amenity/visually important category. Any downgrading should be targeted much more precisely than here. Of course some of it could be used for other uses, as long as they do not jeopardise the things that we do enjoy in Radstock. We must not throw the baby out with the bathwater.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 3943/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>I wish to protest most strongly against any proposal to downgrade the protection of the hillsides, shown as shaded areas in the may 19B that relates to Norton Radstock (East). I applaud BANES for opposing the Inspectors suggestion that sufficient protection already exists for these Important Hillsides within BANES. I believe however that the (reported) less assertive stance adopted by BANES authority in relation to Norton Radstock Hillsides as compared to those around Bath is unacceptable.</p> <p>The inevitable congestion and pollution from traffic which exists in the centre of Radstock, renders the protection of the surrounding green hillsides around the town as extremely important for the health and amenity values for everyone.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3944/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>I object to the Governments proposal to remove the hillsides around Radstock. The present road form Radstock to Bath is subsiding badly and is a concern for a lot of people living in Bristol Road. If houses were built behind, it would make it a lot worse.</p> <p>I think they should get on with doing the Main Road as was supposed to happen in September. The roads will not take more traffic.</p>	<p>development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3969/J4</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Does this country's Planning Inspectorate have a full understanding of What makes the City of Bath a World Heritage Site?</p> <p>The green open spaces and trees that surround the city and frame its historic architecture give every citizen or visitor a sense of "countryside in the city" wherever they are.</p> <p>A 'one-size-fits-all' national planning policy that demands, like an alien, the deletion of conservation policies and maps relating to Important Hillside and Parks and Gardens of local historic interest, is in my professional opinion confusing. Is this deliberate? It is likely to lead to lasting damage to the qualities that make Bath unique and cause irreversible harm to its historic integrity.</p> <p>Wherever new development takes place, three main points must be born in mind. The scale and size of buildings, in relation to their location in the city, their architectural style and colour and texture of the wall and roof materials themselves are the three key elements that must respect and learn from varied harmony that is Bath's heritage.</p> <p>If the relationship between any of these three key elements is wrong the result is urban landscape despoliation and impoverishment of all.</p> <p>Sad examples of miss-placed endeavour in the past can be seen in the straight lines of the Snow Hill flats which wreck the view from the National Trust gardens at Prior Park. More recent, but as incongruous is the brutish grey panelling of the Unite Student Accommodation on the Lower Bristol Road which vandalises the breathtaking view of Bath's crescents from Lansdown View, Twerton.</p> <p>Great care must ensure proposals for the Western riverside Area do not perpetuate such blundering. Follow the examples of good building not bad.</p> <p>Involvement in coaching many sports at grass roots level leaves no one in any doubt about the value of open spaces.</p> <p>It is no excuse for selling off and building on playing fields or open space to say that a sports hail is a better alternative.</p> <p>Like any sports facility, Playing Fields need fencing, maintenance, protection from dog fouling, appropriate lighting and changing facilities. It is no reason to build on</p>	<p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillside are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillside make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to</p>	<p>No change.</p>

them because facilities are lacking. Major charitable trusts, The Football Association, The Rugby Football Union, The England and Wales Cricket Board, British Athletics, the Lawn Tennis Association and other sporting bodies support the work of the National Playing Fields Association and similar bodies. There are always funds for sports fields provided people are given the go ahead and are permitted to access them

Short term mindset often frustrates important initiative. The cost implications to the nation's and the City of Bath's health of building freely on open spaces in cities and towns are planning factors rarely considered by senior Planning Inspectors. Do Governments make sure such things are not measured "targets" and therefore not part of the remit when really "joined up government" would insist that it was? There are "targets" for building on "brown land" — land that has been built on before. "Brown Land" used to refer to redundant industrial land, now it can refer to a local pub with a much used and enjoyed garden. National Planning Policy guidelines define some gardens, the green lungs of a city as "brown land". How curious!

The profit from shops big or small run by local families mostly stays in the locality. In contrast, all the profits made by national retail shops and supermarkets are siphoned off away from the area often to fuel mega city bonuses of the banks and institutions that own them in this country and, increasingly, abroad.

Is it then a little strange in this light that proposals for multi-national "supermarkets" or "foodstore" are quickly cropping up all over the city, building on playing fields, or opening in a closed post office here, or a garage there? Who is really in charge, behind the scenes? May we be told why?

Proposals for "a foodstore" such as that seemingly to be forced onto the playing fields opposite the site of St Martin's hospital usually distort traffic flows, encourage car-borne shopping and make life for local walkers, cyclists, local residents and traders alike a losing hell. The cricket ground at St Martin's hospital itself where generations of local people played cricket has already been lost and is at the moment a building site. Was the priority given to recreation by our forebears misplaced? How has our local world been so turned upside down? By whom?

This is not fair. It is not market forces. Local shop keepers and business owners are "cut down to size" every generation by death duties and inheritance taxes. Napoleon, who learnt to respect this nation of little shopkeepers would approve. Little people paying a tax not paid by multi-nationals. Great! Local shop keepers cannot "wine and dine" the great and good like the multi-nationals can. Does this monopolistic "edge" come from multi-national business getting "close" to those in power to get regulations that suit them? It seems to work.

In 1942, on 25 April, German Luftwaffe planes including Dornier bombers were sent to attack Bath precisely because it was an "historic" city that High Command wished to destroy. They used the international historic guide, the "Baedeker", to get the right place. It would seem the Planning Inspectorate choose not to be as informed. It seems to the observer that they choose deliberately to fog the issue about whether Bath is special or not. Such niceties seem to be ignored. There seems a deliberate wish on their part to subvert the idea that there exist Cities like Bath and smaller market towns which are special, that are loved. Does it seem there might be another agenda? Secret? Instead, is it acceptable they "Cry Havoc!" or at least the Planning Inspectorate equivalent? Why? War on what? On quality? On cherished heritage? On shop keepers? On sports fields? On green hillsides? On spaces for trees?

We need more houses very badly, we need more priority bus routes, more safe

Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

cycle ways, better footpaths, spaces like Queen Square and the Circus are needed to be treated as recreational community urban spaces not roundabouts, we need even trams without overhead wires say the far sighted, but we are given more supermarkets. Where does this madness come from? From the denizens of a sinister secretive Dornier Wood? From the Department of Environment? From the Department of what?

I wish to support in the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan, all those policies specially conceived and designed to ensure we do not destroy our heritage of open space, fine buildings and Green Belt natural setting which so clearly and finely define the qualities that make Bath unique. I support policies that ensure that when we build we leave a legacy which our heirs will wish to cherish, not feel embarrassed about.

Ref: 4269/J1

Location (None)

We write to say how sorry we are to learn that someone is proposing to allow development on the Hillside of Radstock.

My wife and I have lived in Radstock for over 60 years and have witnessed many changes from a working town with two railway stations and now all that our planners can imagine is to build more houses for the overspill of other towns etc. No one seems to know what to do with traffic except to pass it through the town and shoppers, according to the latest plan. Also what is going to happen to existing services? Also, no additional employment will mean more commuting and extra traffic which Radstock does not need.

(Bristol Road is already being used as a rat run, with the pavement used as a car park.)

Radstock was recently described as a unique town built of natural stone and worth preserving as such. Who is going to preserve our town and who is thinking about the quality of life for our residents?

I hope that you will take notice of residents comments.

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

No change.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

		The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.	
<p>Ref: 4276/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>With reference to the new proposals set out for Radstock, the proposed modification to M/C2/11 Policy NC3 Important hillside at Norton Radstock and also recommendation Number R103.</p> <p>We are strongly against this as it will affect wildlife and the beautiful countryside. We have just moved from Bath and would not like to see what has happened there happen in Radstock.</p> <p>Also the amount of traffic trying to travel to Bath for work/college every morning is terrible. More buildings, more cars, more problems. These proposals are just short sightedness.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 4277/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>I strongly object to the removal of the Amenity/Visually Important designation from the hillsides around Radstock/Midsomer Norton.</p>	<p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 4277/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>I strongly object to the removal of the Amenity/Visually Important designation from the hillsides around Radstock/Midsomer Norton.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character.</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4037/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Bath</p>	<p>M/C2/11. Policy NE3 (Important Hillside at Norton Radstock & Recommendation No. R10.3. Extract from Inset 19 (Eastern Part) & 19B - Norton Radstock.</p> <p>I wish it to be known that I object most strongly to any change from their present status as 'Amenity/Visually Important' designated land, to the hillsides around Radstock.</p> <p>These hillsides provide relief from the ever increasing housing development forced on this area in recent years, visual relief and relief from the increased pollution that results from yet more housing.</p> <p>To degrade this status would no doubt eventually lead to development on these hillsides and the destruction of the character of Radstock.</p>	<p>This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 644/J8</p> <p>Location Important Hillside Norton Radstock</p>	<p>Reason for Objection: The fact that this area of Welton Vale on the South Slope of the valley of Welton Brook should remain designated as "Important Hillside" as was specified on the map (Inset 19 - western part + 19a). Please reinstate "Important Hillside" on the map itself. This serves to safeguard the areas an attractive piece of open country side forming a marked boundary between Radstock and Midsomer Norton.</p> <p>The farm buildings at Manor Farm are currently being modified to form office and workshops. This will make for further traffic movement on Millards Hill which is already blighted with excessive traffic.</p>	<p>conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillside are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	No change.
		<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillside make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature</p>	

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 652/J6</p> <p>Location Important Hillside Norton Radstock</p>	<p>Object to the removal of "Important Hillside" from the map because it makes specific hillside more vulnerable to a future change of opinion. Leaving it on the Map would be an added safeguard to the specific Hills between Midsomer Norton and Radstock. Removing the Important Hillside from the map leaves those areas open to future exploitation: piecemeal and by strength. This is a sensitive area which maintains the identities and characters of MSN & Radstock as separate entities and yet affords an area to be enjoyed by both towns. It is a well used amenity containing the greenway. Removal of the title from the map makes it more vague and less of a safeguard</p>	<p>conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillside are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification. For information the Manor Farm buildings did not lie within the important hillside designation.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillside make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3781/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I object to the removal of the designation 'important hillside' from the hillsides around Norton-Radstock, while retaining it contrary to the inspector's recommendation. For Bath the hillsides are what made Radstock unique. They should be protected because of their environmental and ecological significance. However the NRR/Bellway planning application proves they do not have adequate protection.</p>	<p>The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification. For information, the Manor Farm buildings did not lie within the important hillside designation.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	No change.

