

Schedule of Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan

November 2006

Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan
including minerals and waste policies

Planning Services



BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET



RADSTOCK MUSEUM
NORTH SOMERSET COALFIELD HERITAGE

Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan including minerals and waste policies

SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE LOCAL PLAN

PREFACE

A Public Local Inquiry (PLI) into the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan was held between 8th February and 6th May 2005. The Inspector's Report on objections to the Local Plan was received in April and published by the Council on 17th May 2006 and informed all objectors and others of its publication. Two Addendum Reports were subsequently received to clarify the Inspector's recommendations in respect of South West Keynsham and Hayesfield School Playing Field/St Martin's Garden Primary School.

This **Schedule of Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan** was approved for public consultation by the Council on 12th October 2006. The accompanying Statement of Decisions sets out the Council's response to the Inspector's Report into objections made to the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan is published in a separate document as are the Proposed Modifications to the Proposals Map (see below). It identifies where the Council proposes modifications to the Local Plan as well as giving reasons for not accepting any of the Inspector's recommendations.

Consultation on the Local Plan

The Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan was originally placed on deposit for a period of six weeks ending 29 February 2002. The revised deposit plan was placed on deposit for a period of six weeks ending on the 11 December 2003. Pre-Inquiry Changes (PICs) to the Local Plan were placed on deposit for a six week period ending 30 September 2004, and Further Pre-Inquiry Changes (FPICs) were placed on deposit for a six week period ending 20 January 2005. Twenty-two changes were put forward as Inquiry Changes (ICs) under delegated authority and as agreed with the Executive Member for Sustainability and the Environment and some comments on these were received during the inquiry. The Inspector has had regard to all these changes in the consideration of the objections.

Inspector's Report

In the Report the Inspector considers 2379 outstanding duly made objections and 663 outstanding duly made supports to the Deposit Draft Local Plan (DDLDP). 1607 outstanding duly made objections and 1125 outstanding duly made supports to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan (RDDLP). 175 outstanding duly made objections and 86 outstanding duly made supports to the PICs. 133 outstanding duly made objections and 12 outstanding duly made supports to the FPICs. In total there were some 176 conditional withdrawals of representations.

In general the Inspector supports the overall direction and strategy of the Plan and, subject to recommended modifications to detailed wording, the majority of its policies and detailed site proposals.

Format of the Schedule of Proposed Modifications

This document is set out in the same chapter order as that in the Local Plan and that in the Inspector's Report. It reproduces only those policies, proposals and paragraphs to which proposed changes have been agreed (the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan should be referred to for policies and proposals that remain unchanged).

The Modification number is identified in the far left hand column adjacent to the relevant Local Plan reference. All modifications to the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan and new text are shown in bold with any deletions to the text struck through. The final column sets out the Council's reasons for the proposed modification. Amended or new Schedules, Tables and Diagrams are set out at the end of relevant chapters. Proposals Map changes are referred to in the text in *Italics* and set out in a separate document entitled **Schedule of Proposed Modifications to the Proposals Map**. Those Pre-Inquiry Changes being carried forward unchanged as a Proposed Modifications are shown in a grey tinted row.

David Davies
Head of Planning Services

ABBREVIATIONS

AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
B&NES	Bath & North East Somerset Council
BLRS	Business Location Requirements Study
BPEO	Best Practicable Environmental Option
BWR	Bath Western Riverside
C&TCS	City and Town Centre Study (retail)
CA	Conservation Area
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
DDLDP	Deposit Draft Local Plan
DETR	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (up to 2001)
DPD	Development Plan Document
DTLR	Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions (from 2001)
FPIC	Further Pre-Inquiry Change
GDS	General Development Site
GOSW	Government Officer for the South West
GSS	Green Space Strategy
HDB	Housing Development Boundary
HERS	Heritage and Economic Regeneration Scheme
HRIA	Health Radiation Impact Assessment
IC	Inquiry Change
JRSP	Joint Replacement Structure Plan
LAP	Local Area for Play
LDF	Local Development Framework
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LEAP	Local Equipped Area for Play
LTP	Local Transport Plan
MoD	Ministry of Defence
MPA	Minerals Planning Authority
MPG	Mineral Planning Guidance
MWALP	Mineral Working in Avon Local Plan
NEAP	Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play
NPFA	National Playing Fields Association
PCC	Parochial Church Council
PIC	Pre-Inquiry Change
PPA	Playing Pitch Assessment
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance Note
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PROW	Public Right of Way
QG	Quick Guide
RDDLDP	Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan
RIGS	Regionally Important Geological Site
RJ	Reasoned Justification
RPG	Regional Planning Guidance
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SNCI	Site of Nature Conservation Importance
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
SRA	Strategic Rail Authority
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SUDS	Sustainable Underground Drainage Systems
SWK	South West Keynsham
SWMA	Strategic Waste Management Assessment 2000 (Environment Agency)
SWRDA	South West Regional Development Agency
TPO	Tree Preservation Order
UHCS	Urban Housing Capacity Study
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
VIOS	Visually Important Open Space
WENHAM	West of England Housing Need and Affordability Model
WHS	World Heritage Site
WPA	Waste Planning Authority

