

REPRESENTATIONS IN RESPECT OF ST MARTIN'S GARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL/ HAYESFIELD SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD

A standard objection was submitted by a large number of individuals. The respondent numbers are listed in Annex 1 for reference (Other objections to the Proposed Modification and the Council's responses are listed in Annex 2).

Summary of Comment

I am writing to oppose the recommendation in the Local Plan that the St Martin's Garden Primary School site be allocated for mixed use development. The Local Plan should only be accepted once the use of "St Martin's Garden Primary School" has been removed from it. The school and its grounds have been enjoyed by the local community and by generations of school children. We should protect these facilities and valuable open green space so that they will remain available for use by generations to come. The legacy we leave behind should preserve this heritage. The reasons for my opposition are outlined below.

- No reason is given by the Government's Inspector for the Local Plan for allocating St Martins Garden Primary School for mixed use. As there are no planning reasons for this change of use, the only reason may be to maximise the value of the land. Land value should not be allowed as a consideration when making planning decisions.
- The proposed re-zoning includes the playing fields of St Martin's Garden Primary School. The Council has no Green Space Strategy, and the Council should not plan to develop on the playing fields until this has been completed.
- The designation of the land includes convenience floor space and small retail outlets. The Council has no Retail Strategy, and the Council should not promote the development of these commercial facilities until this has been completed
- The Council has a policy of supporting local businesses. Retail development should not be promoted on the site without first carrying out a study of retail needs. Previous studies for Bath were simply a desktop exercise, which concentrated on the city centre.
- The Council was unaware of LiDL's plan to move into Bath when the Plan was changed to include the St Martin's Garden Primary School. This should now be taken into consideration.
- Any development should be sensitive to the local area and a consultation of the needs for the local area and impact on the local community should be carried out first. St Martin's Garden Primary School is central to the community it serves, so safeguards should be made to ensure that any large scale developments in the area are appropriate for the school and community.
- The loss of land from the school site will be detrimental to the community as a whole. Not only is it used for multi-curricular activities by the school, but it is also used by a number of other organisations e.g. Scouts, MoD, University, B&NES and other schools such as Combe Down who do not have the facilities themselves.
- The school's current facilities will allow expansion when roll numbers increase. This is likely as 2,000 more houses could be built in South Bath. The other local primary schools, St Philip's and Combe Down, have no room to expand on their existing sites.
- The site is located at the junction of two major through roads; the B31 10 and A367. Development of land in this area should not be allowed to increase the traffic burden at this junction; which is already overstretched.

To summarise I believe the complete St Martins' Garden Primary School site should remain designated for educational use and not be included on a mixed use site. Also any developments should only be implemented following full consultation with all stakeholders, and not until a Green Space Strategy and Retail Strategy have been completed.

Council's Response

Basis for a mixed-use proposal

The Inspector recommended that the Council consider the allocation of this site to meet development needs. This need was identified through the comprehensive consideration of a range of issues, including public objections, at the Local Plan Inquiry. A mixed-use scheme accords with government guidance (PPS1) and good practice on good design / sustainable development principles. The inclusion of SMGPS in the allocation was recommended by the Inspector after consideration of representations considered at the Inquiry. The allocation provides the opportunity to take a comprehensive and well planned overview of these adjoining land-uses. However, the redevelopment of the school is not a requirement of the policy.

Effect on the playing field

The Local Plan requires retention of a grassed playing field. Regarding the wider impact on recreational open space the Local Plan proposal requires the provision of public access open space which meets the standards set out in the draft Green Spaces Strategy.

The existing wording of the Policy does not require the school and its playing field to be replaced or redeveloped. It could remain in its current location and be refurbished. This can be set out clearly in the required Development brief.

Need for retail

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term (plan period). The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy.

Education

It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site.

Increase in Traffic

Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel.

A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Employment

The policy requires the provision of local employment opportunities.

Proposed Change: No change.

**List of objectors who submitted the standard objection to the allocation of
St Martin's Garden Primary School Hayesfield School Playing Field**

M/B5/50 – new para B5.32 on convenience shopping	3704/J2	3752/J1	4306/J1	4373/J2	4404/J2
3696/J2	3705/J2	3757/J2	4307/J2	4374/J2	4405/J2
	3706/J2	3758/J2	4308/J2	4375/J2	4406/J2
	3707/J2	3759/J2	4309/J2	4376/J2	4407/J2
	3708/J2	3760/J2	4310/J2	4377/J2	4408/J2
M/B9/51 – new para B5.32A on convenience shopping	3709/J4	3761/J2	4311/J2	4378/J2	4409/J2
120/J392	3710/J2	3789/J1	4312/J2	4379/J2	4410/J2
1909/J4	3711/J2	3790/J2	4313/J2	4380/J2	4411/J2
2082/J5	3712/J2	3792/J2	4314/J2	4381/J2	4412/J2
2552/J4	3714/J2	3793/J2	4315/J2	4382/J2	4413/J2
2813/J3	3715/J4	3794/J2	4316/J2	4383/J2	4414/J2
3307/J3	3716/J2	3795/J2	4317/J1	4384/J2	4416/J2
3626/J10	3717/J2	3796/J2	4318/J2	4385/J2	4417/J2
3652/J7	3718/J2	3797/J2	4319/J2	4386/J2	4418/J2
3679/J2	3730/J2	3802/J4	4320/J2	4387/J2	4419/J2
3680/J1	3731/J2	3803/J2	4321/J2	4388/J1	4420/J2
3687/J1	3732/J2	3804/J2	4357/J2	4389/J2	4421/J2
3688/J1	3733/J2	3806/J3	4358/J2	4390/J2	4422/J2
3689/J1	3734/J2	3898/J2	4359/J2	4391/J2	4423/J2
3690/J2	3735/J2	3911/J3	4360/J2	4392/J2	4425/J2
3691/J1	3736/J2	3948/J26	4361/J2	4393/J2	4426/J2
3692/J2	3739/J2	3958/J2	4362/J2	4394/J2	4427/J2
3693/J2	3741/J2	3959/J1	4363/J2	4395/J2	4428/J2
3694/J1	3742/J2	3960/J2	4364/J2	4396/J2	4429/J2
3695/J2	3743/J2	3996/J2	4365/J2	4397/J2	4430/J2
3700/J1	3746/J2	3997/J2	4366/J2	4398/J2	4431/J2
3700/J2	3747/J2	3999/J2	4368/J2	4399/J2	4432/J2
3702/J2	3748/J2	40/J3	4369/J2	4400/J2	4433/J2
3703/J2	3749/J2	4036/J4	4370/J2	4401/J2	4434/J2
	3750/J2	4170/J3	4371/J2	4402/J2	4435/J2
	3751/J2	4305/J2	4372/J3	4403/J2	4436/J2

4437/J2	4476/J2	4518/J2	4557/J2	4596/J2	4637/J2
4438/J2	4477/J2	4519/J2	4558/J2	4597/J2	4638/J2
4439/J2	4478/J2	4520/J2	4559/J2	4598/J2	4639/J2
4440/J2	4479/J2	4521/J2	4560/J2	4599/J2	4640/J2
4441/J2	4480/J2	4522/J2	4561/J2	4600/J2	4641/J2
4442/J2	4481/J2	4523/J2	4562/J2	4601/J2	4642/J1
4443/J2	4482/J2	4524/J2	4563/J2	4603/J2	4643/J2
4444/J2	4483/J2	4525/J2	4564/J2	4604/J2	4644/J2
4445/J2	4486/J1	4526/J2	4565/J2	4605/J2	4645/J2
4446/J2	4488/J2	4527/J2	4566/J2	4606/J2	4646/J2
4447/J2	4489/J2	4528/J2	4567/J2	4607/J2	4648/J2
4448/J2	4490/J2	4529/J2	4568/J1	4608/J2	4649/J2
4449/J2	4491/J2	4530/J2	4569/J2	4609/J2	4650/J2
4450/J2	4492/J2	4531/J2	4570/J2	4610/J2	4651/J2
4451/J2	4493/J2	4532/J2	4571/J2	4611/J2	4653/J2
4452/J2	4494/J2	4533/J2	4572/J2	4612/J2	4654/J2
4453/J2	4495/J2	4534/J2	4573/J2	4613/J2	4655/J2
4454/J2	4496/J2	4535/J2	4574/J2	4614/J2	4656/J2
4455/J2	4497/J2	4536/J2	4575/J2	4615/J2	4657/J2
4456/J2	4498/J2	4537/J2	4576/J2	4616/J2	4658/J2
4457/J2	4499/J2	4538/J2	4577/J2	4618/J2	4659/J2
4458/J2	4500/J2	4539/J2	4578/J2	4619/J2	4660/J2
4459/J2	4501/J2	4540/J2	4579/J2	4620/J2	4661/J2
4460/J2	4502/J3	4541/J2	4580/J2	4621/J2	4662/J2
4461/J2	4503/J2	4542/J2	4581/J2	4622/J2	4663/J2
4462/J2	4504/J2	4543/J2	4582/J2	4623/J2	4665/J2
4463/J2	4505/J2	4544/J2	4583/J2	4624/J2	4666/J2
4464/J2	4506/J2	4545/J2	4584/J2	4625/J2	4667/J2
4465/J2	4507/J2	4546/J2	4585/J2	4626/J2	4668/J2
4466/J2	4508/J2	4547/J2	4586/J2	4627/J2	4669/J2
4467/J2	4509/J2	4548/J2	4587/J1	4628/J2	4670/J2
4468/J2	4510/J2	4549/J2	4588/J2	4629/J2	4671/J2
4469/J2	4511/J2	4550/J2	4589/J2	4630/J2	4672/J2
4470/J2	4512/J2	4551/J2	4590/J2	4631/J2	4673/J2
4471/J2	4513/J2	4552/J2	4591/J2	4632/J2	4674/J2
4472/J2	4514/J2	4553/J2	4592/J2	4633/J2	4675/J1
4473/J2	4515/J2	4554/J2	4593/J2	4634/J2	4676/J2
4474/J2	4516/J2	4555/J2	4594/J2	4635/J2	4677/J2
4475/J2	4517/J2	4556/J2	4595/J2	4636/J2	4679/J2