<p>Ref: 3781/J4</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>Specifically, we object to the following amendments:</p> <p>A) Proposed Modification No M/C2/I 1 Policy NE.3 (Important Hillside at Norton Radstock) and Recommendation Number R10.3 Extract from Inset 19(Eastern Part) and 19B – Norton Radstock. On p121 Statement of Decisions the Council states that it disagrees with the policy of removing the designation 'important hillside'. It will keep the policy which seeks to protect the important hillsides in Bath and Norton Radstock which make an important contribution to local character, but will not show them on the proposals map. 'Reason: Whilst there are other policies in the Local Plan which may be used indirectly to contribute to this objective, the hillsides which do not have specific protection of the particular contribution that they make to the local character of Bath and Norton Radstock, The Inspector is only partially correct in suggesting that there are other policies in the Plan which achieve the same objective. Development which would potentially affect the hillsides may be permissible under other policies. This is of particular significance in the World Heritage Site of Bath. In Norton Radstock the Inspector is only partially correct in stating that the hillsides are covered by the landscape character assessment. The Inspector's concern that this policy amounts to a local landscape designation is accepted and the policy will no longer serve to protect the landscape qualities of the hillsides.'</p> <p>We agree that the designation 'important hillside' is necessary to protect those hillsides, whatever their formal status as 'areas of outstanding natural beauty' or of 'special scientific importance' because it is the hillsides which give Norton Radstock its distinctive special character and make it a healthy and desirable place in which to live.</p> <p>The hillsides are important aesthetically, economically, for the development of tourism, and environmentally, for the preservation of wildlife. Our own Fox (see attached photograph in the electronic version) even has deer on it. It is clear from the developments which are already taking place, that there is insufficient protection under the 'other policies' to which the Inspector refers. This applies as much to natural hills such as the tumulus crowned hill in Kilmersdon Road behind Meadow View as to the batches at Tynning and Norton As stated above, we also depreciate the amendment which gives Bath hillsides protection, but not those in Norton Radstock.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 3840/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I would like to object to the redesignation from its present status. I believe that these hillsides are amenity/visually important to all residents and all who pass through the area.</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3843/J1</p> <p>Location Important Hillside Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I wish to register my objection to the above proposal that areas of hillside around Radstock have their designation of Amenity/Visual Importance removed. I trust that this communication will be recorded.</p>	<p>development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3855/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposed building on hillsides around Radstock. I live next to one of these sites, behind the Radstock library, which has now been made into a recreation area that is always kept tidy and looks very attractive. I can look out of my window and see Jubilee Tump and right through the beautiful valley, including the hill sloping down from the football field to the railway. To build on any of these fields would completely spoil a lovely little town. I hope my protest and hopefully others, will make the proposers of this scheme realise that they are making a terrible mistake.</p>	<p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to</p>	

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3856/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed re-designation of the hillside around Radstock. I am a resident living at Bristol Road, Radstock and I feel that the land between Bristol Road and the New Bath Road (A367) is unsuitable for any future possible development domestic or commercial, due to the geography of the land and the access to the land.</p> <p>Any development would also bring increased traffic to the town, and Radstock is already under pressure from local and through traffic. I would think that this also applies to other areas included in the proposal.</p>	<p>Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3857/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I am 61 years of age and have lived within a stones throw of one of these proposed sites (i.e. the field behind Radstock Town football field). This is an outstanding area of open countryside with wonderful views of the surrounding valleys. It has been enjoyed by old and young alike. If houses are ever built here it would be a travesty.</p>	<p>a further modification.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 3858/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>I am writing to lodge my strong objections to the proposed building on the hillsides on and around Radstock; this would completely devastate the town and surrounding districts. Radstock is designated as a heritage town and is unique in character - we are already under the threat of 210 houses being built on the Railway Land in the centre of the town, to which I am also opposed.</p> <p>Have any of the planners been in the town and looked at its situation - I think not!!</p>	<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it</p>	No change.

This ridiculous proposal should be thrown out immediately and I urge the people concerned to vote unanimously against this proposal.

I was born in Radstock and have lived here all my life and the thought of this happening to the areas fills me with dread.

was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.

There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Ref: 3904/J1

Location (None)

Norton Radstock

I am writing to strongly object to the plans by BANES to remove the amenity/visually important designation from the Hillsides around Radstock. If this happens then building on these sites will only be a matter of time. There will be enough building in Radstock spoiling these lovely hillsides. BANES must think carefully on this and listen to the objections put forward.

This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local

No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4039/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>M/C2/11. Policy NE.3 (Important Hillside at Norton Radstock & Recommendation No. R10.3. Extract from Inset 19 (Eastern Part) & 19B - Norton Radstock.</p> <p>I wish it to be known that I object most strongly to any change from their present status as 'Amenity/Visually Important' designated land, to the hillsides around Radstock.</p> <p>These hillsides provide relief from the ever increasing housing development forced on this area since 1974, visual relief and relief from the increased pollution that results from yet more housing.</p> <p>To degrade this status would no doubt eventually lead to development on these hillsides and the destruction of the character of Radstock, a process which seems to have begun in 1974, with the creation of the so-called county of Avon. One had hoped that things would change when the Bristol-based 'Avon' was replaced by Bath and North-East Somerset council but alas this has not happened. Whereas from 1974 to 1996 the whole area was being sacrificed for the greater glory of Bristol, it seems that since 1996 Bath has replaced Bristol as the town for which we are being sacrificed.</p> <p>When protection is removed from the hillsides around Bath, only then would I consider there is any legitimate case for so doing at Radstock.</p>	<p>distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	
		<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillside. In Bath the Important Hillside fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4040/J1</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>M/C2/11. Policy NE3 (Important Hillside at Norton Radstock & Recommendation No. R10.3. Extract from Inset 19 (Eastern Part) & 19B - Norton Radstock.</p> <p>I wish it to be known that I object most strongly to any change from their present status as 'Amenity/Visually Important' designated land, to the hillsides around Radstock.</p> <p>These hillsides provide relief from the ever increasing housing development forced on this area in recent years, visual relief and relief from the increased pollution that results from yet more housing.</p> <p>To degrade this status would no doubt eventually lead to development on these hillsides and the destruction of the character of Radstock.</p>	<p>would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p> <p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p>	No change.

			The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.	
Ref:	4041/J1	M/C2/11. Policy NE3 (Important Hillside at Norton Radstock & Recommendation No. R10.3. Extract from Inset 19 (Eastern Part) & 19B - Norton Radstock. I wish it to be known that I object most strongly to any change from their present status as 'Amenity/Visually Important' designated land, to the hillsides around Radstock. These hillsides provide relief from the ever increasing housing development forced on this area in recent years, visual relief and relief from the increased pollution that results from yet more housing. To degrade this status would no doubt eventually lead to development on these hillsides and the destruction of the character of Radstock.	This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.	No change.
Location	(None) Norton Radstock			
			The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.	
Ref:	4042/J1	We view with some concern the proposals which are now under review for changes to the Local Plan particularly those relating to the Radstock Hillsides. Nikolas Pevsner once wrote that "Radstock is really desperately ugly..... " That was when it was still an active coal mining town. Since then, some 50 years hence, much has been achieved to restore Radstock to an attractive country town, yet still retaining some tangible links with the past. One of the attractions is its setting, and the hillsides which form the approach to the town from all directions are to be fought for and saved. But it is not only the physical appearance which is important for the council to consider. The underlying geological make up in these hillsides and valleys is very complex as an inspection of the relevant Geological maps will indicate. Development on whatever future scale would be accompanied by major civil engineering works not only to protect the hillsides and new development but also maintain the stability for the existing development which has been undertaken in the past, perhaps without too much knowledge or thought of the consequences. Please do not allow the "whims" of some remote being to dictate the future of the appearance of our town, its semi- rural setting and in the process ruin what has been achieved in restoring Radstock to its current state. This letter is written on behalf of all the members of the Radstock Women's Institute.	This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.	No change.
Location	(None) Norton Radstock			
			There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World	

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4046/J2</p> <p>Location (None) Norton Radstock</p>	<p>The declassification of the hillsides around the Norton-Radstock area should not be allowed. These hillsides define the community and many of them have special worth archeologically and also as indicators of the social history of the area. If the designation is removed there is a possibility of the area becoming another urban sprawl, linking up all the areas from Peasedown St John, Westfield, Haydon through the Great Mills area to Farrington Gurney. It is only the retention of the hillsides that prevents this.</p>	<p>Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).</p> <p>The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.</p> <p>There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the</p>	

character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).

The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.

Modification: M/C2/12 - Natural Environment

Ref:	4035/J4	Important hillsides must be protected as they form a vital part of the character of Bath. There must be no further building on green spaces or hillsides.	This issue was considered via the Local Plan Inquiry and the Council's response to the Inspector's recommendation (Inspector's Report paras 10.18-22). The Inspector recommended deletion of the designation partly because she considered that the objective was already covered by overarching Policy NE.1 which seeks to protect landscape character. This was accepted in part by the Council although it was considered necessary to retain a general policy (revised Policy NE.3) seeking to prevent development which would harm the contribution open hillsides make to the character of Bath and Norton Radstock. The removal of the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map does not imply that development is proposed or will be permitted. In addition to Policy NE.3, Policy NE.1 states that development which does not either conserve or enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape will not be permitted.	No change.
Location	(None)	Bath	There are also other policies in the Local Plan which will assist in safeguarding Important Hillsides. In Bath the Important Hillsides fall within the World Heritage Site designation (Policy BH.1) and, with one small exception, the Conservation Area (Policy BH.6). Many are also designated nature conservation sites and so any development proposal would be assessed against the relevant policies on these issues (Policies NE.8 – NE.12). With regard to Norton-Radstock, in the Radstock Conservation Area includes extensive open areas around the town and in particular clause (v) of Policy BH.6 recognises the need to protect landscape contributing to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The designated hillsides are also outside the defined HDBs and new housing development would not normally be acceptable in such areas (Policy HG.4).	
			The representation raises no new issues warranting a further modification.	

Modification: M/C2/14 - Natural Environment

Ref: 1568/J25 /s	The trust supports the removal of the word 'generally' from the last sentence so as to strengthen the statement that 'ancient woodlands are important for wildlife....'.	Support noted.	No change.
Location (None)	Ancient woodland is our richest habitat for wildlife, being from home to more species of conservation concern than any other habitat, and therefore it cannot be replaced.		

Modification: M/C2/15 - Natural Environment

Ref: 1568/J26	Whilst we support the addition of the phrase 'Ancient trees', we are objecting to the statement that '...they are in the latter stage of their life, a/though this can be the longest period.' We would like to see a further addition to this sentence — '. . . the longest period, as well as the richest in terms of ecology, landscape and culture Reasons	Noted. This can be treated as a non-material change and the Local Plan updated accordingly prior to its adoption.	No change.
Location (None)	Old and significant individual trees are an important part of our cultural, landscape and wildlife heritage. They resonate with the history of the landscape and form milestones in the lives of individual people and communities. Trees also make a significant contribution to the urban environment both in visual terms and in helping to abate air pollution and create oxygen. There is a need to ensure that this ancient tree heritage continues in a sustainable way so that future generations will be able to enjoy the benefits of ancient trees after the current specimens are gone. It has been estimated that Britain may be home to around 80% of northern Europe's ancient trees and therefore we have a great responsibility in looking after them. The presence of ancient woodland in Bath & North East Somerset suggests that there could be significant concentrations of individual ancient trees about which we may not know. Ancient and mature trees harbour a unique array of wildlife and the Trust and the Ancient Tree Forum (ATF) wish to see this priceless legacy conserved for the benefit of all in our society. It is important that there is no further avoidable loss of ancient trees through development pressure, mismanagement or poor practice. The ATF would like to see all such trees recognised as historical, cultural and wildlife monuments scheduled under TPOs and highlighted in plans so they are properly valued in planning decision-making. There is also a need for policies ensuring good management of ancient trees, the development of a succession of future ancient trees through new Street tree planting and new wood pasture creation, and to raise awareness and understanding of the value and importance of ancient trees. Changes We would therefore like to see addition of the words 'as well as the richest in terms of ecology, landscape and culture' to the revised penultimate sentence of this paragraph.		