CHAPTER A1 – INTRODUCTION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A1/1	Para A1.1	Land-use planning is essentially about quality of life. The planning system influences where people work, how they live and travel, where they shop, what economic activities flourish and the quality of the environment. Planning permission is generally needed to build something or change the use of land. The Local Plan seeks to improve our quality of life. It sets out policies for the use of land in the public interest, enabling development whilst protecting the environment. In deciding whether planning permission should be granted, the Local Plan is the single most important consideration.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.1
M/A1/2	Para A1.5	Consultation on an Issues Report in 1999 has contributed to the emerging policy framework. The Local Plan has reached a key stage in its preparation with the publication of the <i>Deposit Draft</i> in January 2002 and now Revised Deposit Draft in Autumn 2003. The Local Plan covers the period from 1st April 1996 to 31st March 2011. The timetable and process for preparation is indicated in Quick Guide 1.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.2
M/A1/3	Para A1.6	This is the most important opportunity to comment on the Local Plan's policies and proposals. If you have commented on the Deposit Draft Local Plan 2002 or will be commenting on the Revised Deposit 2003, you will have the chance to influence the nature and location of development in the District up to 2011 and beyond.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.2
M/A1/4	Para A1.7	If you have representations (comments of support or objection) to the Revised Deposit Draft, they must be made within the six week period as required by Regulation. Please see the accompanying <i>Representation Form</i> which sets out when and how to make comments on the Deposit Draft.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.2
M/A1/5	Para A1.8	The Council will consider representations made and may make further proposed changes to the Plan before a Public Local Inquiry into objections is held.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.2
M/A1/6	Para A1.9	If you have any queries, please contact: The Planning Policy Team Leader Planning Services Trimbridge House Trim Street Bath, BA1 2DP	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.2
M/A1/7	Para A.10	As well as your views, the Local Plan takes account of Government Guidance, the Joint	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.2

CHAPTER A1 – INTRODUCTION

		Replacement Structure Plan, the Council's Local Transport Plan and the strategies of the Council and other organisations (see paras A2.1 to A2.4 Section A2).																							
M/A1/8	Quick Guide 1	<p style="text-align: center;">Quick Guide 1 Local Plan Timetable</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Pre-deposit consultation and publicity (Issues Report)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Oct 1999 -To March 2000</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">↓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Deposit Draft Local Plan</td> <td style="text-align: center;">January 2002</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">↓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Revised Deposit Local Plan</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Autumn 2003</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">↓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Local Plan Inquiry</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2004</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">↓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Modifications</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2004-5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">↓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Local Plan Adopted</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2005-6</td> </tr> </table>	Pre-deposit consultation and publicity (Issues Report)	Oct 1999 -To March 2000	↓		Deposit Draft Local Plan	January 2002	↓		Revised Deposit Local Plan	Autumn 2003	↓		Local Plan Inquiry	2004	↓		Modifications	2004-5	↓		Local Plan Adopted	2005-6	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.1
Pre-deposit consultation and publicity (Issues Report)	Oct 1999 -To March 2000																								
↓																									
Deposit Draft Local Plan	January 2002																								
↓																									
Revised Deposit Local Plan	Autumn 2003																								
↓																									
Local Plan Inquiry	2004																								
↓																									
Modifications	2004-5																								
↓																									
Local Plan Adopted	2005-6																								
M/A1/9	Para A1.11	The Local Plan also has an important role in the delivery of other Council strategies for example through the provision of affordable housing, identifying land for schools or safeguarding land for employment.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.2																						
M/A1/10	Para A1.17	The population of the District has been slowly but steadily growing and the 2001 Census gives a population of about 169,000. during recent decades and at the 2001 census stood at 169,040. About half the population live in the historic city of Bath with the other main centres of population being Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock. There are numerous villages and hamlets spread across 47 rural parishes (see Diagram 3A) which accommodate a substantial rural population.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3																						
M/A1/11	Para A1.20	Some 20,000 21,000 people live in Midsomer Norton and Radstock in the south of the District. Together these two towns are referred to as Norton-Radstock reflecting their former Urban District Council status. These towns lie at the centre of the former Somerset Coalfield and the rich legacy of the coal mining industry has considerably influenced local character. Many of the spoil heaps have been transformed with remoulding and	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3																						