4680/J2	4721/J2	4761/J2	4801/J2	4840/J2	4885/J2
4681/J2	4722/J2	4762/J2	4802/J2	4841/J2	4886/J2
4682/J2	4723/J2	4763/J2	4803/J2	4842/J2	4887/J2
4683/J2	4724/J2	4764/J2	4804/J2	4843/J2	4889/J2
4684/J2	4725/J2	4765/J2	4805/J2	4844/J2	4890/J2
4685/J1	4726/J2	4766/J2	4806/J2	4845/J2	4891/J2
4686/J2	4727/J2	4767/J2	4807/J2	4846/J2	4892/J2
4687/J2	4728/J2	4768/J2	4808/J1	4847/J2	4893/J2
4688/J2	4729/J2	4769/J2	4809/J2	4848/J2	4894/J2
4689/J2	4730/J2	4770/J2	4810/J2	4849/J2	4895/J2
4690/J2	4731/J2	4771/J2	4811/J2	4850/J2	4896/J2
4691/J2	4732/J2	4772/J2	4812/J2	4851/J2	4897/J2
4692/J2	4733/J2	4774/J1	4813/J2	4857/J2	4898/J2
4693/J2	4734/J2	4775/J2	4814/J2	4858/J2	4899/J2
4694/J1	4735/J2	4776/J2	4815/J2	4859/J2	4900/J2
4695/J2	4736/J2	4777/J2	4816/J2	4860/J2	4901/J2
4697/J2	4737/J2	4778/J2	4817/J1	4861/J2	4902/J2
4699/J2	4738/J2	4779/J2	4818/J2	4862/J2	4903/J2
4700/J2	4739/J2	4780/J2	4819/J2	4863/J2	4904/J2
4701/J2	4740/J2	4781/J2	4820/J1	4864/J2	4905/J2
4702/J2	4741/J2	4782/J2	4821/J2	4865/J2	4906/J2
4703/J2	4743/J2	4783/J2	4822/J2	4866/J2	4907/J2
4704/J2	4744/J2	4784/J2	4823/J2	4867/J2	4908/J2
4705/J2	4745/J2	4785/J1	4824/J2	4868/J2	4909/J2
4706/J2	4746/J2	4786/J2	4825/J2	4869/J2	4910/J2
4707/J2	4747/J2	4787/J2	4826/J2	4870/J2	4911/J2
4708/J2	4748/J2	4788/J2	4827/J2	4871/J2	4912/J2
4709/J2	4749/J2	4789/J2	4828/J2	4872/J2	4913/J2
4710/J2	4750/J2	4790/J2	4829/J2	4873/J2	4914/J2
4711/J2	4751/J2	4791/J2	4830/J1	4874/J2	4915/J2
4712/J2	4752/J2	4792/J2	4831/J2	4875/J2	4916/J2
4713/J2	4753/J2	4793/J2	4832/J2	4876/J2	4917/J2
4714/J2	4754/J2	4794/J2	4833/J2	4877/J2	4918/J2
4715/J2	4755/J2	4795/J2	4834/J2	4878/J2	4919/J2
4716/J2	4756/J2	4796/J1	4835/J2	4879/J2	4920/J2
4717/J2	4757/J2	4797/J2	4836/J2	4880/J2	4921/J2
4718/J2	4758/J2	4798/J2	4837/J2	4881/J2	4922/J2
4719/J2	4759/J2	4799/J2	4838/J2	4883/J2	4923/J2
4720/J2	4760/J2	4800/J2	4839/J2	4884/J2	4924/J2

4925/J2	3815/J1	M/B9/18	3692/J1	3750/J1	3821/J2
4926/J2	3816/J1	4001/J1	3693/J1	3751/J1	3822/J2
4927/J2	3817/J1		3694/J2	3752/J2	3823/J2
4928/J2	3818/J1	M/B9/30 – GDS.1/B18 –	3695/J1	3757/J1	3824/J2
4929/J2	3819/J1	Hayesfield School	3696/J1	3758/J1	3859/J2
4930/J1	3820/J1	Playing Field/St.	3702/J1	3758/J3	3860/J2
4931/J2	3821/J1	Martin's Garden	3703/J1	3759/J1	3861/J2
4932/J2	3822/J1	Primary School	3704/J1	3760/J1	3862/J2
4933/J2	3823/J1	110/J27	3705/J1	3761/J1	3863/J2
4934/J2	3824/J1	120/J390	3706/J1	3778/J1	3864/J2
4935/J2	3859/J1	120/J391	3707/J1	3789/J2	3865/J1
4936/J2	3860/J1	152/J2	3708/J1	3790/J1	3866/J1
4937/J2	3861/J1	1909/J3	3709/J3	3791/J1	3867/J1
4938/J2	3862/J1	2082/J4	3710/J1	3791/J2	3868/J2
4939/J2	3863/J1	2086/J4	3711/J1	3792/J1	3887/J1
4940/J2	3864/J1	2552/J3	3712/J1	3792/J3	3888/J1
4954/J2	3868/J1	2813/J2	3714/J1	3792/J4	3897/J1
4955/J2	3917/J1	3116/J178	3715/J3	3793/J1	3898/J1
4956/J2	3918/J1	3126/J222	3715/J5	3794/J1	3907/J1
4957/J2	3920/J1	3307/J2	3716/J1	3795/J1	3911/J2
4958/J2	3925/J1	3308/J4	3717/J1	3796/J1	3916/J1
4959/J2	3926/J1	3382/J6	3718/J1	3796/J3	3917/J2
4960/J3	3927/J1	3626/J9	3722/J1	3797/J1	3918/J2
4961/J2	3928/J1	3652/J6	3730/J1	3802/J3	3919/J1
4962/J2	3929/J1	3661/J9	3731/J1	3803/J1	3920/J2
505/J100	3930/J1	3671/J7	3732/J1	3804/J1	3924/J1
565/J2	4297/J2	3678/J1	3733/J1	3806/J2	3925/J2
745/J48	4296/J2	3679/J1	3734/J1	3809/J1	3926/J2
852/J2	4298/J2	3680/J2	3735/J1	3810/J1	3927/J2
896/J2	4299/J2	3681/J1	3736/J1	3811/J1	3928/J2
897/J2	4300/J2	3682/J1	3739/J1	3812/J2	3929/J2
	4301/J2	3684/J1	3740/J1	3813/J2	3930/J2
M/B5/53 – Shopping	4302/J2	3686/J1	3741/J1	3814/J2	3948/J20
152/J1	4303/J2	3687/J2	3742/J1	3815/J2	3958/J1
742/J18	4304/J2	3688/J2	3743/J1	3816/J2	3959/J2
2086/J3		3689/J2	3746/J1	3817/J2	3960/J1
3812/J1	M/B5/57	3690/J1	3747/J1	3818/J2	3962/J1
3813/J1	4001/J2	3691/J2	3748/J1	3819/J2	3963/J1
3814/J1			3749/J1	3820/J2	3969/J3

3995/J1	4315/J1	4390/J1	4431/J1	4470/J1	4512/J1
3996/J1	4316/J1	4391/J1	4432/J1	4471/J1	4513/J1
3997/J1	4317/J2	4392/J1	4433/J1	4472/J1	4514/J1
3999/J1	4318/J1	4393/J1	4434/J1	4473/J1	4515/J1
40/J1	4319/J1	4394/J1	4435/J1	4474/J1	4516/J1
40/J2	4320/J1	4395/J1	4436/J1	4475/J1	4517/J1
4003/J1	4321/J1	4396/J1	4437/J1	4476/J1	4518/J1
4004/J1	4357/J1	4397/J1	4438/J1	4477/J1	4519/J1
4005/J1	4358/J1	4398/J1	4439/J1	4478/J1	4520/J1
4006/J1	4359/J1	4399/J1	4440/J1	4479/J1	4521/J1
4007/J1	4360/J1	4400/J1	4441/J1	4480/J1	4522/J1
4008/J2	4361/J1	4401/J1	4442/J1	4481/J1	4523/J1
4011/J1	4362/J1	4402/J1	4443/J1	4482/J1	4524/J1
4012/J1	4363/J1	4403/J1	4444/J1	4483/J1	4525/J1
4013/J1	4364/J1	4404/J1	4445/J1	4486/J2	4526/J1
4014/J1	4365/J1	4405/J1	4446/J1	4488/J1	4527/J1
4015/J1	4366/J1	4406/J1	4447/J1	4489/J1	4528/J1
4036/J3	4368/J1	4407/J1	4448/J1	4490/J1	4529/J1
4170/J2	4369/J1	4408/J1	4449/J1	4491/J1	4530/J1
4296/J1	4370/J1	4409/J1	4450/J1	4492/J1	4531/J1
4297/J1	4371/J1	4410/J1	4451/J1	4493/J1	4532/J1
4298/J1	4372/J1	4411/J1	4452/J1	4494/J1	4533/J1
4299/J1	4373/J1	4412/J1	4453/J1	4495/J1	4534/J1
43/J5	4374/J1	4413/J1	4454/J1	4496/J1	4535/J1
4300/J1	4375/J1	4414/J1	4455/J1	4497/J1	4536/J1
4301/J1	4376/J1	4416/J1	4456/J1	4498/J1	4537/J1
4302/J1	4377/J1	4417/J1	4457/J1	4499/J1	4538/J1
4303/J1	4378/J1	4418/J1	4458/J1	4500/J1	4539/J1
4304/J1	4379/J1	4419/J1	4459/J1	4501/J1	4540/J1
4305/J1	4380/J1	4420/J1	4460/J1	4502/J1	4541/J1
4306/J2	4381/J1	4421/J1	4461/J1	4503/J1	4542/J1
4307/J1	4382/J1	4422/J1	4462/J1	4504/J1	4543/J1
4308/J1	4383/J1	4423/J1	4463/J1	4505/J1	4544/J1
4309/J1	4384/J1	4425/J1	4464/J1	4506/J1	4545/J1
4310/J1	4385/J1	4426/J1	4465/J1	4507/J1	4546/J1
4311/J1	4386/J1	4427/J1	4466/J1	4508/J1	4547/J1
4312/J1	4387/J1	4428/J1	4467/J1	4509/J1	4548/J1
4313/J1	4388/J2	4429/J1	4468/J1	4510/J1	4549/J1
4314/J1	4389/J1	4430/J1	4469/J1	4511/J1	4550/J1