Modification: M/C2/16 - Policy NE.4

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 1568/J27 /s Location (None)	The trust supports the addition of the word 'historic' to sub-para i. of this policy, so as to strengthen the adverse impacts where development will not be permitted. Historic connections with ancient woodland and especially ancient trees are of great interest to many people and provide a valuable conduit for re-connecting communities with their natural environment.	Support noted.	No change.
Ref: 3116/J173 Location (None)	Support a comprehensive protective policy for trees and woodlands. Detail is needed on what 'compensatory provision' will mean in practise in amenity, wildlife, cultural, productive and Carbon Dioxide emission terms.	Support noted. However comment on last para of Policy NE.5 is not duly made as it does not relate to a modification to the policy.	No change.
Ref: 3116/J176 Location (None)	Support: a comprehensive protective policy for trees and woodland. Detail is needed on what 'compensatory provision' will mean in practise, in amenity, wildlife, cultural, productive and carbon dioxide emission terms.	Support noted. However comment on last para of Policy NE.5 is not duly made as it does not relate to a modification to the policy.	No change.
Ref: 3126/J217 /s Location (None)	Support because strengthened by modification.	Support noted.	No change.

Modification: M/C2/19 - Natural Environment

Ref: 731/J27 Location (None)	The Parish Council objects to the extension of the boundary of the "Forest of Avon" - Avon no longer exists as a County and just where are all the trees that make a forest?	The Forest of Avon was originally established in the early 1980s and the boundary was drawn to encompass Bristol and a wide swathe of surrounding 'urban fringe'. In Bath & NE Somerset it extends southwards from Bristol to Corston, Compton Dando, Pensford and Chew Magna. More recently the Forest of Avon Partnership members representing North Somerset, South Gloucestershire and Bath & North East Somerset Councils have discussed the potential to extend the boundary so that the activities and benefits of the community forest could be spread more widely across the area and to raise its sub-regional profile. The Partnership agreed in early 2005 that the extension of the Forest boundary should be examined further and a consultation process be undertaken. It was concluded that the extension of the Forest of Avon boundary was welcomed by the community and its representatives and should be put forward for endorsement in the three unitary authorities affected. The extension to the boundary was subsequently endorsed by the Council on 30 June 2006 and the Proposals Map amended accordingly.	No change.
---	--	---	------------

Modification: M/C2/32 - NE.8 Burlledge Sidelands and Meadows

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 731/J26</p> <p>Location Burlledge Sidelands and Meadows Stowey Sutton</p>	<p>The Parish Council would like to know why there should be an additional SSSI at Burlledge Sidelands and Meadows.</p>	<p>English Nature has responsibility for identifying and protecting the SSSIs in England under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). The Council was notified of the designation of the Burlledge Sidelands and Meadows SSSI in November 2005 after a four month period of consultation with the owners and occupiers. It is nationally important for a wide variety of species-rich unimproved neutral grassland communities characterised by crested dog's tail <i>Cynosurus cristatus</i> and common knapweed <i>Centaurea nigra</i>. The designation is shown on the Proposals Map as are all other SSSIs and protected under Policy NE.8</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Modification: M/C2/43 - Policy NE.12</p>			
<p>Ref: 1568/J28</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Object We object to the addition of sub-para a. ('any harm to the feature is minimised').</p> <p>Reasons Policy NE. 12 includes woodlands and veteran trees, and thus by implication ancient woodland, which is an irreplaceable semi-natural habitat. Ancient woodland (land that has been continually wooded since at least AD1600), is our richest habitat for wildlife being home to more species of conservation concern than any other habitat (supporting some 232 species as outlined in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, 1994). Ancient woods form a unique link to the primeval wildwood habitat that covered most of lowland Britain following the last Ice Age. Ancient woodland sites are irreplaceable - the interactions between plants, animals, soils, climate and people are unique and have developed over hundreds of years. These eco-systems cannot be re-created and with only just over 2% of the land area in Great Britain, and 1.84% in BAN ES, covered by ancient woodland, we cannot afford any more of this finite resource to be lost forever. It is therefore essential that this habitat be protected from development.</p> <p>The Government's policy on ancient and native woodland states that "The existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland." It also states that "The cultural heritage associated with ancient woodland and veteran trees should be protected and conserved." (Keepers of time - A statement of policy for England's ancient and native woodland, 2005, pg 10)</p> <p>Planning Policy Statement 9 on Biodiversity and Geological Conservation clearly states: "Ancient woodland is a valuable biodiversity resource both for the diversity of species and for its longevity as woodland. Once lost it cannot be recreated. Local planning authorities should identify any areas of ancient woodland in their areas that do not have statutory protection (e.g. as an SSSI). They should not grant planning permission for any developments that would result in its loss or deterioration... Aged or 'veteran' trees found outside ancient woodland are also particularly valuable for biodiversity and their loss should be avoided. Planning authorities should encourage the conservation of such trees as part of development proposals." (ODPM, PPS9, 2005, paragraph 10).</p> <p>Under section 74 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, the Government has a statutory duty to publish lists of priority conservation habitats. Under section</p>	<p>Noted. However, to reiterate the Council's previous response, the policy wording is considered sufficiently robust in that if a valuable habitat, such as an ancient woodland, cannot be replaced in the terms required in the policy, the proposal should be refused.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, all public authorities now have a statutory duty to conserve biodiversity. The just published revised UK BAP targets includes a new Habitat Action Plan for Native Woodland which specifies a clear 'maintenance' target of no more loss of ancient woodland. It is therefore axiomatic that Sedgemoor District Council has a statutory obligation to protect ancient woodland.

In addition, the SW Woodland & Forestry Framework 2005 (Forestry Commission) sets out in Objective N1, A in Section 5 – 'Natural Resources and the Environment' an action to 'Ensure ancient wood/and is protected against development through the planning system'

Semi-natural ancient woodland has acquired its unique characteristics over centuries, even millennia, and its cultural history and present day significance are inextricably bound up with its location. It therefore deserves absolute protection avoiding any harm or mitigation.

Changes

We would therefore like this policy amended to provide absolute protection for irreplaceable semi-natural features like ancient woodland.

Modification: M/C2/44 - Natural Environment

Ref: 1427/J241 /s	The Environment Agency supports the deletion of the word 'public' 'private' supplies require equal protection from pollution.	Support noted.	No change.
Location (None)			

Modification: M/C2/46 - Natural Environment

Ref: 576/J1	I suggest amending references to PPG25 as this has been replaced by recently published PPS25 and DCLG Direction Document 04/2006 which comes into operation in January 2007.	Noted. This can be treated as a non-material change under Regulation 29 and the Local Plan updated accordingly prior to its adoption.	No change.
Location (None)			

Ref: 1427/J240	Whilst generally supportive the Environment Agency objects to the modification in order to seek wording changes:	Noted. This can be treated as a non-material change under Regulation 29 and the Local Plan updated accordingly prior to its adoption.	No change.
Location (None)	The word 'flood plain' should be replaced by 'Flood zones 2 and 3' or where.....risk from flooding '(e.g. ground water, surface water, sewers, other water bodies)'. The changes suggested will better reflect both PPG 25 and the newly published PPS 25.		

Modification: M/C2/48 - Natural Environment

Ref: 1427/J239	The Environment Agency is generally supportive of the modifications to this paragraph but objects in order to seek wording changes:	Noted. This can be treated as a non-material change under Regulation 29 and the Local Plan updated accordingly prior to its adoption.	No change.
Location (None)	Indicative flood zones defined by the Environment Agency are shown on the Proposals Maps. These zones are reviewed on a regular basis by the Environment Agency.		

These changes more accurately reflect the information provided by the Environment Agency.

Modification: M/C2/49 - Policy NE.14 - Flood risk

Ref: 43/J2 /s	This council applaud the insertion of the final paragraph i.e. Flood Risk assessments. This support is provided in order to underline, and avoid, the dangers to the interests of potential residents or other users of sites proposed to be developed in such risk areas.	Support noted.	No change.
Location (None)			
Ref: 574/J21 /s	We support the inclusion of a requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment for all planning applications located within an indicative flood plain shown on this proposals map or where there is other evidence that it is at risk from flooding.	Support noted.	No change.
Location (None)			
Ref: 1427/J237	Whilst the Environment Agency is generally supportive of the Policy wording we feel it necessary to object to seek wording changes. The changes sought refer to the concluding paragraph. At present this is an exclusive Policy. Large developments situated outside the flood plain i.e. in flood zone 1, can of themselves create a flood hazard. Applications for such development should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment with a main focus on surface water management. The following changes are recommended to reflect this. 'All planning applications located within the flood zones shown on the Proposal Maps, all major applications and, those where there is other,.....' Please be aware that PPS 25 was published on 7 December 2006. This provides further guidance on the need for a FRA. It also provides guidance on the need to undertake a strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and the exception test. It may be helpful to the Plan reader to identify that your Authority are to carry out a SFRA and the anticipated timescale for its delivery.	This wording was recommended by the Inspector taking into account previous Environment Agency objections. Clause (ii) will not allow development that either causes flooding or is subject to flooding. The final paragraph of Policy NE.14 essentially relates to procedural matters and covers all circumstances where a flood risk assessment is considered necessary. The Council and the Environment Agency have the tools to require developers to supply evidence to demonstrate whether a development proposal will create a flooding problem. The Council is in the process of commissioning an SFRA.	No change.
Location (None)			

Modification: M/C2/59 - Policy NE.16

Ref: 3126/J216	Object to the last sentence in particular which implies that development on lower grade agricultural land is acceptable. This conflicts with the stated intention of RPG10 1.27 that land is a finite resource and to make the best use of it. Priority must be given to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings. Reword e.g. "Development, after passing the RPG10 sequential test, should be....."	Policy NE.16 does not prohibit the development of the best and most versatile land but indicates that the protection afforded by the policy can be outweighed by the need for the development or sustainability considerations affecting lower grade land. This accords with advice in PPS7. The Inspector merely redrafted the policy for the sake of clarity.	No change.
Location (None)			

Chapter C3. Built & Historic Environment

Modification: M/C3/7 - Policy BH.1

Ref: 120/J389 /s	Support the strengthened wording of the modification.	Support noted.	No change.
Location (None)			

Modification: M/C3/22 - Built & Historic Environment

Ref: 3186/J20	We object to the deletion of the designation "Parks & Gardens of Local Historic Interest" and the consequent amendments to paras. C3.54 & 56 and Policy BH9, removal of policy BH10 and removal from the Local Plan Proposal map. We would like the designation to be reinstated as it is not clear that these important areas will receive similar or adequate protection from future planning development under the proposed modifications. Within the last ten years both areas in Chew Magna with the designation have been subject to development proposals and it is our belief that protection is essential as pressure for development on these sites is likely to increase not decrease.	<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how</p>	No change.
Location (None)			

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4035/J5</p> <p>Location (None)</p> <p>Bath</p>	<p>The local plan must protect Bath's important green spaces. Inspectors recommendations must be rejected and deletions restored.</p>	<p>features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p> <p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Modification: M/C3/23 - Built & Historic Environment

<p>Ref: 4035/J3</p> <p>Location (None) Bath</p>	<p>The local plan must protect Bath's public green spaces. The Inspectors recommendations must be rejected and the deletions restored.</p>	<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	-------------------

Modification: M/C3/24 - Built & Historic Environment

<p>Ref: 4035/J2</p> <p>Location (None) Bath</p>	<p>The local plan must protect Bath's important/ public open green spaces. The Inspectors recommendations must be rejected and the deletions restored.</p>	<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	---	-------------------

lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.

Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.

Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.

The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.

A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Modification: M/C3/26 - Deletion of Policy BH.10

Ref: 241/J14

This council also deplores the removal of categories important hillsides, parks and gardens of Local Historical Interest and Visually Important Open Space.

Location (None)

The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from

No change.

Ref: 362/J5	We understand that following an inspectors report into the local plan, that protection that applied to historic parks and gardens is to be removed. We strongly object to this removal. If we understand correctly the Council will have to justify each park protection separately. We feel that the Council should keep the existing protection to these areas and if necessary make a case for each.	<p>protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
Location (None)		<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the</p>	

Ref: 564/J46	We object to the removal of Policy BH10. This will potentially reduce the protection of Local Parks and Gardens of Historical interest, many of which are a very important part of the setting of Baths listed buildings. They also have important informal leisure potential.	<p>policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
Location (None)		<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the</p>	

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 686/J216</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>The Council agreed the Inspector's recommendation to delete all references to Parks and Gardens of Local Historical Interest. The Trust strongly disagrees with this decision. The identification of these parks and gardens should be retained in order to ensure that no development in these areas is agreed without reference to their historical value. They should also be noted on the Notation Map to ensure accurate identification.</p>	<p>setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
		<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p>	

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 3126/J177	The Inspector is suspicious of the veracity of the plans of historic gardens. She has then gone and deleted them from the plan. Surely if you suspect the records are faulty, you employ someone to determine which gardens should be on a register and which should not, and then remove those which no longer function as historic gardens.	<p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
Location (None)		<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p>	
		<p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development</p>	

Ref: 4043/J1

Location (None)

1.Reasons for the Objection

The proposed modifications remove the element of protection from sites included in the Gazetteer list although the historic interest of these sites has been widely recognized since the Gazetteer was adopted by the relevant local authorities.

The Trust considers the evidence base for the Gazetteer list is not 'inadequate' as described. Perhaps for this reason there appears little evidence of sites where the data record is 'out of date' or of sites historic gardens that are not 'substantially intact'.

The Gazetteer survey work was carried out systematically on the data-base set up nationally by the Dept of Archaeology at York University (which has been in used by many County Gardens Trusts working with their local planning authorities). This was later made available on-line as the UK Data Base. There is an accompanying documentary record of site maps and other records and historic material which is accessible. It is noted that the Parks and Gardens staff of English Heritage have consulted these records in considering relistings of their Register sites.

It is possible to review site records included in the Gazetteer list. Work has recently taken place with adjoining local authorities on reviewing sites and on including the information in the Heritage Environment Record.

Currently, the national Association of Gardens Trusts is developing and improving the UK Data Base (with HLF funding) to become the Parks and Gardens Data Base (PGDP). This work is being carried out in consultation with ALGOA and other interested bodies.

It is suggested that, instead of the comparison made with SNCI records, the comparison should be with other heritage listings. However, it is noted that there have been planning appeals where nature conservation issues are disputed and this is provided for in the planning process. It is also suggested that a provisional element is present in all such designations.

Heritage protection is understood to be still under review nationally but there is still recognition of the need for locally originated designations (such as the Gazetteer list) and for these to be managed by the local authority. However, when considering planning decisions which affect these sites, the present recommendations will have the effect of removing the weight currently given to arguments for the protection of these sites. The Trust therefore wishes to object to this recommendation

2. Amendment to the recommendation requested

The Committee of the Avon Gardens Trust requests that:

1. On the Proposals Map, retain the Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest.
2. Retain Policy BH 10 (amended to include wording to allow provision for periodic review and deletion or addition of sites to the local list).

Framework.

The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.

Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.

Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.

The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.

A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.

No change.

Modification: M/C3/27 - Built & Historic Environment

<p>Ref: 564/J45</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>We object to the removal of all Parks and Gardens of Local Historical Interest from the proposals map. These are a very important feature of Bath. Visually important and with their trees vitally important for air quality and informed leisure.</p>	<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 2600/J9</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>The wording concerns me. It does not give explicit protection to Baths parks and gardens. Therefore I see a loophole. The local plan must be crystal clear. BANES makes strange decisions. We are a World Heritage site, for how much longer?</p>	<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Ref: 3948/J34	<p>(1) Because English Heritage's register is based on information provided by local authorities, and because there has been no obligation on local authorities to ensure that everything that should be in that register is indeed there, it cannot be left solely to that register to protect Bath's Parks and Gardens that because of the history, landscape, features or setting should be protected. Indeed, PPG15 specifically says "no additional statutory controls follow from the inclusion of a site in English Heritage's Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest". PPG15 also limits to "registered parks and gardens" the obligation to protect them when considering planning applications. The Local Plan must explicitly protect Bath's important green spaces rather than relying on the more implicit protection suggested in other policies. This has a knock on impact on MODS M/C3/23, MIC3/24, and M/C3/25.</p> <p>(2) The inspector's recommendation should be rejected and the amendments reversed.</p>	<p>Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
Location (None)		<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published</p>	

criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.

Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.

The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.

A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Ref: 3955/J1

Location (None)

1. The proposed deletion of Policy BH.10 leaves the historic parks and gardens of local interest unprotected by a specific policy. Yet they are an important part of our heritage. The Inspector identifies difficulties which lead her to recommend the deletion of the policy, but fails to explore the more positive alternative of modifying the policy. Moreover, the reasoning in paragraphs 11.33-38 of her report is unconvincing in a number of respects:-

- As these are historic gardens, a Gazetteer prepared in 1992 with much of the work undertaken in the 1980s is not going to become “out of date” unless the gardens have been obliterated by development. This is a matter which could easily and quickly be checked, if the Council have not done so already. (para 11.34)
- It is not necessary for an historic garden to be “substantially intact” for its inclusion to be valid. Provided it has not been obliterated, it can be recreated from a wide range of possible evidence both documentary and physical. The techniques of restoring historic gardens have developed dramatically in recent years and gardens formerly regarded as completely lost have been successfully restored. (para 11.34)
- Although the information provided by the Gazetteer may not be so rigorous as that relating to the designation of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs), that is no reason why the gardens should not be protected. A huge amount of effort has been put into the protection of sites for nature conservation over the years. Historic gardens have received much less attention, so it is not surprising that the protection system is less fully developed, with only the most exceptional examples included in English Heritage’s Register. (para 11.35)

2. It may be argued that there is no need for the policy, as the parks and gardens

The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.

Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.

Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green

No change.

concerned are already covered by other policies which protect them. This is not a valid argument. First, the preservation of parks and gardens is a distinct interest in its own right and should be considered along with the other material considerations when planning applications are made. Secondly, paragraph C3.55 demonstrates that by no means all of our parks and gardens are adequately protected: The increased demand for land for development means that some of these parks and gardens are under threat. Many are particularly vulnerable to housing schemes, especially where the previous use has become redundant or historic designs have been overgrown " This is a realistic assessment which vividly underlines the need for the policy to be retained.

3. If the Council feel that some allowance needs to be made for the less comprehensive nature of the evidence available on parks and gardens of local historical interest, all that needs to be done is to modify the wording of Policy BH.10. It should be made clear that if the evidence in support of the desirability and practicability of retention and restoration is inadequate, it will then carry little weight as a consideration in the determination of an application to develop. This might be achieved, for example by amending the policy to read as set out below.

Amendments sought

(a) The proposed modification should be rejected.

(b) Policy BH.10 should remain and be modified along the following lines:-
 "Subject to the existence of adequate evidence of the desirability of conserving a Local Park or Garden of Historic Interest (and if it is necessary to restore it, the practicality of doing so), development which adversely affects the park or garden will not be permitted."

(C) Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest should remain shown on the Proposals Maps, except for any which have been obliterated by being built over.

(d) Paragraphs C3.54-56 should remain.

Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.

The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.

A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Ref: 3968/J1

Location (None)

I enclose a petition of 33 sheets with a total of 468 signatures subscribed to the following objection:-

We, the undersigned, object to the proposed modification to the Local Plan deleting Policy BH.10. This would leave our historic parks and gardens of local interest unprotected by a specific policy. They are an important part of our heritage and should be protected.

The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.

Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.

Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green

No change.

		<p>Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	
<p>Ref: 3969/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>All historic garden and open space serve special purpose;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be looked at 2. To be enjoyed 3. To be used for special events <p>They must be protected by policy in their own right. One size does not fit all.</p>	<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4034/J2</p> <p>Location (None) Bath</p>	<p>The current interactive map of registered parks and gardens on www.magic.gov.uk indicates that, out of the 12 parks and gardens registered by English Heritage in the Bath area, only four of the nine parks managed by B&NES are registered. I therefore object to the removal of any protection afforded to the other parks through being listed in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer.</p> <p>The Inspector's deletion of Gazetteer recognition of Bath's historic public parks and gardens from BH.9, without allowing B&NES time to organise a substitute survey/listing, leaves unregistered parks without specific designation, although covered by more general policies such as NE.9, SR.1 and BH.15. Alexandra Park, for example, is left with no formal recognition of its historic importance to the Victorian/Edwardian expansion of the city particularly in relation to the Bear Flat/Beechen Cliff conservation area, or its unrivalled position on the Bath skyline, once PG status is removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>All nine B&NES parks appear on the current list of parks open to the public on the Avon Gardens Trust website and are described in detail in Historic public parks: Bath published in 1997 by the Trust. As the original objections to Gazetteer recognition appears to stem from owners of private parks or gardens, a possible way forward would be to use the Trust's reference to historic parks until a more exacting system of protection is worked out.</p>	<p>within the open countryside.</p> <p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
		<p>The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.</p> <p>Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.</p>	
		<p>The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.</p> <p>A consistent approach will need to be taken to how</p>	

			features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.	
Ref:	4035/J7	The local plan must protect Baths important/public green open spaces. The Inspectors recommendations must be REJECTED and the deletions restored.	The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.	No change.
Location	(None)		Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.	
Bath			Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.	
			The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.	
			A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.	
Ref:	4036/J1	1. I object to M/C3/22 because it will have the effect of removing the current explicit protection for Baths parks and gardens. There must be no question of reducing or adversely affecting these areas. The protection they have hitherto enjoyed should continue. They are a huge contribution to the beauty and	The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the	No change.
Location	(None)			
Bath				

atmosphere of the city and the policies protecting them should be retained.
2. In order that Baths parks and gardens continue to be protected from inappropriate development, I request that the Council deletes M/C3/22 and instead restores the original wording of paragraph C3.54, and accordingly also restores paragraphs C3.55 and 56 and policy BH.9.

designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.

Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.

Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.

The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.

A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Modification: M/C3/28 - Built & Historic Environment

Ref: 3992/J3

We also object to part of the Council's modification M/C3/28 - 31 in as much as there is no actual justification for removing VIOS Spaces from the Proposals Map other than some form of unnecessary appeasement by way of concession to the Inspector.

Location (None)

In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the

No change.

Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.

Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.

Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Modification: M/C3/29 - Built & Historic Environment

Ref: 3992/J4

We also object to part of the Council's modification M/C3/28 - 31 in as much as there is no actual justification for removing VIOS Spaces from the Proposals Map other than some form of unnecessary appeasement by way of concession to the Inspector.

Location (None)

In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.

No change.

Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which

seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.

Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Modification: M/C3/30 - BH.15 Visually Important Open Space Designation

Ref: 743/J46

It is considered most important that the Visually Important Open Space in the middle of Combe Hay village and conservation area be retained on the map.

Location (None)

In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.

No change.

Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.

Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Policies BH.15 and BH.6, inter alia, will apply to the any proposals affecting the open space in the centre

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 2307/J3</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>The justification for the Policy is muddled and confused. Its formulation was not systematic.</p> <p>The only way the Inspector thought that this Policy should be retained was if such a systematic and thorough assessment was undertaken. This has not taken place. The policy should therefore be deleted in its entirety. It is no excuse to defend the retention of the Policy, as the Council suggests in its Statement of Decisions (November 2006) that such a review is 'unfeasible at this stage of the Local Plan process'. The Inspector would have been aware of this in making her recommendations and hence her option in these circumstances was to delete the policy altogether.</p> <p>Material circumstances have not altered since the Inspector made her recommendation. Both PPG17 and PPS1 were already in existence prior to the issue of the Inspector's Report in May 2006.</p> <p>Therefore the policy should be deleted as the Inspector recommended.</p>	<p>of Combe Hay is in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 3116/J174</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Support with additional text:</p> <p>"These open spaces will be retained as open spaces, precluding built development."</p> <p>Reason: To help overcome the problem highlighted by the response to the question re allotments and land at Southbourne gardens, raised at council on September 14 2006, and my further questions arising from that response. These implied that BH.15 (original form) did not preclude development, and our representation is to urge that the council clarify that VIOS should preclude built development.</p> <p>We support the Council against the inspector in this instance as we believe she underestimated the impact its removal would have. Our objection is to strengthen the Council's modification.</p>	<p>Support noted. However the proposed additional wording is considered unreasonably restrictive.</p>	No change.

<p>Ref: 3126/J226</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Support Council but retain original stronger Policy by retaining VIOS on the Proposals Map along with a commitment for early review that is needed. Reason: in line with the Council's reasoning.</p>	<p>Support noted. However with regard the retention of the previous policy the Council would reiterate its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 3186/J18</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>These modifications water down the protection afforded to important sites, which contribute to the village character and the setting of its buildings, by only giving them general protection as opposed to the specific designation of "Visually Important Open Spaces" that they previously enjoyed.</p>	<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3257/J316</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Visually Important Open Spaces (Policy BH.15)</p> <p>We do not believe that all of these spaces are covered adequately by other policies in the B&NES Local Plan due to the deficiency of the Conservation Area Assessment documents. We believe that it is possible that, in drawing up these documents, particular attention was not paid to areas that were already seen as protected by plan policies.</p> <p>The Inspector also recommends either deletion of, or the inclusion of criteria for, the policy on Visually Important Open Spaces (Policy BH. 15), most of which are also protected as recreational areas in Norton Radstock, the remainder being within the Conservation Areas. The visually important space in Conservation Area 4 is not mentioned in the Radstock Conservation Area Assessment and is not a feature of the general text. Neither is the linear feature adjacent to the Important Hillside in the west of the area. Ludlows tip in the south west of Area 5 is flagged up as integral to the special quality of the town. Another space in area 5 is now the Miners ' Memorial Garden. The areas adjacent to Bath Old Road (Areas 1 and 5), however, do not feature in the text, and neither does an area north of Mill Road within the river corridor (also in area 5). These areas are not covered by other designations in the plan. The feature in Area 1 is flagged up in the text of the document. Other visually important Open spaces are covered by Recreation policies.</p> <p>We recommend that the Visually Important Open Spaces designation remain because these areas are not adequately protected under Policy BH.6 and only a proportion of them in the Authority are covered by Recreation policies.</p>	<p>local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p> <p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3295/J17</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>The Inspector's Report recommended that either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy BH.1 5 and the Visually Important Open Space (VIOS) designations be deleted from the proposals map, or • The Council should assemble a set of defined criteria. Sites which accord with the criteria can then be identified as VIOS. <p>The proposed modifications have failed to modify the Local Plan in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations. The VIOS designations have been deleted from the Proposals map, which is supported, but the policy, although reworded, has been retained but without a set of defined criteria. The Inspector considered that, given the extent of the conservation areas within settlements, the tightly defined housing development boundaries and the policies protecting the playing fields, the deletion of the policy would be unlikely to undermine the protection of the environmental quality of the district. As worded at present the policy is inappropriate and unworkable.</p> <p>Changes Sought: Policy BH.15 should be deleted in line with the Inspectors recommendations</p>	<p>Development Framework.</p> <p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 3493/J9</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>There is no need for an additional layer of protection this policy provides. It overlaps with other protective policies in the plan, which are considered sufficient. We seek the removal of this policy in its entirety, as recommended by the Inspector.</p>	<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3992/J5</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>We also object to part of the Council's modification M/C3/28 - 31 in as much as there is no actual justification for removing VIOS Spaces from the Proposals Map other than some form of unnecessary appeasement by way of concession to the Inspector.</p>	<p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed</p>	

more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Modification: M/C3/31 - BH.15 Visually Important Open Space (Map)

<p>Ref: 241/J15</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>This council also deplores the removal of categories important hillsides, parks and gardens of local historical interest and visually important open space.</p>	<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 3186/J19</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>These modifications water down the protection afforded to important sites, which contribute to the village character and the setting of its buildings, by only giving them general protection as opposed to the specific designation of "Visually Important Open Spaces" that they previously enjoyed.</p>	<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3493/J8 /s</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>Support removal of VIOS designation of land South of St Marks Church, Widcombe from the proposals map. There is no need for an additional layer of protection for this site as has been demonstrated by the sites planning history. Planning permission has been refused in the past for development on this site with the reasons for refusal relying on the existing designations which effect this site.</p>	<p>framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly thorough the emerging Local Development Framework.</p> <p>Support noted. However the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3923/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>I would like to register my objections to any changes to the City Plan which might result in the loss of VIOS status for the land at Southbourne Gardens. I feel that the city plan should incorporate the decision taken by B&NES Council at its full Council meeting when it was decided to maintain this category of designation. I do not feel the new City Plan should in any way reduce the protection of previously VIOS sites within the World Heritage site.</p>	<p>Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p> <p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ref: 3969/J2</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>The conservation offices of Bath have worked hard to make the process of conserving Bath easier to understand and more secure from subversion. The inspectors "knife" makes this work more difficult. Big business benefit, Citizens suffer.</p>	<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the</p>	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Ref: 3992/J6</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>We also object to part of the Council's modification M/C3/28 - 31 in as much as there is no actual justification for removing VIOS Spaces from the Proposals Map other than some form of unnecessary appeasement by way of concession to the Inspector.</p>	<p>policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove</p>	

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 4268/J1</p> <p>Location (None)</p>	<p>We object to the Inspectors proposal R11.18 and see no justification for spending the time and money re evaluating all sites from an un-classified starting point.</p> <p>We object to the Inspector's proposal R11.19 and wish to retain the classification of Visually Important Open Space because it provides an important safeguard within the planning process for unique environments such as World Heritage Sites.</p> <p>We object to the way it is presented as an "either I or" as this immediately restricts the democratic process.</p> <p>We also object to part of the Councils modification M/C3/28 - 31 in as much as there is no actual justification for removing VIOS Spaces from the Proposals Map other than some form of unnecessary appeasement by way of concession to the Inspector.</p> <p>Our objections refer to VIOS within the character of the City of Bath as a whole and also to Former Allotments at Southbourne Gardens, Bath in particular.</p>	<p>Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p> <p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.
<p>Ref: 2338/J2</p> <p>Location Southbourne Gardens, Land at Bath</p>	<p>I wish to object to the possible proposal to remove the category of visually important open space and to support the proposal to protect open spaces which make an important contribution to local character, especially within the world heritage site. Specific protection for open spaces must be retained.</p>	<p>In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the</p>	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
<p>Ref: 3343/J96</p> <p>Location University of Bath Bath</p>	<p>(I) Modification M/C3/31 claims to accord with the Council's response to Recommendation R11.19 (blanket deletion of Visually Important Open Space designation from Proposals Map). However, the Inspector's full recommendation with respect to Policy BH.15 (Visually important Open Spaces) reads as follows: "EITHER: R11.18 The Council assemble a set of defined criteria against which to evaluate undeveloped sites within built up areas and carry out an assessment of sites identified in the RDDLP as VIOS against those criteria. Sites which accord with the criteria may then be identified with explicit reasons for the inclusion of sites within the VIOS designation; and modify the Proposals Map in accordance with that site selection process; and modify Policy BH.15 to relate directly to the criteria for the selection of sites and the contribution the site makes to the character of the settlement. OR: R11.19 Delete Policy BH.15 and delete the VIOS designation from the Proposals Map." Where/how/when was it formally agreed by Council to accept Recommendation R11.19 rather than R11.18? I disagree with the blanket removal of VIOS designations across the district and call for the acceptance of Recommendation R11.18 rather than the less-onerous R11.19. For example, some of the open spaces which would be stripped of their VIOS designation remain in the Green Belt and Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (e.g. St John's Field, Claverton Down) and are therefore, by definition, visually important. (2) Amend Modification M/C3/31 to accord with Recommendation R11.18 rather</p>	<p>Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.</p> <p>Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.</p> <p>Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.</p>	No change.

than R11.19.

Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Ref: 4035/J1

The local plan must protect Baths important/ public open green spaces. The Inspectors recommendations must be rejected and the deletions restored.

In response to this objection the Council reiterates its response to the Inspector's recommendations (R11.18 and R11.19). The Inspector accepts that the principle of protecting open spaces which contribute to local character is valid but is concerned, inter alia, about the lack of clarity in the policy wording and the process of designation. Of her recommended alternatives, an overarching review of all sites is unfeasible at this stage in the Local Plan process but complete deletion of the policy will leave a gap in the Local Plan policy framework. PPG17 emphasises the particular value that open spaces contribute to local character and PPS1 seeks to protect the character of urban areas.

No change.