CHAPTER A1 – INTRODUCTION

		vegetation growth and are distinctive local landscape features. The former railway lines provide existing and potential recreational routes.	
M/A1/12	Para A1.26	Former coal mining in the south of the district has left a network of villages and hamlets within the attractive ridge and valley landscape. The white/blue lias limestone has been used as a distinctive local building material evident in the coal miners terraces in villages such as High Littleton, Paulton and Timsbury. Peasedown St. John has experienced significant growth in the last decade to become the largest village in the district with a population of over 5,000 6,000 .	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3

CHAPTER A2 – THE POLICY CONTEXT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A2/1	Para A2.2	<p>Sustainable Development is about seeking balance. It is about ensuring a high quality of life by promoting the development we need for a healthy economy and meeting social needs whilst at the same time conserving the environment. It is about making sure that all members of our communities have access to jobs and healthy lifestyles in a way which does not harm the natural or built environment. It is about considering the long term implications of decisions. The Local Plan policy framework takes account of the National Sustainable Development Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social Progress which recognises the needs of everyone - Effective protection of the environment - Prudent use of natural resources - Maintenance of high & stable levels of economic growth and employment 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.4
M/A2/2	Quick Guide 2	<p style="text-align: center;">Quick Guide 2</p> <p>National Sustainable Development Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Progress which recognises the needs of everyone • Effective protection of the environment • Prudent use of natural resources • Maintenance of high & stable levels of economic growth and employment <p>A Better Quality of Life (DETR 1999)</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.4
M/A2/3	Para A2.3	<p>A policy framework based on sustainable development therefore means taking into account economic, environmental and social perspectives (see Quick Guide 2, above). Nevertheless, there will be situations where a trade-off is necessary. For instance, certain types of development in especially sensitive areas may have to be constrained. Alternatively, in a particular location there may be an overriding need for a development in order to ensure future employment opportunities. It is the purpose of the Local Plan to provide a clear basis for this decision making.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.5
M/A2/4	Para A2.4	<p>The Local Plan Deposit Draft has been subject to a sustainable development appraisal, the results of which are available as a separate document. Appraisals take place at various stages in the production of the Local Plan in order to ensure that it's its policies and proposals take us nearer to achieving sustainable development. The</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/1) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

CHAPTER A2 – THE POLICY CONTEXT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		appraisal.....	
M/A2/5	Para A2.5	In order to encourage more sustainable ways of living and greater community involvement, the Council has worked with local communities to produce a Local Agenda 21 Initiative entitled <i>Change 21</i> . This sets out a 'Vision for the future - what local people want life to be like in 2019' (see para A3.3 & Quick Guide 4).	Proposed modification to delete reference to Quick Guide 4 arising from Inspector's Recommendation R1.8
M/A2/6	Para A2.5A	In accordance with the Local Government Act 2000, the Council is currently preparing has prepared a Community Strategy for the District. The Strategy will sets out a long-term vision to enhance the quality of life of local communities, through action to improve the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area and its inhabitants. A range of partner organisations (together forming a Local Strategic Partnership) are have been involved in its preparation, including those from public, private and voluntary sectors. The completed Community Strategy will influence all other Council strategies, including the Local Plan as it progresses through the adoption process and is reviewed in the future.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/2) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/A2/7	Para A2.12	A key function of the JRSP is to decide how much development should take place in Bath and North East Somerset and, in general terms, where it should go. Key objectives of the JRSP are described in Quick Guide 3 in para A2.12A . The Local Plan is required to conform generally with the JRSP. The JRSP was adopted in September 2002.	Quick Guide 3 proposed to be deleted for the sake of consistency with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in her Report to delete other Quick Guides (see para 1.11 of Report). The text is proposed to be included in a new para A2.12A. Therefore reference to Quick Guide 3 deleted.
M/A2/8	New Para A2.12A	The Structure Plan locational strategy proposes that in Bath & North East Somerset: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Priority should be given to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within or immediately adjacent to urban areas. 2. Existing employment sites should be safeguarded for employment, unless there are particular reasons for changing that use. 3. Bath & North East Somerset should make land available for 6,200 new homes up to 2011 4. Development for housing, jobs and other facilities should be concentrated within and, where it is in accordance with 	Quick Guide 3 proposed to be deleted for the sake of consistency with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in her Report to delete other Quick Guides (see para 1.11 of Report). The text is proposed to be included in a new para A2.12A.