4551/J1	4590/J1	4630/J1	4670/J1	4711/J1	4751/J1
4552/J1	4591/J1	4631/J1	4671/J1	4712/J1	4752/J1
4553/J1	4592/J1	4632/J1	4672/J1	4713/J1	4753/J1
4554/J1	4593/J1	4633/J1	4673/J1	4714/J1	4754/J1
4555/J1	4594/J1	4634/J1	4674/J1	4715/J1	4755/J1
4556/J1	4595/J1	4635/J1	4675/J2	4716/J1	4756/J1
4557/J1	4596/J1	4636/J1	4676/J1	4717/J1	4757/J1
4558/J1	4597/J1	4637/J1	4677/J1	4718/J1	4758/J1
4559/J1	4598/J1	4638/J1	4679/J1	4719/J1	4759/J1
4560/J1	4599/J1	4639/J1	4680/J1	4720/J1	4760/J1
4561/J1	4600/J1	4640/J1	4681/J1	4721/J1	4761/J1
4562/J1	4601/J1	4641/J1	4682/J1	4722/J1	4762/J1
4563/J1	4602/J1	4642/J2	4683/J1	4723/J1	4763/J1
4564/J1	4603/J1	4643/J1	4684/J1	4724/J1	4764/J1
4565/J1	4604/J1	4644/J1	4685/J2	4725/J1	4765/J1
4566/J1	4605/J1	4645/J1	4686/J1	4726/J1	4766/J1
4567/J1	4606/J1	4646/J1	4687/J1	4727/J1	4767/J1
4568/J2	4607/J1	4648/J1	4688/J1	4728/J1	4768/J1
4569/J1	4608/J1	4649/J1	4689/J1	4729/J1	4769/J1
4570/J1	4609/J1	4650/J1	4690/J1	4730/J1	4770/J1
4571/J1	4610/J1	4651/J1	4691/J1	4731/J1	4771/J1
4572/J1	4611/J1	4653/J1	4692/J1	4732/J1	4772/J1
4573/J1	4612/J1	4654/J1	4693/J1	4733/J1	4774/J2
4574/J1	4613/J1	4655/J1	4694/J2	4734/J1	4775/J1
4575/J1	4614/J1	4656/J1	4695/J1	4735/J1	4776/J1
4576/J1	4615/J1	4657/J1	4697/J1	4736/J1	4777/J1
4577/J1	4616/J1	4658/J1	4698/J1	4737/J1	4778/J1
4578/J1	4618/J1	4659/J1	4699/J1	4738/J1	4779/J1
4579/J1	4619/J1	4660/J1	4700/J1	4739/J1	4780/J1
4580/J1	4620/J1	4661/J1	4701/J1	4740/J1	4781/J1
4581/J1	4621/J1	4662/J1	4702/J1	4741/J1	4782/J1
4582/J1	4622/J1	4663/J1	4703/J1	4743/J1	4783/J1
4583/J1	4623/J1	4664/J1	4704/J1	4744/J1	4784/J1
4584/J1	4624/J1	4664/J2	4705/J1	4745/J1	4785/J2
4585/J1	4625/J1	4665/J1	4706/J1	4746/J1	4786/J1
4586/J1	4626/J1	4666/J1	4707/J1	4747/J1	4787/J1
4587/J2	4627/J1	4667/J1	4708/J1	4748/J1	4788/J1
4588/J1	4628/J1	4668/J1	4709/J1	4749/J1	4789/J1
4589/J1	4629/J1	4669/J1	4710/J1	4750/J1	4790/J1

4791/J1	4830/J2	4874/J1	4915/J1	727/J27
4792/J1	4831/J1	4875/J1	4916/J1	745/J46
4793/J1	4832/J1	4876/J1	4917/J1	745/J47
4794/J1	4833/J1	4877/J1	4918/J1	852/J1
4795/J1	4834/J1	4878/J1	4919/J1	896/J1
4796/J2	4835/J1	4879/J1	4920/J1	897/J1
4797/J1	4836/J1	4880/J1	4921/J1	
4798/J1	4837/J1	4881/J1	4922/J1	
4799/J1	4838/J1	4883/J1	4923/J1	
4800/J1	4839/J1	4884/J1	4924/J1	
4801/J1	4840/J1	4885/J1	4925/J1	
4802/J1	4841/J1	4886/J1	4926/J1	
4803/J1	4842/J1	4887/J1	4927/J1	
4804/J1	4843/J1	4889/J1	4928/J1	
4805/J1	4844/J1	4890/J1	4929/J1	
4806/J1	4845/J1	4891/J1	4930/J2	
4807/J1	4846/J1	4892/J1	4931/J1	
4808/J2	4847/J1	4893/J1	4932/J1	
4809/J1	4848/J1	4894/J1	4933/J1	
4810/J1	4849/J1	4895/J1	4934/J1	
4811/J1	4850/J1	4896/J1	4935/J1	
4812/J1	4851/J1	4897/J1	4936/J1	
4813/J1	4857/J1	4898/J1	4937/J1	
4814/J1	4858/J1	4899/J1	4938/J1	
4815/J1	4859/J1	4900/J1	4939/J1	
4816/J1	4860/J1	4901/J1	4940/J1	
4817/J2	4861/J1	4902/J1	4953/J1	
4818/J1	4862/J1	4903/J1	4954/J1	
4819/J1	4863/J1	4904/J1	4955/J1	
4820/J2	4864/J1	4905/J1	4956/J1	
4821/J1	4865/J1	4906/J1	4957/J1	
4822/J1	4866/J1	4907/J1	4958/J1	
4823/J1	4867/J1	4908/J1	4959/J1	
4824/J1	4868/J1	4909/J1	4960/J1	
4825/J1	4869/J1	4910/J1	4961/J1	
4826/J1	4870/J1	4911/J1	4962/J1	
4827/J1	4871/J1	4912/J1	4976/J1	
4828/J1	4872/J1	4913/J1	505/J99	
4829/J1	4873/J1	4914/J1	565/J1	

Other objections to the allocation of St Martin's Garden Primary School Hayesfield School Playing Field and the Council's responses

<i>Respondent</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Duly Made</i>
-------------------	-----------------	------------------

Chapter B5. Shopping

Modification: M/B5/51 - New para B5.32A on convenience shopping

Ref: 3948/J26

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

(1) This change of use is in direct conflict with Policy SR.1A ii). It also does not meet the criteria for "surplus to requirements" set out in PPG17. It has not been established that this land is incapable of being used for recreation. Therefore both other parts of the Local Plan and PPG1 7 make this change unacceptable, and neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore published Government guidance. There has been no public consultation to establish whether there is indeed a need for convenience store floorspace in this area, nor has any impact assessment on other shops in the areas and within convenient travelling distance. The argument that Sainsbury's needs pressure relieved is at best spurious, and at worst an attempt to undermine their profitability. The inspector's recommendation should have been rejected outright; there is no legal justification for it. It should also be noted that the inspector's recommendation R5.18 suggests using this land for housing which directly conflicts with recommendation R4.4, so any picture of the inspector's preference is completely obscured. Also, there is no possible justification for including St Martin's Garden School in this amendment: the school is recently modernised, and the council cannot reasonably justify the disruption to the pupils' education or the expense of re-providing it elsewhere. This objection also affects M/B5/53 and M/B9/30.

Initial Response

The development requirements fully accord with the emerging Green Space Strategy which concluded that the shortfall in recreational open space in this part of Bath should be provided as part of the redevelopment of the site. The Green Space Strategy has been prepared in accordance with advice in PPG17. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The development requirements require that convenience floorspace to meet local needs is provided by small retail outlets in accordance with the emerging retail strategy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4036/J4

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

1. I object to these four modifications (as amended by full council on 12th October 2006) because I am concerned that a number of small convenience retail and non-retail mixed uses on the Hayesfield site will FAIL to fulfil the Inspector's original intention of providing sufficient convenience floorspace in South Bath to (her report, para 4.37) "reduce the need for the residents in a densely developed part of the city to travel into town for convenience shopping."
2. The modification should be revised to ensure the provision of sufficient convenience floorspace in South Bath to remove the need for use of further green space in South Bath for convenience shopping in future years.

Initial Response

Ref: 1909/J4

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath Yes

Summary of Comment

I am writing to object to the proposal to build a superstore on the site by St. Martin's School, Odd Down. Firstly, I think it is unfair to include this without proper consultation - I understand that retail and traffic studies etc. will not be completed until after the closing date for representations. Secondly, I feel that a superstore would have a detrimental effect on local communities. Currently there are thriving retail communities on the Bear Flat, Moorland Road, Odd Down, etc. and these would probably be badly affected. I think the local shops should be encouraged and nurtured and not driven off by competition from the large retailers. For this reason, I also object to the proposal to build a supermarket on the old factory site on the Lower Bristol Road (apologies if this isn't in the Local Plan). I also consider that a large store would see an increase in traffic (and especially delivery lorries) which would have a negative effect on the local area. I also think it is a made idea to knock down a perfectly good school for no good reason, thereby causing a lot of stress to the staff and parents. It would be lovely if this green site (or at least part of it) could be preserved as a nature site but, if this is not possible, I would prefer to see it developed as a residential or commercial site (office accommodation) with some small retail units for little, local shops for local residents to use. Thank you for reading this letter and I do hope no more supermarkets or superstores will be built in Bath.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments. The Local Plan requires retention of a grassed playing field. Regarding the wider impact on recreational open space the Local Plan proposal requires the provision of public access open space which meets the standards set out in the draft Green Spaces Strategy.