Location (None)

Bath

Open spaces make an important contribution to local character of settlements in Bath & North East Somerset in all settlements and especially in the World Heritage Site. Whilst other policies in the Plan provide general protection for character, complete deletion of the policy will remove the very specific protection these areas have in the Local Plan. Therefore, an approach is proposed which seeks to address the Inspector's concerns but also retains specific protection for open spaces.

Therefore the Council has resolved to remove Visually Important Open Spaces from the Proposals Map but modify Policy BH.15 to offer general protection to open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality. The issue of safeguarding open space will be addressed more thoroughly through the emerging Local Development Framework.

Modification: M/C3/33 - Policy BH.16

Ref: 241/J13

This Council deplores abandonment of the category of Village Buffers. The close proximity of villages in this part of the Somerset Coalfield brings the danger of amalgamation by infill. A conurbation stretching from Norton Radstock to include Chilcompton, Paulton, Timsbury, Camerton, High Littleton, Hallatrow, Farrington Gurney, Temple Cloud, Clutton and Farmborough needs active discouragement.

The Green Belt policy (GB.1) has its own stringent policy provisions and reflects national advice in PPG2 'Green Belts'. Policy BH.16 will not allow development which prejudices the separateness of settlements outside the Green Belt. There are also

No change.

Location (None)

Such a town would need infrastructure and facilities quite beyond anything existing or which could be feasibly provided. Village buffers make the policy clear to all. The strange replacement wording (which implies that development which prejudices the separateness of settlements will be permitted in the Green Belt) even when corrected for meaning weakens the communication of this policy to potential developers.

a number of policies which can help maintain the separateness of the settlements including Policy NE.1 which protects the character of the rural landscape and policies HG.4 and HG.6 which restrict residential development to within housing development boundaries. The preamble to Policy BH.16 emphasises the sensitivity of the gaps between settlements to the pressure of development particularly in the south of the District.

Ref: 686/J215

Location (None)

The Council agreed the Inspector's recommendation to delete all references to Parks and Gardens of Local Historical Interest. The Trust strongly disagrees with this decision. The identification of these parks and gardens should be retained in order to ensure that no development in these areas is agreed without reference to their historical value. They should also be noted on the Notation Map to ensure accurate identification.

The Inspector is not opposed to the principle of protecting parks and gardens of local historic interest. Rather, her concern relates to the validity of the evidence base which underpins the designation as shown on the Proposals Map and the lack of a mechanism with which to review sites. Not all sites identified in the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer were previously shown on the Proposals Map and those that were are included in the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and so benefit from protection under Policy BH.12.

No change.

Whilst the information in the Gazetteer may still be relevant and the boundaries of parks and gardens of local historic interest correct, the Council has conceded that, as there is currently no published criteria or methodology to select or de-select of sites within the District in a consistent manner, the policy should be deleted and the designation removed from the Proposals Map.

Nevertheless, in addition to Policy BH.12, sites will still benefit from policy protection in the Local Plan by virtue of their location in, for example, the Green Belt (Policy GB.1) or Conservations Area (Policy BH.6). Those within the curtilage of, or provide the setting to, a listed building or structure gain protection under Policy BH.2, and Policy BH.15 applies to those sites that contribute to the character of settlement or locality. Overarching Policy NE.1 also seeks to protect landscape character and will apply particularly to those sites within the open countryside.

The 12 sites on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens within the District are still shown on the Proposals Map and afforded protection under Policy BH.9.

A consistent approach will need to be taken to how features of local historic interest might be protected through the emerging Local Development

Framework.

Chapter C4. Minerals

Modification: M/C4/60 - Table 4.1

Ref:	43/J4	We object to a statement which is and was inaccurate at both the date of the Inspector's report and the Schedule of Proposed Modifications.	Noted. This can be treated as a non-material change under Regulation 29 and the Local Plan updated accordingly prior to its adoption.	No change.
Location	Hayeswood Mine Freshford	The June 1996 extension does not reflect the position. A further application was approved in 2005. The annex should be amended to reflect the latest planning position as at November 2006.		

Chapter D ACCESS

Modification: M/D/4 - Update to para D1.5

Ref:	686/J212	The Council accepts "the Bath Package... which includes a road linking the A36 and A46 to the east of Bath".	The A36/A46 link road is mentioned as one of the schemes recommended by the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study. It is not included in the Bath Package but the Local Transport Plan envisages the submission of a major scheme bid after 2011. The amendment to this paragraph is an update reflecting the latest position on the Joint Local Transport Plan. The Local Plan does not include a proposal for the A36/A46 link road.	No change.
Location	(None)	The Trust is very concerned that the Council now includes the link A36/A46 road, whereas, up until now, it has given the firm impression that such a project was not being considered as it was no longer viable.		

Modification: M/D/5 - Update to para D2.1

Ref:	3126/J188	1. One of the primary reasons for the South Bristol ring road is to cater for Bristol Airport expansion. Since the stern report, enthusiasm for airport expansion is deflating rapidly. Add the word "tentative" in front of construction.	1. The South Bristol Ring Road has been proposed primarily to serve a major urban expansion on the south side of Bristol. However, this proposal is not a modification to the Local Plan and the amendments to this para are reference to the recommendations of the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study.	No change.
Location	(None)	2. The A36 and A46 link has been dismissed by report after report yet curiously came to life on the GBSTS. Omit it from the local plan. See Inspector's comment (13.91).	2. An A36/A46 link road has been recommended by both the Bristol/Bath to South Coast Study and the GBSTS. The Local Transport Plan envisages the submission of a Major Scheme Bid after 201. The amendments to the para reflect this. The Local Plan does not include a proposal for the A36/A46 link road.	

Modification: M/D/9 - Update to para D2.3

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 564/J47 Location (None)	In Para D2.3 of the Inspectors amendments, we suggest the removal of the last sentences reference to "the expansion of Park and Ride..." This statement ignores the Sustainability Assessment 2006 document which casts doubt on the benefit of encouraging more car travel (section D - Access - para 3.21 and 3.22)	The inspector took account of the SDA in her assessment of the Local Plan. This para has been amended to refer to the new Joint Local Transport Plan. However, the modifications do not allocate new Park & Ride schemes & in fact, include the deletion of the proposed new Park & ride at Newbridge.	No change.
Ref: 688/J4 /s Location (None)	Item 10. Doc A, page 242 - 243, para D2.3 HGVs. "The Council has welcomed the recent Bristol/Bath South Coast Transport Study..... And restrictions on the movement of HGV's in the city." The trust fully supports the council's proposals to minimise the impact of long distance heavy vehicles passing through the City of Bath.	Support Welcomed	No change.
Modification: M/D/15 - Access			
Ref: 3126/J219 /s Location (None)	Support safe routes to School.	Support Welcomed	No change.
Modification: M/D/18 - Policy T.3			
Ref: 1427/J238 /s Location (None)	The Environment Agency supports the introduction of this Policy. Successful implementations of this Policy will encourage greater non-vehicular use.	Support Welcomed.	No change.
Ref: 3126/J220 /s Location (None)	Support new policy.	Support welcomed.	No change.
Modification: M/D/30 - Saltford Station			
Ref: 740/J11 Location (None)	Modification M/D/30: the Parish Council objects strongly to the last sentence of the proposed modification to Para. D5.3 and requests its deletion. The council supports the continued inclusion in the Plan of a reference to a possible station at Saltford (as still proposed in Para. D5.3) and contends that it is illogical to leave the site (of the old station) unallocated simply because development is not expected in the Plan period - which now has only 3 to 4 years to run. If this site is not properly safeguarded it is likely to be lost to other development, and any prospect of re-opening the station here will have been lost. Reliance on Policy T9, and on the sites Green Belt location (as proposed) is not regarded as a sufficient safeguard.	The Parish Council's comments are noted but the District Council's stance accords with Government guidance. The Inspector considered the need to continue to retain the reservation but recommended its deletion. The Council has insufficient reasons to depart from her recommendation (See Council's Statement of Decisions for full response).	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 3126/J221 Location (None)	Land at both Saltford and West edge of Bath should be safeguarded. Reason - to accord with our representation on new housing in the most sustainable locations, submitted in RSS consultation.	Comments are noted but the District Council's stance accords with Government guidance. The Inspector considered the need to continue to retain the reservation but recommended its deletion. The Council has insufficient reasons to depart from her recommendation (See Council's Statement of Decisions for full response).	No change.
Modification: M/D/32 - Saltford Station			
Ref: 3948/J10 Location (None)	1. The proposed amendment relies on things outside the council's control. The current outrage over the new timetables proves that services cannot be taken for granted. 2. Add the words "Provided the rail operators provide adequate services..." before "It is hoped..."	The suggested additional wording to para D5.5 is not considered to be necessary	No change.
Modification: M/D/35 - Policy T.10 Saltford Station			
Ref: 3126/J224 Location (None)	Reinstate safeguarding of Saltford Station and also add wording to safeguard land at W edge of Bath. Instate or reinstate on Proposals Map. Reason: as for M/D/30	Comments are noted but the District Council's stance accords with Government guidance. The Inspector considered the need to continue to retain the reservation but recommended its deletion. The Council has insufficient reasons to depart from her recommendation (See Council's Statement of Decisions for full response).	No change.
Ref: 740/J10 Location Saltford Station Saltford	For the reasons outlined in our objection to M/D/30 to the proposed deletion of reference to a new railway station at Saltford from para D5.5. The Parish Council objects to the deletion of the Saltford station reservation from Policy T.10 and Proposals Map inset 11B	The Parish Council's comments are noted but the District Council's stance accords with Government guidance. The Inspector considered the need to continue to retain the reservation but recommended its deletion. The Council has insufficient reasons to depart from her recommendation (See Council's Statement of Decisions for full response).	No change.
Modification: M/D/36 - Saltford Station			
Ref: 3126/J225 Location (None)	Reinstate safeguarding of Saltford Station and also add wording to safeguard land at W edge of Bath. Instate or reinstate on Proposals Map. Reason: as for M/D/30	Comments are noted but the District Council's stance accords with Government guidance. The Inspector considered the need to continue to retain the reservation but recommended its deletion. The Council has insufficient reasons to depart from her recommendation (See Council's Statement of Decisions for full response).	No change.
Ref: 740/J12 Location Saltford Station Saltford	For the reasons outlined in our objection to M/D/30 to the proposed deletion of reference to a new railway station at Saltford from para D5.5. The Parish Council objects to the deletion of the Saltford station reservation from Policy T.10 and Proposals Map inset 11B	The Parish Council's comments are noted but the District Council's stance accords with Government guidance	No change.