CHAPTER A2 – THE POLICY CONTEXT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Green Belt policy, immediately adjacent to the built up area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Residential development which cannot be accommodated within Bath should be directed towards Keynsham, which lies on a good public transport network with comprehensive access (including by rail) to the major centres of employment and other facilities at Bath and Bristol. 6. There should be no strategic changes to the Green Belt with the exception of adjustments at Keynsham to provide land for future housing and other uses. 7. Provision for economic development in Norton-Radstock should primarily be for local employment needs, addressing current imbalances between housing and employment provision and aiding regeneration. 8. Whilst the open countryside should be protected from harmful development, limited development within or adjoining rural settlements can be allowed in order to maintain economic and social vitality of rural areas, subject to accessibility to facilities and employment, character and Green Belt considerations. 9. City and town centres should be the priority locations for retail, office and major recreation/leisure facilities. 	
M/A2/9	Quick Guide 3	<p style="text-align: center;">Quick Guide 3 Structure Plan Key Objectives</p> <p>The Structure Plan locational strategy proposes that in Bath & North East Somerset:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Priority should be given to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within or immediately adjacent to urban areas. 2. Existing employment sites should be safeguarded for employment, unless there are particular reasons for changing that use. 3. Bath & North East Somerset should make land available for 6,200 new homes up to 2011 4. Development for housing, jobs and other facilities should be concentrated within and, where it is in accordance with Green Belt policy, immediately adjacent to the built up area 5. Residential development which cannot be accommodated within Bath should be directed towards Keynsham, which lies on a good public transport network with comprehensive access (including by rail) 	<p>Quick Guide 3 proposed to be deleted for the sake of consistency with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in her Report to delete other Quick Guides (see para 1.11 of Report). The text is proposed to be included in a new para A2.12A.</p>

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>to the major centres of employment and other facilities at Bath and Bristol.</p> <p>6. There should be no strategic changes to the Green Belt with the exception of adjustments at Keynsham to provide land for future housing and other uses.</p> <p>7. Provision for economic development in Norton Radstock should primarily be for local employment needs, addressing current imbalances between housing and employment provision and aiding regeneration.</p> <p>8. Whilst the open countryside should be protected from harmful development, limited development within or adjoining rural settlements can be allowed in order to maintain economic and social vitality of rural areas, subject to accessibility to facilities and employment, character and Green Belt considerations.</p> <p>9. City and town centres should be the priority locations for retail, office and major recreation/leisure facilities.</p>	