Ref: 3715/J4

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath Yes

Summary of Comment

As residents of 59 years in Cranmore Place we can hardly believe anyone would contemplate putting a supermarket on the site now occupied by St. Martin's Garden School. Having just spent two million pounds updating this excellent school, is this just to be written off? This is a residential area, can you imagine the disruption to peoples lives here? The other problem is the traffic the store would create. The road adjacent to the school is always busy but at peak times is horrendous. On Wednesday at 4.30p.m. trying to get out of Banwell Road was difficult enough. The traffic was one long line as far as the eye could see on Upper Wellsway and on reaching the Red Lion roundabout there was a line of traffic along Frome Road which was most likely to the bottom of Rush Hill and beyond, a line of traffic approaching from the city centre along Wellsway and another line of cars at the back of the school which stretched past Combe Down almost to Brassknocker Hill. How can the roads cope with even more traffic the supermarket would cause. No-one seems to have mentioned the large school for special needs children being built opposite to the Hayesfield playing ground or the large housing development at the St. Martin's Hospital site, which will again bring more traffic. Please come and see for yourself exactly the problems arising from this ill thought out and rushed through proposal, but do come at a peak time!

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental

and transport assessments.

Modification: M/B5/53 - Shopping

Ref: 742/J18

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

Englishcombe Parish Council objects to the allocation of land at the above site for retail development on the grounds that the south and south-west of Bath is already adequately provided with retail outlets including a substantial supermarket at Moreland Road and local shops and supermarkets at a number of locations. Additional retail outlets, and more particularly a substantial 'superstore' at the above site would significantly adversely affect existing retail businesses in the south and south-west of Bath from Combe Down to Twerton including Odd Down, Southdown, Bear Flat and Moreland Road. Additionally, the above site is in an area of heavy traffic congestion which already leads to unacceptable rat-running through the narrow rural lanes in adjacent parishes and is entirely unsuitable for a development which would generate significant additional traffic.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4298/J2

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

No

Summary of Comment

I do not think that another supermarket is needed in Odd Down. It will increase the traffic on a busy road near a school. St Martin's is a well established school with a special needs centre and recently upgraded. Any disturbance would not be helpful. The small local shops are important in the area and would be affected by the competition from Tesco's. The field belonging to Hayesfield School would be more useful for affordable housing for teachers. With the coming Olympics the School may get money towards a sports hall.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Chapter B9. General Development Sites

Modification: M/B9/30 - GDS.1/B18 - Hayesfield School Playing Field/St. Martins Garden PS

Ref:43/J5

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

(1) I support the exclusion of a superstore from the site and the restriction of convenience floorspace to 'small retail outlets' on the grounds that:

(a) A large supermarket on that site would jeopardise the future of small shops at Odd Down, Combe Down, Moorland Rd and in the nearby villages of Wellow, Tunley and Freshford among others. Small shops are pivotal to the survival of balanced communities, and need protection through our planning policies.

(b) The road system in the vicinity of the A367 and the B3110 is already saturated, and cannot accommodate the additional traffic generated by a supermarket.

(2) I would wish the proposed modification, as amended by Council on 12 October 2006, to be further amended to restrict the size of any convenience floorspace (compatible with the emerging retail strategy) on this site. I suggest that 'small retail outlets' be defined to mean 'not necessitating a customer car park'.

Initial Response

Support noted. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 727/J27

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I wish to object to the above-proposed modification to the Local Plan on the following grounds.

1. Legality of the Inspectors Modification on the basis of revealed bias:-The Council should have recognised that the Inspector had shown bias against an existing supermarket by referring to them by name, Sainsbury's, and wishing to 'take pressure of them'. An Inspector should not be commenting on the relative popularity or otherwise when considering future trading provisions. By showing bias the Inspector's recommendation is invalid. The Inspector is able to comment on the pressure on a local road network but not the trading level of a retailer. The Inspectors comment may be the result of an unfavourable view of Sainsbury's, which is unacceptable by an Inspector. The Council should have challenged the Regional Planning Inspector to give a view on the objectivity of the Inspector regarding this modification.

2. Inconsistency of Process of Consultation:- Over several years the Draft Local Plan has been through many stages of development regarding new amendments and changes. Each stage was subject to detailed officer and Committee review. This proposed amendment has not as yet received any such detailed internal or public review. The Council is being inconsistent and perverse in its hurried and inadequate adoption of the proposed amendment. In not acting in a consistent manner the Council is not complying with the statutory requirements for public consultation on the Plan as it develops.

3. Inconsistency of Site Evaluation:- The Council has acted inconsistently in that this site was not selected by the Council as a prospective site, it argued against its use at the Enquiry, but then approved its use without considering any alternative sites. This is contrary and inconsistent with the Council's establish process as already used for the previous selection and consultation for sites for either St Johns school or the Special needs new school. Both of these schools were considered during the Plan development process. The Enquiry process only had one site to consider on the basis of that selected by the objector. The Council is not complying with the requirement to examine other prospective sites so as to ensure the best site in the south Bath area is selected for the additional retail purpose. The Council had already clearly demonstrated that this site is not the most suitable by not proposing its use as part of the Plan development

4. Inadequate Provision of the required information for Consultation: - in not complying with statutory requirements for adequate consultation I have been denied my right to be provided with information by Council staff as to the details behind the Council's action in adopting the Inspector's recommendation. I enclose copies of my five requests for information for which I have not as yet had a response other than an acknowledgement. These requests include the essential problem of why the Council was advised that the Inspector's recommendation could not be resisted. These are key sources of information that are needed to be able to object on a factual basis for the actions of the Council.

Information requested

4.1 Reports, internal memos/discussions regarding environmental assessments

4.2 Reports, internal memos/discussions regarding impact of new retail facility

4.3 Reports, internal memos/discussions regarding traffic assessment

4.4 Costs of School relocation being greater than site income

4.5 Reasons why Inspectors Modification could not be rejected

5. Lack of and Inconsistency of Evaluation of Changes to the Draft Plan: In making their hurried adoption of the recommendation the Council has not considered the effects of the recommendation in the same manner as that of other significant changes as the Plan developed. A proper public consultation cannot take place without the full and correct information being in the public domain before the public consultation period starts. This significant recommendation requires the identification of the type, size and location of the proposed retail outlet; the effect on the existing local community shopping facilities; the effect on St Martins Garden School if not moved; the effect on the pupils of St Martins Garden School if it is moved; the effect of any of these alternatives on the local traffic network; the environmental impact assessments needed.

6. Inconsistent Consideration of Retail Provision throughout Bath: This modification is based on the single assumption that south Bath needs a new retail area: The existing large retail outlets are all centred in the middle of Bath, hence all quadrants of Bath must by the same logic need a new retail area. These other areas have been ignored. Because this site was selected by Hayesfield School to maximise its own site value a skewed allocation of new retail provision has resulted. The site selected has one school on it already and two directly adjacent with a third only half a mile away. The impact on these pupils has not been included in any assessment that I am aware of. The effect on the local shopping facilities and communities will be disastrous.

The analysis of need and its effects on the local shopping provision was based on estimates of population growth through the SWDA housing provision some time in the future and increases in purchasing power of the local communities. These assumptions have not been tested by Council officers. The SWDA housing is a long way off so that if the retail provision goes ahead before the housing development there will not be the custom available to sustain both the new store and the existing shopping facilities. Experience elsewhere around the country shows that the local shop will die as does the heart of each community. This is contrary to Council's Objectives.

7. No evaluation of the Educational Impact of the Modification has been made:-To enable Hayesfield School to maximise the value of its site St Martins Garden School must be moved. To put the education of primary school pupils above that of a new retail facility has not yet been justified. No details of where St Martins Garden School will be located and at what size are available. Hence public consultation cannot be made without such important details. The Council is incorrect in its duties for public consultation on this Inspectors recommendation. To put the education of a thousand or more primary pupils at risk over several years for implementing an ill thought-out recommendation is totally unprofessional. The welfare of the pupils must be paramount and should have been considered first before rushing into agreeing with the Inspector. Again lack of adequate consultation is causing a real problem.

8. The Approval by the School's Organisation Committee of a Move of St Martins Garden School was assumed without approval from the Schools Organisation Committee: The transfer and reduction in size of St Martins Garden School was mentioned by the Councillor responsible for Education at a public Committee Meeting as part of the discussion of how the two combined sites would be used. This was given as one reason to support the Inspector's recommendation. No change in the status or physical location of a school may take place without the approval of the Schools Organisation Committee. In approving the Inspector's recommendation the Council has now pre judged the Schools Organisation Committee decision of approving the proposed move. A decision in favour of such a move after the recent approval by the Schools Organisation Committee to the current size and site would be perverse in the extreme. It would put the independence of that Committee into serious doubt and legal challenge. The correct consultation procedures with the appropriate body have not been followed.

9. The Approval of Sport England was assumed without their approval for the change in size of playing fields of St Martins Garden School:

The supporting documentation to the Council's decision does not include any mention of consulting Sport England regarding any proposed changes to St Martins Garden School site. To make use of the site approval for any reductions in playing field allocation must be sought before the School is moved. The Council has made a second assumption that a Statutory Authority's approval would be forthcoming without previously seeking approval. The correct consultation procedures with the appropriate Statutory body have not been followed.

Without the full information being made to the general public and not following the correct statutory and public consultation procedures the Inspector's recommendation should be rejected. My objection is based on these premises.

If the Council is minded to accept the recommendation then a full consultation process should be held before which the correct information regarding the options available should be made public. This process should have happened before the Council rushed into making such a decision.