Modification: M/D/37 - Modifications to para D6.1

Ref: 3001/J7	Motor Services (Bath) Ltd operates from its premises at Locksbrook Road, Bath. The site is utilised for both vehicular sales and after sales servicing and maintenance. The current operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd comprise of land on and adjoining the former Midland Railway line. The retention of all of that land is critical for the future operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. The objections of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd and the proposed changes sought are outlined in more detail below.	This modification simply updates the comments on the possible need for an additional rail link between Bristol and Bath. See response to rep 3001/J2 about the Rapid Transit Route modification.	No change.
Location Locksbrook Road Bath	<p>PARA D6.1 - D6.3 - Reason for Objecting:</p> <p>1. The Council has stated that, since the conclusion of the Inquiry, circumstances have changed with regard to the status of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and the Bath Western Riverside SPD.</p> <p>2. Motor Services (Bath) Ltd note that the SPD is not an adopted planning document, and indeed cannot be adopted until the adoption of the Plan. It therefore appears perverse to propose Local Plan text pursuant to unadopted SPD.</p> <p>3 The LTP has not yet been agreed by the Government. The Bath Package is seeking 80% central government funding which is required to deliver the Bath Package, including the segregated busway, which has not been secured.</p> <p>4 The Council consider that the whole of the former Midland Railway is disused and as such is available for development. Given that parts of the land are in beneficial use the cost of acquiring the land will be considerably more than estimated by the Council, it is therefore questioned whether the Council has sufficient funding in place to deliver the segregated transport route.</p> <p>Changes sought:</p> <p>1 Comply with the Inspectors recommendation R13.15 to remove paragraphs D6.1 D6.3 and 'Rapid Transit'.</p> <p>2 If the rapid transit route is retained the supporting text should be amended to state that the route will be reviewed before implementation.</p>		

Modification: M/D/38 - Rapid Transport Route

Ref: 3001/J2	Motor Services (Bath) Ltd operates from its premises at Locksbrook Road, Bath. The site is utilised for both vehicular sales and after sales servicing and maintenance. The current operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd comprise of land on and adjoining the former Midland Railway line. The retention of all of that land is critical for the future operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. The objections of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd and the proposed changes sought are outlined in more detail below.	The proposed bus-way is a firm proposal which is included in the current Major Scheme bid for funding. Further finances will be provided by the Western Riverside development. The council is fully aware that parts of the route are in existing use.	No change.
Location Locksbrook Road Bath	<p>Reason for Objecting</p> <p>1 The Council are unable to demonstrate that the proposed transport route is deliverable at the current time, it is therefore inappropriate to propose the transport route within the Plan. The advice in PPG12 is that plans should only include proposals which are firm, with a reasonable degree of certainty of proceeding within the plan period and should be identified as such in the LTP.</p> <p>2 The latest LTP has not yet been agreed by the Government. The Bath Package is seeking 80% central government funding required to deliver the Bath Package, including the segregated busway, which has not been secured.</p>	<p>Since the Local Plan Inquiry the Regional Assembly has recognised the importance of The Bath Package by identifying it in Table 1 of their priorities for regional funding allocations for schemes to be completed prior to 2016. These priorities have now been accepted by the Department for Transport. The Joint Local Transport Plan also identifies the Bath Package as a priority for construction in the period to 2011, and indeed a Major Scheme Bid for the package was also submitted in July 2006 to</p>	

3 The Council has failed to give due consideration to the Inspectors recommendation with regard to deleting the Rapid Transit and paragraphs D6.1 to D6.3.

4 The Inspector not only referred to the fact that the LTP and SPD were not sufficiently developed, but that the safeguarding of the route on land in beneficial use would cause blight to occupiers.

5 The Council consider that the whole of the former Midland Railway is disused and as such is available for development. Given that parts of the land are in beneficial use the cost of acquiring the land will be considerably more than estimated by the Council, it is therefore questioned whether the Council has sufficient funding in place to deliver the segregated transport route.

Changes Sought

1 Comply with the Inspectors recommendation R13.15 to remove paragraphs D6.1 – D6.3 and 'Rapid Transit'.

2 If the rapid transit route is retained the supporting text should be amended to state that the route will be reviewed before implementation.

3 Notwithstanding the fact that the rapid transit route should be deleted from the plan, as a minimum the use of the former Midland Railway line should be referred to an option to be considered rather than the only option.

central government for funding.

The SPD cannot be adopted until the parent document, the Local Plan, is adopted. The SPD & the modifications were prepared in conjunction reflecting the Council's responses to the Inspector's recommendations. The SPD will need to take account of any further modifications to the Local Plan if any are proposed.

Ref:	3001/J9	Motor Services (Bath) Ltd operates from its premises at Locksbrook Road, Bath. The site is utilised for both vehicular sales and after sales servicing and maintenance. The current operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd comprise of land on and adjoining the former Midland Railway line. The retention of all of that land is critical for the future operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd.	The proposed bus-way is a firm proposal which is included in the current Major Scheme bid for funding. Further finances will be provided by the Western Riverside development. The council is fully aware that parts of the route are in beneficial use. However, implementation of the RTS is essential to the successful redevelopment of the BWR site	No change.
Location	Locksbrook Road Bath	Reason for Objecting (PARA D6.1 - D6.3); 1 The Council has stated that, since the conclusion of the Inquiry, circumstances have changed with regard to the status of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and the Bath Western Riverside SPD. 2 Motor Services (Bath) Ltd note that the SPD is not an adopted planning document, and indeed cannot be adopted until the adoption of the Plan. It therefore appears perverse to propose Local Plan text pursuant to unadopted SPD. 3 The LTP has not yet been agreed by the Government. The Bath Package is seeking 80% central government funding which is required to deliver the Bath Package, including the segregated busway, which has not been secured. 4 The Council consider that the whole of the former Midland Railway is disused and as such is available for development. Given that parts of the land are in beneficial use the cost of acquiring the land will be considerably more than estimated by the Council, it is therefore questioned whether the Council has sufficient funding in place to deliver the segregated transport route. Changes sought 1 Comply with the Inspectors recommendation R13.15 to remove paragraphs D6.1 D6.3 and 'Rapid Transit'. 2 If the rapid transit route is retained the supporting text should be amended to state that the route will be reviewed before implementation.		

Modification: M/D/39 - Modifications to para D6.3

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 3126/J228 Location (None)	Add: Park and Ride enhancement will first be assessed in accordance with the Sustainable Development Appraisal (SDA) recommendation. Reason: The SDA was commissioned to inform the local plan its recommendation should be acted upon.	The Inspector took account of the SDA in her Assessment of the Local Plan	No change.
Ref: 3001/J8 Location Locksbrook Road Bath	Motor Services (Bath) Ltd operates from its premises at Locksbrook Road, Bath. The site is utilised for both vehicular sales and after sales servicing and maintenance. The current operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd comprise of land on and adjoining the former Midland Railway line. The retention of all of that land is critical for the future operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. Reason for Objecting to PARA D6.1 - D6.3: 1 The Council has stated that, since the conclusion of the Inquiry, circumstances have changed with regard to the status of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and the Bath Western Riverside SPD.	The modification relates to on-street measures proposed in the Bath Package	No change.
Modification: M/D/40 - Policy T.11Rapid Transit Route			
Ref: 3001/J4 Location Locksbrook Road Bath	Motor Services (Bath) Ltd operates from its premises at Locksbrook Road, Bath. The site is utilised for both vehicular sales and after sales servicing and maintenance. The current operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd comprise of land on and adjoining the former Midland Railway line. The retention of all of that land is critical for the future operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. The objections of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd and the proposed changes sought are outlined in more detail below. Reason for Objecting 1 The Council are unable to demonstrate that the proposed transport route is deliverable at the current time, it is therefore inappropriate to propose the transport route within the Plan. The advice in PPG12 is that plans should only include proposals which are firm, with a reasonable degree of certainty of proceeding within the plan period and should be identified as such in the LTP. 2 The LTP has not yet been agreed by the Government. The Bath Package is seeking 80% central government funding required to deliver the Bath Package, including the segregated busway, which has not been secured. 3 The Council and the LTP both appear to consider that the whole of the former Midland Railway is disused and as such is available for development. Given that parts of the land are in beneficial use the cost of acquiring the land will be considerably more than estimated by the Council, it is therefore questioned whether the Council has sufficient funding in place to deliver the segregated transport route. 4 The Council has not provided evidence to demonstrate that the proposed segregated transport route is deliverable within the Plan period. The Council does not control the whole of the proposed route, as such CPO will be required. Changes Sought 1 Comply with the Inspectors recommendation R13.15 to remove paragraphs D6.1 – D6.3 and 'Rapid Transit'. 2 However, if policy T.11 is retained in the Plan it should be reworded to include the following issues: • Reference to fully reviewing the transport route before its implementation; • As proposed in Policy GDS.1, Policy T.11 should state that existing businesses that	The proposed bus-way is a firm proposal which is included in the current Major Scheme bid for funding. Further finances will be provided by the Western Riverside development. The council is fully aware that parts of the route are in beneficial use. However, implementation of the RTS is essential to to the successful redevelopment of the BWR site	No change.

will be affected by the proposed development will be found suitable alternative sites prior to the implementation of the policy.

Ref:	3001/J5	Motor Services (Bath) Ltd operates from its premises at Locksbrook Road, Bath. The site is utilised for both vehicular sales and after sales servicing and maintenance. The current operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd comprise of land on and adjoining the former Midland Railway line. The retention of all of that land is critical for the future operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. The objections of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd and the proposed changes sought are outlined in more detail below. POLICY T.11 & PARA'S D6.1 — D6.3	The proposed bus-way is a firm proposal which is included in the current Major Scheme bid for funding. Further finances will be provided by the Western Riverside development. The council is fully aware that parts of the route are in beneficial use. However, implementation of the RTS is essential to to the successful redevelopment of the BWR site	No change.
Location	Locksbrook Road Bath	Reason for Objecting 1 The Inspector recommended that the Council review the sustainable transport route to remove any former railway route which has been subject to redevelopment and is in beneficial use. 2 The Council has stated that such an assessment has been undertaken and confirms that they do not include any former railway route which has been subject to development and is in beneficial use. 3 The Council has provided no evidence to demonstrate that an assessment of the route has been carried out. 4 The commercial operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd have developed on the former railway and do make beneficial use of the land. The land is critical to the commercial operation of the business. 5 If the Council has reviewed the sustainable transport route they have clearly overlooked the land controlled by Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. 6 The safeguarding of the sustainable transport route will result in the blight of the land controlled by Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. The uncertainty over the future use of the land could prejudice the future growth of the business. Changes Sought I Remove the safeguarding of the sustainable transport route / segregated busway / rapid transit route on any part of the former Midland Railway line which is in beneficial use, specifically the land within the control of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. 2 The proposed change is in accordance with recommendation R13.16 proposed by the Inspector.		

Modification: M/D/41 - Rapid Transit Route

Ref:	3001/J3	Motor Services (Bath) Ltd operates from its premises at Locksbrook Road, Bath. The site is utilised for both vehicular sales and after sales servicing and maintenance. The current operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd comprise of land on and adjoining the former Midland Railway line. The retention of all of that land is critical for the future operations of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd. The objections of Motor Services (Bath) Ltd and the proposed changes sought are outlined in more detail below.	The proposed bus-way is a firm proposal which is included in the current Major Scheme bid for funding. Further finances will be provided by the Western Riverside development. The council is fully aware that parts of the route are in beneficial use.	No change.
Location	Locksbrook Road Bath	Reason for Objecting I The Council are unable to demonstrate that the proposed transport route is deliverable at the current time, it is therefore inappropriate to propose the transport route within the Plan. The advice in PPG12 is that plans should only		

include proposals which are firm, with a reasonable degree of certainty of proceeding within the plan period and should be identified as such in the LTP.
 2 The LTP has not yet been agreed by the Government. The Bath Package is seeking 80% central government funding required to deliver the Bath Package, including the segregated busway, which has not been secured.
 3 The Council and the LTP both appear to consider that the whole of the former Midland Railway is disused and as such is available for development. Given that parts of the land are in beneficial use the cost of acquiring the land will be considerably more than estimated by the Council, it is therefore questioned whether the Council has sufficient funding in place to deliver the segregated transport route.
 4 The Council has not provided evidence to demonstrate that the proposed segregated transport route is deliverable within the Plan period. The Council does not control the whole of the proposed route, as such CPO will be required.