Any Council decision to accept the Inspector's recommendation should be carried out with a public notice giving the details provided by the Planning Department of why the recommendation could not be rejected. Nothing has been provided in the public domain as to why this recommendation cannot be rejected. The Council has never previously considered this modification hence it cannot comply with Council planning objectives, so why the change?

Initial Response

The objector has been supplied with the relevant information which underpinned the proposed modification to allocate the site for a comprehensive mixed use scheme through a Freedom of Information request.

Ref: 745/J46

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

South Stoke Parish Council objects to the proposal to introduce a major retail facility into this part of the city. The traffic generated by the proposed new supermarket will exacerbate an increasingly difficult "rat-run" problem through all the small settlements adjacent to the A367 & B3110. In addition there would be a significant increase in both light and noise pollution of the area of Green Belt and AONB, which is close to the site. The effect on local small shops would be disastrous. Most of the general and specialist food and hardware stores in Combe Down and Odd Down would face closure.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3116/J178

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

Object to council's objection of inspector's recommendation, AND Support council's objections to inspector's modifications. Object: not in accordance with inspectors R4, 2 requiring assessment of recreational needs for this land. Support: mixed use development for playing field site, rather than retail development; subject to 114.2 assessment first. Mixed use development is more compatible with Policies to protect small shops. Object to any reference to relocate St Martins Garden Primary School. As per attachment to our representation on M/B5/53 we support relocation of St Johns Primary School here. We urge deletion of this paragraph. and the addition of a paragraph in the Community Facilities section, close to Policy CF.5 to include a statement in support of the inspector's recommendation in IC6.

Initial Response

Support for mixed-use development noted. The development requirements fully accord with the emerging Green Space Strategy which concluded that the shortfall in recreational open space in this part of Bath should be provided as part of the redevelopment of the site. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. See response to 3116/K177 with respect to the preferred site for the relocation of St John's primary school. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3308/J4

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

(1) I support the exclusion of a superstore from the site and the restriction of convenience floorspace to 'small retail outlets' on the grounds that:

- (a) A large supermarket on that site would jeopardise the future of small shops at Odd Down, Combe Down, Moorland Rd and in the nearby villages of Wellow, Tunley and Freshford among others. Small shops are pivotal to the survival of balanced communities, and need protection through our planning policies.
- (b) The road system in the vicinity of the A367 and the B3110 is already saturated, and cannot accommodate the additional traffic generated by a supermarket.
- (2)1 would wish the proposed modification, as amended by Council on 12 October 2006, to be further amended to restrict the size of any convenience floorspace (compatible with the emerging retail strategy) on this site. I suggest that 'small retail outlets' be defined to mean 'not necessitating a customer car park'.

Initial Response

Support noted. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3382/J6	Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's Garden PS	Bath	Yes
---------------------	---	-------------	-----

Summary of Comment

The proposal to designate the St Martin's Garden School area for mixed development ignores the considerable pressure currently inflicted on the locality. These include Three Ways School, St Martins Hospital and the "Pulteney View" development on the former Clark's site. Upper Wellsway, Frome Road and Bradford Road are already heavily used. To add to this loading by building shops and housing on the St. Martin's Garden School site would be unwise as well as unnecessary. And if a supermarket were to be put on to this site the traffic levels would be grim, hindering the flow of vehicles in and out of Bath along Upper Wellsway. What evidence has the Council that there is a need for further shops in this area? Would these new retail outlets not damage the trade of current shops in Odd Down? I urge the Council to abandon this damaging idea. No reason is given by the Government's Inspector for the Local Plan for allocating St Martins Garden Primary School for mixed use. As there are no planning reasons for this change of use, the only reason may be to maximise the value of the land. Land value should not be allowed as a consideration when making planning decisions.

- The Council has a policy of supporting local businesses. Retail development should not be promoted on the site without first carrying out a study of retail needs. Previous studies for Bath were simply a desktop exercise, which concentrated on the city centre.
- The site is located at the junction of two major through roads; the B31 10 and A367. Development of land in this area should not be allowed to increase the traffic burden at this junction; which is already overstretched.

To summarise I believe the complete St Martins' Garden Primary School site should remain designated for educational use and not be included on a mixed use site. Also any developments should only be implemented following full consultation with all stakeholders, and not until a Green Space Strategy and Retail Strategy have been completed.

Initial Response

A mixed-use scheme accords with government guidance (PPS1) and good practice on good design / sustainable development principles. The inclusion of SMGPS in the allocation was recommended by the Inspector after consideration of representations considered at the Inquiry. The allocation provides the opportunity to take a comprehensive and well planned overview of these adjoining land-uses. However, the redevelopment of the school is not a requirement of the policy. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3661/J9	Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's Garden PS	Bath	Yes
---------------------	---	-------------	-----

Summary of Comment

Objection to Proposed Policy GDS.1/B18

1. As the Governing Body of St. Martin's Garden Primary School we do not feel that we have been made aware of the impact the proposed change in use for the site would have on the school. We are concerned that:

- There would be a very significant reduction in the space available to the children at the school, both internally and externally, and that the quality of the site, e.g. tree maturity, would be much poorer
- The site of any new school would be inappropriate to the education and welfare of primary aged children e.g. between a behavioural centre (The Link) and a shopping parade
- There would be a significant increase in the danger posed by a significant increase in traffic, and that air quality would drop
- It would result in the loss of a significant green space for the local community.

Since we have had no assurances from anyone about any of the above (except that 'studies will be done') we do not feel that we can agree to any changes.

2. Therefore, for the above reasons, we would like St. Martin's Garden Primary School site removed from the sections referring a change to 'mixed use' (as outlined in Section 2 of this form).

Initial Response

It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3671/J7

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

(1) I object to the limitation to "small retail outlets" in the Development Brief requirements, item 6.

(2) I am seeking the removal of the words "provided by small retail outlets in accordance with the emerging retail strategy" from item 6 of the Development Brief requirements.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will provide flexibility in terms of meeting the need for additional convenience floorspace in the south of Bath. The Retail Strategy currently being undertaken will provide guidance beyond Plan period. It will reassess of the floorspace requirements for Bath, including convenience retail, and how this will be met by testing various options. The Strategy is anticipated to be completed by summer 2007 and will inform the development brief which will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3679/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I have lived on Odd Down for the last 40 years and I am very concerned about the proposed supermarket and the consideration of taking the field next to the school grounds known as the Jews Cemetery. Many people regularly walk their dogs on this small area of grass - we are gradually losing all such areas. The area is already becoming busier by the day. Over the years the traffic build up on the main Wellsway leaving the city has become much worse. I live on this road and traffic is stacking by 4.30 every evening, usually stacking way back across the Red Lion roundabout

and down Wellsway. The last thing we need is to add the traffic from a supermarket. St Martins Garden Primary School is a wonderful school. It is on a large site giving excellent facilities for the children. I live opposite the school and the children use this field for every break when the weather permits. Soon we will have no green space left on Odd Down. Odd Down is a wonderful community if a Supermarket is built we will lose all the small shops in the area. The size of the current school and its grounds is not going to be replaced. The Margaret Coates Centre has only just been built and the children are perfectly situated to have space and also able to integrate with the main school. Isn't it amazing that areas such as Lansdown are always left alone!!!!

Initial Response

It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3681/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

No further retail outlets are needed in the area. A well laid out recreation area (wanted), having consulted with a representative section particularly of young people which is environmentally enhancing for wildlife/nature.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. The Local Plan requires retention of a grassed playing field. Regarding the wider impact on recreational open space the Local Plan proposal requires the provision of public access open space which meets the standards set out in the draft Green Spaces Strategy.

Ref: 3682/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I object on the following grounds:

It was only a few months ago that the council was looking for a site for a new catholic junior school in Bath. The above site would have been more that suitable and now there is a proposal to sell it off! What is the point of having a local plan, a local council or councillors if the planning and development agenda is driven in a totally ad hoc way for the gain of individual vested interests rather than the planned needs of the community. I would welcome a new supermarket in Bath which is poorly served compared with almost every other town in the south of England. The closure of Stothert and Pitt and other industrial sites gave the council a golden opportunity to address this shortfall. Failure to do so may, in no small part, be a consequence of the procrastination and inability of the council to deliver a strategic plan of vision for Bath. The Hayesfield site is inappropriate for redevelopment and a supermarket for the following reasons:

1. The road infrastructure is unsuitable, particularly during busy periods. Several million pounds was recently spent resurfacing roads in the area, only to find that the Old Frome Road has been marked out with a large parking area which seriously disrupts the flow of traffic and is now being dug up as part of a secondary development. In addition access from top of Wells Way has been reduced as part of the road now appears to be effectively a truck rental and car sales forecourt.
2. The proposed site is adjacent to a residential area and presumably the supermarket would want to operate twenty-four hours a day. This would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life for those residents adjacent to the site, who would suffer noise and light pollution for the financial gain of the school.
3. Is a supermarket adjacent to a school really a good idea?
4. Any new supermarket should, where possible, be located within easy access from all areas of Bath, a better site would be part of the old Stothert and Pitt site or the gas works area, closer to the

centre of town. Has Bath learnt nothing from research into the effects of out of town shopping?
I hope a modicum of common sense will prevail, but I am not holding my breath.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments. The site at Oldfield Lane remains the preferred option for the relocation of St John's RC Primary School.

Ref: 3684/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I would like to outline my objections to the proposed development on the St. Martin's Garden Primary School site and Hayesfield School playing field at Odd Down for mixed use including retail outlets-

- The school has recently had a large sum of money spent on it to upgrade the facilities which would seem to me a total waste if it is now demolished and rebuilt. I also think that in future the efforts of fundraisers may not be as fruitful if their efforts are seen to be of such little value.
- The fact that the school site redevelopment was announced just as the school was breaking up for the long summer holidays seems somewhat underhand. It is hardly the easiest time of the year to either go through a consultation exercise or for information to be circulated and commented on.

I do not have such a strong objection to the development of the Hayesfield School playing field except that I think a new sports hall/gym at the school should be funded as a matter of course, according to need, and should not be dependant on selling the playing fields which are used by other groups and are a valuable green area.

- However, I would qualify my last point by saying that the development should be of low-cost housing, housing for the elderly and possibly some social facilities for young people developed keeping with the area and maintaining some green areas.
- Under no circumstances should a large supermarket be built. This side of Bath there are several groups of smaller shops (two groups on Combe Down, Odd Down, Bear Flat, Moorland Road and Southdown) including Cooperative supermarkets, which I feel certain would become unviable if such a store was built. One of my reasons for moving to Bloomfield Drive from Midford was because I would be able to walk to small local shops and develop a relationship with them in a way that is impossible with a large supermarket/superstore. I would be very sceptical to be told that these shops would not be affected. In any case there are various large superstores/supermarkets in the area and I do not see the need for one on Odd Down.
- There does not seem to have been any thought given to the problem of the increase in traffic. It is not only the volume of the traffic which needs to be considered but the noise and pollution in the middle of what is primarily a residential area.

In conclusion I am writing to propose that there should be a complete rethink of the plans, the school should be left as it is and plans for g large retail outlet should be scrapped. I vary much hope that notice will be taken of objections and that commonsense will prevail.

Initial Response

A mixed-use scheme accords with government guidance (PPS1) and good practice on good design / sustainable development principles. The inclusion of SMGPS in the allocation was recommended by the Inspector after consideration of representations considered at the Inquiry. The allocation provides the opportunity to take a comprehensive and well planned overview of these adjoining land-uses. However, the redevelopment of the school is not a requirement of the policy. Although considered for housing the Council's investigations concluded that that the site was needed for retail uses. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy.

The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref:3686/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

Do we really need another supermarket? Is about selling the land to make some cash?

We are becoming a nation of fatties and the cost to the NHS is astronomical so why do the government think that we need another food store in Bath? I do not know of anyone who is starving through lack of local food shops. The traffic already heavy in that locality would become a nightmare. People living behind the proposed store e.g. Lympsham Green and Cranmore Place would have to put up with late night deliveries and constant noise. Last but not least the school should not be rebuilt next to a supermarket with all the noise, fumes from lorries and cars. The school is in a very nice place at the moment so please leave it be.

Hayesfield wanting to sell that land is ludicrous why can they not use the land along side other schools for sports activities? When I was at school we used a hired bus to go into town for swimming and walked to the playing fields for sports days and hockey lessons. We do not need to be like other Cities with food stores dotted about on the outskirts, we have a lovely City, fantastic country side that is slowly being converted into building sites (Pulteney View for instance can Rush Hill really take all the extra traffic?) Having lived in Bath all my life I have seen the outcome of many errors of judgement regarding new builds, they are now being flattened. Fantastic buildings have been demolished in the name of so called progress. So can I ask please you to think long and hard before making a decision to erect yet another large building that we really do not need.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref:3722/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I should like to object to the proposed modifications on the basis that they still leave open the possibility that St. Martin's Garden School will need to be moved and rebuilt in order to make space for any supermarket development on this site. Although I understand this will be at the developers' expense I deplore the prospect of a newly refurbished school having to be re-sited and the disruption that this will cause to the education of these children. I understand that research has shown that a school can lose two years or more in its development as a result of major physical reconstruction.

Initial Response

It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on

the Hayesfield School part of the site. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3740/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

The NPFA has been contacted by local residents, concerned about the recommendation in the Local Plan that St Martin's Primary School should be allocated for mixed use development. They claim that this proposal should be removed from the local plan on the basis that the facilities and open space are of continuing recreational value to existing and future users. Reasons stated for opposing the proposed allocation and consequential change of use include:

- The lack of any completed green space strategy
- The absence of any clear planning reasons for the proposed change, the only reason being financial and the desire to maximize the value and potential proceeds arising out of sale of the land. Land value is, of course, not a material consideration when making planning decisions
- Inadequate consultation with the local community
- The loss of facilities used not only for educational but also for community purposes, current users mentioned being the MoD, the Scouts, the University, Bath & North East Somerset and other schools such as St Philip's and Combe Down
- The need to allow for future educational needs for children arising out of proposed development in South Bath, and the lack of capacity at other local primary schools, namely St Philips and Combe Down, particularly given an inability to expand on existing sites.

While I do not know the site personally, the reasons provided by those in contact with the NPFA lead to a somewhat inescapable conclusion that the proposed allocation should be withdrawn, pending further study of the educational, greenspace and retail requirements and completion of an appropriate report dealing with such matters within the time-scale of the local plan.

Initial Response

The Local Plan requires retention of a grassed playing field. Regarding the wider impact on recreational open space the Local Plan proposal requires the provision of public access open space which meets the standards set out in the draft Green Spaces Strategy. A mixed-use scheme accords with government guidance (PPS1) and good practice on good design / sustainable development principles. The inclusion of SMGPS in the allocation was recommended by the Inspector after consideration of representations considered at the Inquiry. The allocation provides the opportunity to take a comprehensive and well planned overview of these adjoining land-uses. However, the redevelopment of the school is not a requirement of the policy. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site.

Ref: 3758/J3

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I wish to protest at the proposals as I understand them to demolish St Martins Garden Primary School, and the plan to see land belonging to Hayesfield School to facilitate the building of a hypermarket. The impact of heavy traffic on the already busy roads like Frome Road and Wellsway would be enormous, causing chaos and a level of noise and environmental disturbance for those who will have to suffer suffocation by heavy vehicles because we just happen to live in the area. Already 2 million pounds has been invested by the Government in new facilities or for St Martins School and this would be wasted. The proposal made for St Martins Primary School shows lack of planning even in the light of new builds and proposed new builds in Odd Down. Where will the new

families send their children? St Philips is too small as it is. The area is currently well served by a healthy mix of retail shopping outlets (....) the requirements of the local population. Larger outlets are within easy access both in Bath and in the rest of BANES. I trust that although public consultation has not so far been a good feature to the council's ability to listen to the local tax payers, some account will be taken of the overwhelming desire for the plans and the Government appointed Inspector be 'detached'. We want to maintain the status quo.

Initial Response

It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children’s Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area’s convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3778/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin’s
Garden PS **Bath**

Yes

Summary of Comment

I must complain strongly against a supermarket at Odd Down. We have ample shops locally to meet everyday requirements and may lose the, if a store was built. The proposed area to site the store will cause even more traffic chaos on already clogged roads, where rush hour nowadays seems to be 24-7. A new supermarket would be a good idea but how about situating it in the New Southgate complex so people can shop then hop on the bus as many do now with Somerfield.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area’s convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3792/J4

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin’s
Garden PS **Bath**

Yes

Summary of Comment

Further to my letter to certain Councillors and to Don Foster MP dated 1 October 2006, and the standard form that was sent to you, I would like to reiterate and emphasise my opposition to any proposal that would mean St. Martin’s Garden Primary school being re-sited on a smaller area of ground, but also my opposition to a Supermarket on a playing field. I feel it would be very unfair to present and future pupils to deprive them of their “green” surroundings to allow Hayesfield to improve their facilities. Within this walled area is a haven for the children, flora and fauna which should also be taken into consideration. A Supermarket would be very detrimental to the surrounding area and would have a massive environmental impact. Selling off playing fields is going against the Government’s own “School Sports Strategy” which is aiming to increase outdoor sport facilities for all schools by 70% by 2020, which the Government itself says will save on health costs in the region of £600M (reference Radio 4 Today programme 13.10.06). I would also like to know if the Government Inspector has been made aware of the local opposition to any such proposal. Once the field is built on there is no going back and consequently a precious “island” of open space is lost to us all.

Initial Response

It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3809/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

Roads. Roads. Roads. Roads - No consideration given to the infrastructure to support this development. The area with all the extra housing and new school for the disabled which will increase the traffic flow - cannot cope with this proposal. Get the infrastructure BEFORE developing. Do not make the mistake that Bath has constantly made over the last decades.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3810/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

28 Lympsham Green has been occupied by my family since 1948, therefore I am intimately acquainted with St Martins which I first attended in January 1951. I perceive no educational advantage in demolishing a perfectly adequate school, with generous playing areas and re-building it nearby, undoubtedly on a much reduced site area. The only beneficiaries would be BANES and an unspecified supermarket. I would be in favour of using the HSPF for a suitably sized supermarket e.g. Asda or Tesco. Going to Sainsbury is a drag. St Martins should not be touched.

Initial Response

It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy.

Ref: 3812/J2

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

- The government inspector does not give a reason for the allocation of St. Martin's Garden Primary school for mixed use. It is probably to get a higher price for the land, which should not be a consideration.
- The proposed rezoning includes the playing fields. We should be protecting our playing fields, not building on them. This goes against stated government policy.
- The Council's policy is to support local businesses. We have some good local businesses in Odd Down and a study needs to be undertaken before any further retail outlets are planned.
- Any development should take into account local needs. There should be a local consultation before any large developments take place to consider the impact on businesses, schools and people.
- The loss of land from the school site will be detrimental to the community as a whole. The school is used by a number of organisations other than the school.
- The growing number of houses in the area will probably mean the need for school places in the future.
- The traffic situation in this area is already very congested, particularly at peak times. It is set to become even more congested with the new houses at Rush Hill, Wells Road and St. Martin's Hospital site. Any further development should not bring more traffic on to the roads in this area.

I believe that the whole St. Martin's Gardens School site should remain designated for educational use and not be included on a mixed use site. No developments should be implemented without a full consultation with local people and not until a Green Open Spaces Plan has been developed by the Council.