Changes sought

1 Comply with the Inspectors recommendation R13.15 to remove Rapid Transit' from the former Midland railway from all relevant proposals maps and related references in the Plan.

Ref: 4272/J2	The inspector has made significant comments on the local plan and refers to the local transport plan, and refers to the possibility of using the river etc. I have consistently objected to using a rapid transit scheme using existing roads and the inspector has not addressed the problem! I have made suggestions to use a dedicated route using a monorail system. Additional material submitted.	It is proposed that the rapid transit route will initially provide a dedicated road for buses, but future changes in technology beyond the plan period are not precluded	No change.
Location Rapid Transit Route Bath			

Modification: M/D/42 - London Road West highway improvement scheme

Ref: 4035/J8	There must not be any changes made to this road that reduce traffic flow - the road must be improved to increase traffic flow.	Changes to facilitate access to the proposed park and ride site are envisaged	No change.
Location London Road West, land r/o 64-92. Bath			

Modification: M/D/44 - Lansdown Road highway improvement scheme

Ref: 4035/J9	There is no need for any change to Lansdown Road. Free flowing traffic in both directions, here, simultaneously, is vital to the whole economy of the city. This road is a VITAL route in and out of the city.	Changes that will benefit pedestrian safety and movement are envisaged	No change.
Location Lansdown Road Bath			

Modification: M/D/47 - Modifications to para D10.4

Ref: 564/J48 /s	We support the deletion of Policy T21.	Support noted.	No change.
Location (None)			

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 3126/J185 Location (None)	This paragraph states that an all week P&R site "to serve the A36" may be implemented. The Inspector says precisely the opposite. "The A46/A36 link and the east of Bath Park and Ride facility are the subject of a separate study (Bristol/Bath - South coast MMS). As such it would be premature for the plan to include these schemes" (13.91) The most definitive analysis of Park and Ride I have seen has been produced by CPRE - "Ultimately, Park and Ride schemes are best viewed as an interim solution. They do not eliminate car dependency and once they reach saturation point, local authorities are left with the prospect of surrounding our towns and cities with an ever increasing number of car parks. In the end, root causes of traffic growth have to be tackled. This requires the long term process of integrating land use planning with the need to reduce dependence on the car."	The Modification relates to a suggested park and ride site adjacent to the A37 but no additional site to serve the A36 has been included in the Plan	No change.
Ref: 3126/J223 Location (None)	Add: Park and Ride enhancement will first be assessed in accordance with the Sustainable Development Appraisal (SDA) recommendation. Reason: the SDA was commissioned to inform the local plan. Its recommendation should be acted upon.	The Inspector took account of the SDA in her assessment of the Local Plan	No change.
Modification: M/D/48 - Deletion of Policy T.21 Park & Ride Schemes			
Ref: 743/J42 Location (None)	It is considered most important that the area reserved for the extension of the Odd Down Park and Ride site (in Combe Hay Parish) be retained on the proposals map.	The Council has accepts the Inspector's recommendation that this allocation is not needed as the site is within the Green Belt where 'other development is unlikely to be permitted' . Additionally, the site is within the Council's ownership.	No change.
Ref: 3119/J2 Location Odd Down Park and Ride Bath	Re our earlier discussion I can confirm that we consider it is required to protect the Odd Down Park and Ride expansion area. The Bath Package submitted to the Department of Transport (DfT) last July includes the expansion of this site as being completed by April 2008. DfT have now opened discussions with the Council as part the process for awarding the funding required. It is critical to the process that they do not see any problems which could thwart delivery of the bid. Grateful therefore if you could try to ensure that the Odd Down Park and Ride expansion site is protected.	The Council has accepted the Inspector's View that this allocation is not needed as the site is within the Green Belt. The proposed Lansdown Extension was not allocated and as such proposals will be judged against the criteria in Policy T.22	No change.
Modification: M/D/49 - Policy T.22 Park & Ride Schemes			
Ref: 1427/J236 Location (None)	Policy T.22 now refers explicitly to the Lambridge Park and Ride. There are significant flood risk issues associated with this site which are not adequately addressed by the general wording. The Environment Agency has had an in principle objection to this proposal. The Council's position that site forms essential infrastructure has led to the progression of this site to its current position. However, it can only be developed on the prior provision of off site flood compensatory works.	This is not a change in policy as the Local Plan has safeguarded the site since the deposit draft stage. Moreover, the site now has planning permission.	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 3126/J229 Location (None)	Add: Park and Ride enhancement will first be assessed in accordance with the Sustainable Development Appraisal (SDA) recommendation. Reason: The SDA was commissioned to inform the local plan. Its recommendation should be acted upon.	The Inspector took account of the SDA in her assessment of the Local Plan	No change.
Ref: 564/J49 Location Lambridge Park and Ride Bath	We object to the inclusion of a new first sentence to Policy T22 "The Council will safeguard land shown on the proposals map for Park and Ride purposes at Lambridge Bath adjacent A4". A park and ride here will be unable to fulfil the first five criteria of the policy and also ignores the Sustainability Development Appraisal 2006. This document advises at section D - Access - Para 3.22 that "It is impossible to know whether the benefits of Park and Ride exceed the costs, and therefore dangerous to assume that they do." We think that it would be prudent to study the effects of Park and Ride on transport behaviour outwards as well as inwards from sites before committing Bath to any further expansion".	This Modification does not constitute a policy change - merely the transfer of the Lambridge Park and Ride allocation from policy T.21 to policy T.22 in accordance with the Inspector's Recommendation.	No change.
Ref: 3948/J9 Location Lambridge Park and Ride Bath	1. Given that the council's own statistics that show that the Park and Ride at Lambridge will be insufficient to absorb latent demand, protecting the site for this purpose is pointless. This policy will only serve to stifle alternatives that might be more effective. 2. Delete the first sentence.	This Modification does not constitute a policy change - merely the transfer of the Lambridge Park and Ride allocation from policy T.21 to policy T.22 in accordance with the Inspector's Recommendation.	No change.
Modification: M/D/54 - Car Parking Standards			
Ref: 721/J86 Location (None)	Policy T26 D12.3-4 - Access. We wish to maintain our objection to the maximum parking standards proposed for houses/flats/maisonettes. However given our other comments in respect of PPS3, I would also expect this matter to be addressed through your emerging LDF.	Comments noted	No change.
Ref: 3126/J173 /s Location (None)	(no comment)	Support Welcomed	No change.
Ref: 3126/J218 Location (None)	1. C2 Residential/ Boarding Schools Standard is written as though it is mandatory rather than maximum. 2. Clarity based on logic is needed. Class A1 noted on large non-food retail stores contains a similar logical fault. Maximum parking standard implies that for food it could be 1 space per 20m2 (or larger area) which conflicts with the note alongside.	The parking standards schedule includes a number of specific requirements to cover particular needs but in general they are maximum standards. Policy T.26 and para D12.6 make it clear that other factors will be taken into account in determining what is an appropriate level of on site provision.	No change.
Ref: 3186/J7 /s Location (None)	Modification: No M/D/56 Annex 2 to Chapter D Schedule to Policy T26 Plan Reference: Chapter D Parking Standards C3 Location: Support We welcome these sensible, pragmatic amendments changes, but would like to know if the flexibility referred to will allow for an increase above 2 spaces in the case of category C3 iii) three bedroom houses? We would also like to know in DI why Colleges of Further Education are not assessed on merit and have a more prescribed allowance than Primary and Secondary Schools.	Policy T.26 and para D12.6 state that other factors apart from standards will be taken into account in determining what is an appropriate level of on-site provisions. It is considered that schools vary in their requirements more than further educational establishments.	No change.

Respondent Details	Summary of Comment	Proposed Response	Change
Ref: 3948/J11 Location (None)	It is entirely wrong to define absolute maxima in Annex 2. These should be a guide rather than an enforceable limit, so that some flexibility is available in exceptional circumstances. For instance, some premises with parking provision defined by floor space may have rather different staffing requirements than others. 2. Replace "Maximum" with "Preferred upper limits for".	Government guidance is that Local Plans should set out maximum parking standards, but policy T.26 and para D12.6 state that other factors will be taken into account in determining what is an appropriate level of on-site provision.	No change.

Chapter GDS.1

Modification: R8.1 - Bath – Greenway lane; Beechen Cliff School

Ref: 362/K6 /s Location Beechen Cliff School Playing Field Bath	We wish to support the Councils decision in rejecting the Inspectors Recommendation No. R8.1 at Beechen Cliff School, Lower Field, Greenway Lane. We feel that the council have made the right decision as development of this site would have an adverse effect on the area and would be a loss of local amenity.	Support noted.	See Council report for 29 March 2007.
Ref: 454/K1 /s Location Beechen Cliff School Playing Field Bath	I strongly support the Council's decision not to accept the Planning Inspector's recommendation Number R8.1 regarding the Lower Field of Beechen Cliff School (plan reference GDS.1) My reasons for supporting the Council's decision are: 1) this open space is a valuable amenity for local residents (of whom I am one) 2) it provides a "green" connection between Lyncombe Vale and Alexandra Park which is visually attractive and a good foil for the surrounding buildings, and 3) Greenway Lane is narrow and has no pavement for much of its length so it is unsuitable for further residential development. In view of the recent Barker report emphasis on a more pragmatic and less doctrinaire attitude to the green belt, encouraging planners and residents to think of green wedges and other attractive and satisfying ways of bringing quiet spaces into towns, this is just the sort of small amenity which we will need more than ever.	Support noted.	See Council report for 29 March 2007.
Ref: 686/K213 /s Location Beechen Cliff School Playing Field Bath	Beechen Cliff School, Greenway Lane. The Inspector recommended a site for 18 houses in this area of Bath. The council decided that it should not be allocated for residential use on the basis of local safety, narrow lanes and poor junctions in the area. The trust fully supports the council's decision regarding this proposal by the Inspector.	Support noted.	See Council report for 29 March 2007.
Ref: 1957/K2 /s Location Beechen Cliff School Playing Field Bath	Policies SR.1 and BH.15 protect the Lower field It is an Important Open Space within the Conservation Area and the World Heritage Site. It forms the backdrop to the listed Devonshire Buildings and Devonshire Place, it is traversed by two well used public footpaths and provides a community facility. Beechen Cliff School uses it extensively for sports practice and by pupils in their breaks. The use by future pupils should be protected. Greenway Lane is the only entrance to a semi-rural narrow lane ill-suited to	Support noted.	See Council report for 29 March 2007.