Initial Response

A mixed-use scheme accords with government guidance (PPS1) and good practice on good design / sustainable development principles. The inclusion of SMGPS in the allocation was recommended by the Inspector after consideration of representations considered at the Inquiry. The allocation provides the opportunity to take a comprehensive and well planned overview of these adjoining land-uses. However, the redevelopment of the school is not a requirement of the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3866/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

No

Summary of Comment

In the opinion of my wife and myself, the supermarket element of this Modification would bring about the final degradation of Odd Down as a community. Contrary to the Government Inspector's report, residents of Odd Down do not have to pass through the City Centre in order to reach Sainsbury's at Green Park, and return therefrom. For years I have made the two-way car journey every Friday morning, going no further east than Ivo Peters Way, and with no major traffic problem caused or experienced. From experience with the taking over by Tesco of Esso's filling station at Glasshouse in 1997, and the subsequent extension of the previous shop facilities into a mini-supermarket (which itself met with much opposition), it appears to me that this proposed supermarket is intended for the benefit of people living outside of Bath, to the southward, travelling in by car, and almost certainly by-passing the Odd Down Park-and-Ride.

Tesco's Glasshouse development has ruined it as a filling station. Customers now tend to use the pumps as parking places while they use the Tesco shop as a supermarket. I recently spent 42 minutes there, mid-morning, waiting to get to a pump. I presume that the proposed supermarket will have an associated filling station, but how it will interact with the Glasshouse facility I have no idea. It is possible that the Glasshouse PFS will be knocked down or incorporated in the new superstore, in which case drivers presently seeking a superstore facility will transfer their shopping accordingly.

The better these new facilities suit 'outsiders', the more traffic will be channelled into the Upper Wellsway, from four directions, with the Red Lion roundabout liable to be a 'choke point' for much of the day. Lacking any information about any serious consideration of the practicalities of the proposal, I have assumed that access to the supermarket will be from the A3082 at Frome Road, and not direct from the A367. I live on the A367 at Upper Wellsway, immediately opposite St. Martin's Garden School, and I already feel that I take my life in my hands when I use the pedestrian crossing across the A367 whenever the School Crossing Keeper is not there (I have seen him, a big man with a commanding presence and careful techniques, 'near-missed' on several occasions while

standing in the middle of the crossing, wearing his day-glow jacket and holding his ‘lollipop’).

For the residents of Odd Down to use this proposed supermarket in some degree of safety, they will either have to drive the short distance to it, thus adding to local traffic and pollution, or the pedestrian crossing will have to become light-controlled, thus restricting the flow of traffic on the A367 proportional to the pedestrian use of this supermarket. To be useful to Odd Down residents the crossing would have to be somewhere near its present site, i.e. only a short distance from the Red Lion roundabout. This means that at times of high outward traffic on the A367 (the so-called Quality Bus Route) the Red Lion roundabout is likely to be blocked by stopped vehicles for significant amounts of time.

Once this (unwanted by residents?) supermarket is built, residents almost certainly will be forced to use it daily. The local shops currently provide services which no supermarket cares about, but they will certainly not be able to survive when the supermarket takes away their ‘bread and butter’ custom. There will be no point in our catching a bus into the City Centre, for recent BANES Council policies have destroyed or driven away nearly all of the kind of shops which used to provide similar quality services there.

I expect that our exposed hilltop will alleviate the air pollution to some extent, but I am sure that the noise pollution from traffic, day and night (the superstore presumably receives major deliveries via heavy lorries, at times by night) will be above even the levels officially allowed for residential areas.

Even in the 21st Century, the St. Martin’s School playing fields and the row of Chestnut Trees edging them at the A367 preserve a significant image of Odd Down as one of the quarrying villages on the southern ridge above Bath. Based on experience in, and evidence from, other parts of the country, I do not foresee anything green and pleasant surviving a supermarket contractor’s bulldozers, whatever promises may be made or written pledges given beforehand.

Finally, the logic of destroying or curtailing public educational and children’s facilities, some of which are still under construction at enormous expense to the taxpayer, in order to satisfy a commercial requirement which should not be the business of either national or local government escapes me.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children’s Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area’s convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The issue of noise and air pollution could be dealt with at that stage. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3898/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin’s
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

1. Land value should not be a reason to redesignate a playing field site or even consider the demolition of a perfectly functioning school for financial gain. The road network will not cope with a large supermarket or housing on this site, the roads are already overloaded. Local shops/ community would be detrimentally affected. We need to retain out playing fields and utilise them.
2. Hayesfield site should remain as playing/recreational use and St Martins Garden Primary should remain as a school. See attached letter;

Hayesfield Sports Field, Odd Down / St Martin’s Garden Primary School

I am writing to object mostly strongly to the Council’s proposed redesignation of this land from Educational Playing Fields/School to “mixed development to include provision of convenience retail floorspace”. I am appalled at the Inspector’s recommendation to include a perfectly functioning school in this plan. Just because this land would generate a huge amount of money for the Council if redesignated for retail use, there can be no justification for the demolition of a successful school for commercial gain!. We do not want a huge supermarket here. We have many good local shops which provide extremely well for the people of Odd Down, which is a great community, and a supermarket will undoubtedly put many of them out of business. Not everyone wants to shop in huge supermarkets. Older people need local shops, they do not all drive and have to carry their shopping home in small amounts and cannot always walk very far. There is far too much development taking place on Odd Down for the transport system to cope with in the future, the roads are currently overloaded, often congested and dangerous. The new Special Needs School, the development of the St Martins Hospital site for housing, Clarks site for housing, and many other small developments will be completed shortly and the roads will not cope. A lot of children travel on these roads to various schools in this area of Bath, students to the University, staff to the MOD and Wessex Water, the Park and Ride and no provision is being made for the transport systems to be improved to deal with all this additional traffic, sadly accidents will occur. The Bath Bowling Club have been looking for a site for a new bowling club for many years, this would be an ideal site, and would not

create vast amounts of traffic, and be a great asset to the locality for young and old alike and for Bath generally. We cannot keep losing our playing fields.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3907/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I object to building a superstore on this site because it would add to congestion on the roads in the vicinity of the A367 and the B3110. It would also jeopardise the future of small shops at Odd Down, Moorland Road, Combe Down and surrounding areas. These small shops play a vital role in the survival of 'communities' and need protecting.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3916/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

The governing body objects to the limitation to 'small retail outlets' in the Development brief, item 6. We are seeking the removal of the words 'provided by small retail outlets in accordance with the emerging retail strategy' from item 6 of the Development Brief requirements. The council has not accepted either its own retail needs study undertaken in 2004 by Nathaniel Lichfield nor the inspector's recommendation that there is a need for more convenience food shopping in Bath and that the Hayesfield Playing Field site is suitable for allocation to meet the need. Given that the retail survey was undertaken in the last two years and there has been no marked change in food retail provision since this study, it is highly unlikely that the 'emerging retail study' should find the food retail need to be other than that identified in the Nathaniel Lichfield Partners study.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will provide flexibility in terms of meeting the need for additional convenience floorspace in the south of Bath. The Retail Strategy currently being undertaken will provide guidance beyond Plan period. It will reassess of the floorspace requirements for Bath, including convenience retail, and how this will be met by testing various options. The Strategy is anticipated to be completed by summer 2007 and will inform the development brief which will be prepared

in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3919/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I object to the limitation to 'small retail outlets' in the development brief, item 6 I am seeking the removal of the words 'provided by small retail outlets in accordance with the emerging retail strategy.' from item 6 of the development brief requirements. The reason for this is that the council has not accepted either its own retail needs study undertaken in 2004 by Nathaniel Lichfield not the inspector's recommendation based that there is a need for more convenience food shopping in Bath and that the Hayesfield playing field site is suitable for allocation to meet the need. Given that the retail survey was undertaken in the last 2 years and there has been no marked change in food retail provision since this study, it is highly unlikely that the emerging retail study should find the food retail need to be other than that identified in the Nathaniel Lichfield Partners Study.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will provide flexibility in terms of meeting the need for additional convenience floorspace in the south of Bath. The Retail Strategy currently being undertaken will provide guidance beyond Plan period. It will reassess of the floorspace requirements for Bath, including convenience retail, and how this will be met by testing various options. The Strategy is anticipated to be completed by summer 2007 and will inform the development brief which will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3924/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

Objection 1 - Proper studies into increases in traffic flows have not been carried out

Objection 2 - Consultation with local residents have not been fully or properly carried out

Objection 3 - No account has been taken of housing developments at St Martin's Hospital and Pulteney View Rush Hill, which may create need for additional primary school places.

Objection 4 -The proposed demolition of St Martin's Garden Primary School and its rebuilding on a smaller site has not been properly justified.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref:3948/J20

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

(1) This change of use is in direct conflict with Policy SR.1A ii). It also does not meet the criteria for "surplus to requirements" set out in PPG17. It has not been established that this land is incapable of being used for recreation. Therefore both other parts of the Local Plan and PPG17 make this change unacceptable, and neither the council nor the inspector has the authority to ignore published Government guidance. There has been no public consultation to establish whether there is indeed a need for convenience store floorspace in this area, nor has any impact assessment on other shops in the areas and within convenient travelling distance. The inspector's recommendation should have been rejected outright; there is no legal justification for it. It should also be noted that the inspector's recommendation R5.18 suggests using this land for housing which directly conflicts with recommendation R4.4, so any picture of the inspector's preference is completely obscured (and neither justify ignoring PPG17). Also, there is no possible justification for including St Martin's Garden Primary School in this amendment: the school is recently modernised, and the council cannot reasonably recommend the expense of re-providing it elsewhere. If, and only if, it can eventually be shown that the Hayesfield Playing Field meets the criteria for "surplus to requirements" set out in PPG17, there is scope for educational use, alongside St Martin's Garden Primary School in its current location, in the form of the Dyson Academy, which would give the primary school pupils something to aspire to. This objection also affects M/B5/51 and M/B5/53.

(2) Delete the entire policy.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3962/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I am horrified that at such a late stage of approving the Local Plan for BANES that an important change of land use such as this at St Martin's Garden School should be included without proper consultation. The implications for the changes recently outlined are enormous for the whole community. We are in danger of losing a school or at least having it completely rebuilt with all the disruptions that that would cause for children, the loss of open space which could be used by the community and the loss of our local shops in exchange for increased traffic on the local roads and around the backs of existing houses and a supermarket which very few people have asked for. A supermarket would kill our local shops. I have seen the effect of a supermarket on the local shops where I formerly lived. It created a desert of useful shops over a huge area and increased traffic enormously. Delivery vehicles arrived at all times of the day and night and caused a great deal of misery to people living nearby. You are proposing allowing this supermarket between two schools without considering the effects of the fumes and noise on the children. I would like to see B&NES supporting small local shops and local produce. We need to cut down the food miles and reduce the amount of fuel needed to buy our food. Supermarkets with their centralised depots and aggressive buying and selling policies do the opposite. They destroy communities as small shops find it very difficult to compete against such near monopolies. The Tyndall Group on climate change gives us 10 years to reduce our carbon footprint on the earth. That means changing our behaviour in terms of use of carbon. Supermarkets magnifies the wastefulness of western society; even American towns are now moving away from the car-based shopping areas to supporting smaller shops which are within walking distance of homes. The Hayesfield site should be allowed to be developed for housing leaving St Martin's Garden School in its present site. A combination of local people and commercial interests should be allowed to discuss any commercial development on the Hayesfield site.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a

primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3969/J3

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

In a city of hills, flat level well drained playing field or open space is at a premium. Social deprivation in this area is high. Traffic intrusion is bad to intolerable. Local businesses on Odd Down and Combe Down are accessed by foot. Proposed food store will make worse the "car borne" shopping trend not reverse it. STERN Report is relevant.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 3995/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I am writing to you to express my concern about proposals for the green field next to St. Martin's Garden School. I sympathise with Hayesfield School because the playing field is not an asset to the school and they could use the money to develop facilities on the school site. But to allow a supermarket to develop on the site would be dreadful, especially as it would lead to the demolition of St. Martin's School. The Wellsway is already choked with traffic - where would all the extra cars go? Bath already has three large supermarkets - surely the city council should take a stand now against development and start to support small local businesses. Also attached newspaper clipping.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4005/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I support the resolution of council on 12th October 2006 to exclude a superstore from this site and to restrict and convenience floorspace to small retail outlets on the grounds that:

i) A large supermarket on the site would jeopardise the future of small shops at Odd Down, Combe Down, Moorland Road or in the nearby villages of Willow, Tunley, Freshford among others. Small shops play a vital role in the survival of balanced communities and need protection through planning policies.

ii) The road system in the vicinity of the A367 and B3110 is already saturated and cannot accommodate the additional traffic generated by a superstore.

I would wish the proposed modification as amended by Council on 12th October 2006 to be further amended to restrict the size of any convenience floorspace (compatible with the emerging retail strategy) on this site. I suggest that 'small retail outlet' be defined to mean 'not necessitating a customer car park'.

Initial Response

Support noted. The need for car parking associated with the retail element of the scheme can be addressed through the required development brief. This will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4006/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I support the resolution of the Council on 12 October 2006 to exclude a superstore from this site and to restrict any retail convenience floorspace to 'small retail outlets' on the grounds that:

1. A large supermarket on the site would jeopardise the future of small shops at Odd Down, Combe Down, Moorland Road and in Wellow, Tunley and Freshford. Small shops are very important to these communities and need to be protected through planning policies.

2. The road system comprising the A367 and B3110 is already saturated and cannot accommodate additional traffic likely to be generated by a supermarket. I think small retail outlet should mean one that does not need its own car park.

Initial Response

Support noted. The need for car parking associated with the retail element of the scheme can be addressed through the required development brief. This will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4007/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I object to the limitation to 'small retail outlets' in the Development brief, item 6. I am seeking the removal of the words 'provided by small retail outlets in accordance with the emerging retail strategy' from item 6 of the Development Brief requirements.

Reason:

The Council has not accepted either its own retail needs study undertaken in 2004 by Nathaniel Lichfield or the Inspector's recommendation that there is a need for more convenience food shopping in Bath and that the Hayesfield playing field site is suitable for allocation to meet this need. Given that the retail survey was undertaken in the last two years and there has been no marked change in

food retail provision since this study, it is highly unlikely that the 'emerging retail strategy' should find the food retail need to be other than that identified in the Nathaniel Lichfield Partners study.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will provide flexibility in terms of meeting the need for additional convenience floorspace in the south of Bath. The Retail Strategy currently being undertaken will provide guidance beyond Plan period. It will reassess of the floorspace requirements for Bath, including convenience retail, and how this will be met by testing various options. The Strategy is anticipated to be completed by summer 2007 and will inform the development brief which will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4008/J2

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

The provision of small retail outlets will not satisfy the convenience shopping needs identified. 6. Convenient floorspace of 1395 m² (10,000 sq ft) to 1672 m² (18,000 sq ft) for one food and convenience outlet in accordance with the emerging retail strategy.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will provide flexibility in terms of meeting the need for additional convenience floorspace in the south of Bath. The Retail Strategy currently being undertaken will provide guidance beyond Plan period. It will reassess of the floorspace requirements for Bath, including convenience retail, and how this will be met by testing various options. The Strategy is anticipated to be completed by summer 2007 and will inform the development brief which will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4011/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

Re proposed development of a supermarket on the site adjacent to St Martins Garden School, Wellsway. Bath

I wish to object to any plan to build a supermarket on the above site on the following grounds:

Schools and green fields must not be sacrificed for yet another supermarket. There are good and ample local shopping facilities in the above area and the community is also well served by The Co-op and Tesco. A further supermarket will be far too much for local traders to compete with and will destroy what is now a very pleasant community shopping experience. I live in Bathwick where local shops have almost disappeared and for convenience I frequently visit both the Odd Down and Combe Down shops where I find that the service in the small local shops is much more friendly efficient and one can always get what is needed. Please do not allow outside commercial giants to destroy the community and our environment.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. It is clear from Policy GDS.1/B18 that no loss of education function is being proposed. The Policy requires the retention of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start children's Centre as well as provision of recreational open space to meet the standards set out in the emerging Green Spaces Strategy. The Council has control over the site due to its ownership and in addition, the Development Brief could clarify that this could include the retention of the existing school on its current site with refurbishment. The remaining development would need to be accommodated on the Hayesfield School part of the site. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an

implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4014/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

I object to the limitation to 'small retail outlets in the Development brief, item 6. I am seeking the removal of the words 'provided by small retail outlets in accordance with the emerging retail strategy' from item 6 of the Development Brief requirements.

Reason:

The Council has not accepted either its own retail needs study undertaken in 2004 by Nathaniel Lichfield or the Inspector's recommendation that there is a need for more convenience food shopping in Bath and that the Hayesfield playing field site is suitable for allocation to meet this need. Given that the retail survey was undertaken in the last two years and there has been no marked change in food retail provision since this study, it is highly unlikely that the 'emerging retail strategy' should find the food retail need to be other than that identified in the Nathaniel Lichfield Partners study.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will provide flexibility in terms of meeting the need for additional convenience floorspace in the south of Bath. The Retail Strategy currently being undertaken will provide guidance beyond Plan period. It will reassess of the floorspace requirements for Bath, including convenience retail, and how this will be met by testing various options. The Strategy is anticipated to be completed by summer 2007 and will inform the development brief which will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4036/J3

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS

Bath

Yes

Summary of Comment

1. I object to these four modifications (as amended by full council on 12th October 2006) because I am concerned that a number of small convenience retail and non-retail mixed uses on the Hayesfield site will FAIL to fulfil the Inspector's original intention of providing sufficient convenience floorspace in South Bath to (her report, para 4.37) "reduce the need for the residents in a densely developed part of the city to travel into town for convenience shopping."
2. The modification should be revised to ensure the provision of sufficient convenience floorspace in South Bath to remove the need for use of further green space in South Bath for convenience shopping in future years.

Initial Response

A mixed-use scheme accords with government guidance (PPS1) and good practice on good design / sustainable development principles. The inclusion of SMGPS in the allocation was recommended by the Inspector after consideration of representations considered at the Inquiry. The allocation provides the opportunity to take a comprehensive and well planned overview of these adjoining land-uses. However, the redevelopment of the school is not a requirement of the policy. The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will provide flexibility in terms of meeting the need for additional convenience floorspace in the south of Bath. The Retail Strategy currently being undertaken will provide guidance beyond Plan period. It will reassess of the floorspace requirements for Bath, including convenience retail, and how this will be met by testing various options. The Strategy is anticipated to be completed by summer 2007 and will inform the development brief which will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.

Ref: 4298/J1

Site Hayesfield School PF/St Martin's
Garden PS Bath

No

Summary of Comment

I do not think that another supermarket is needed in Odd Down. It will increase the traffic on a busy road near a school. St Martin's is a well established school with a special needs centre and recently upgraded. Any disturbance would not be helpful. The small local shops are important in the area and would be affected by the competition from Tesco's. The field belonging to Hayesfield School would be more useful for affordable housing for teachers. With the coming Olympics the School may get money towards a sports hall.

Initial Response

The strategy for retail provision in the Local Plan is underpinned by the City & Town Centres Study 2004. The Inspector was persuaded by conclusions of this study that there is a need for convenience retail in this part of Bath in short term. The forthcoming Retail Strategy provides guidance beyond Plan period. The Inspector did not specifically recommend the inclusion of a supermarket and there is no requirement for one in the policy. Policy requires preparation of Transport Impact Assessment. As a result of the inadequate local provision, the area's convenience retail is currently being met in other parts of Bath and even outside of town. Local provision would help to reduce the need to travel. A development brief will be prepared in order to provide detailed guidance and an implementation strategy for the site. The brief would be prepared in consultation and engagement with local communities and stakeholders, and the production of environmental and transport assessments.