CHAPTER A3 – VISION AND STRATEGY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A3/1	Para A3.1	As part of the Local Agenda 21 process in Bath & North East Somerset, the Council has been working with partners from business, education, the voluntary and public sectors to develop a shared Community Vision for life in 2019 in Bath and North East Somerset.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.6
M/A3/2	Para A3.2	The Council will play an important part in the implementation of the Vision, and the Local Plan is part of that process in terms of guiding development in the area in a way which contributes to realising the Vision (see Quick Guide 4).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.6
M/A3/3	Para A3.3	The vision takes account of Government guidance, the principles of Sustainable Development, the JRSP requirements, the LA21 Community Vision, the Local Transport Plan and other policies and strategies. It also aims to deliver the objectives of the Community Strategy (see para A2.5A) and the Council's Corporate Objectives. 'Balanced Communities' is put forward as the overriding objective for the Local Plan.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.6
M/A3/4	Para A3.4	Balanced Communities means seeking to ensure that everyone within the District has a better quality of life; this is achieved through the availability of good homes with convenient access to jobs and services within a safe, attractive and accessible environment. It is about giving people the opportunity to achieve their potential through education, participation and good health.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.6
M/A3/5	Para A3.7	<p align="center">Overall Strategy</p> A3.7 Because the Plan will determined the future location of development up to 2011 it is important that anyone with an interest in the future pattern and quality of development in Bath and North East Somerset should participate and help influence its emerging policies. The Council wishes to involve as many people, communities and organisations as possible in influencing the direction and preparation of the Local Plan. Key to improving our environment and in securing balanced communities is the quality of design and this is given a high priority in the Plan.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.7
M/A3/6	Key Objectives	KEY OBJECTIVES – Overall Strategy Design OS.1 To ensure a high quality of design for all new development, while maintaining character and local distinctiveness.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.7

CHAPTER A3 – VISION AND STRATEGY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>OS.2 To create safe, secure and accessible environments.</p> <p>OS.3 To promote mixed use developments and higher densities especially in areas highly accessible to a variety of transport modes (see Access section).</p>	
M/A3/7	Quick Guide 4	<p>Quick Guide 4</p> <p>Community Vision for a Better Future</p> <p>(The first Local Agenda 21 for Bath & North East Somerset change 21 local action for a better future covering period up to 2019)</p> <p>1. Using the Land Wisely</p> <p>As many people as possible will be involved in deciding how land should be used, so that local communities feel part of the decision making process. There will be greater local control of the planning process, which reflects local diversity. Development of energy efficient, low impact housing will be balanced with natural and semi-natural habitats that encourage an increase in the variety of wildlife. Businesses that are energy efficient and socially responsible will be balanced with agriculture that is environmentally sustainable.</p> <p>2. Building Communities that Care</p> <p>People will live in communities where the individual matters and there is a feeling of belonging and community pride. Each person's physical, mental, spiritual and social well being will be important. Everyone will be active in their community and will participate in local democracy. There will be local access to good quality services, employment, recreation, education, community facilities, transport, affordable housing and green spaces.</p> <p>3. Education for Life</p> <p>Education will be accessible to all in the community, regardless of age or location. There will be opportunities to learn from each other and to regularly research what educational needs there are in the community. Communication between people will increase and improve, including the use of information technology.</p> <p>4. Using the Earth's Resources Sensibly</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.8

CHAPTER A3 – VISION AND STRATEGY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>People will use resources efficiently, making sure that everyone uses materials that are produced in a sustainable way. People and organisations will reduce, re-use and recycle so that there is no disposable waste. Energy will be produced and used in a clean way. Individuals and organisations will use this energy efficiently. Everyone will have access to information that will help him or her to make informed decisions about how they use resources. Appropriate technology will be used to solve problems and improve quality of life.</p> <p>5. Access and Mobility for All</p> <p>There will be full access to a public and community transport system. This will be efficient, non-polluting, reliable and safe. Because of greater choice, people will drive less and will be able to cycle, use wheelchairs and walk in a clean, safe environment.</p> <p>6. Local Work in a Strong Local Economy</p> <p>Wherever possible, local needs will be met locally, including food production. Local goods and services will be "branded" so that people know that they are supporting the local economy. There will be appropriate inward investment, encouraging a wide variety of different businesses to develop – both industrial and commercial. Community enterprises will be encouraged and will thrive. There will be an increase in sustainable tourism. Local people will recognise their influence on the economy.</p>	
M/A3/8	Objective E.6	<p>KEY OBJECTIVES – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS</p> <p>E.1 To conserve, enhance and make positive use of the historic environment.</p> <p>E.2 To conserve and enhance the local character and distinctiveness of settlements and the countryside.</p> <p>E.3 To secure the effective stewardship of the area's biodiversity (wildlife and habitats), and geology.</p> <p>E.4 To secure improvements to degraded landscapes and derelict land</p> <p>E.5 To conserve and reduce the consumption of non-renewable resources including greenfield land,</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.9

CHAPTER A3 – VISION AND STRATEGY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>soils, minerals, water and fossil fuels.</p> <p>E.6 To maintain and improve the quantity and quality of water resources necessary for the well being of the natural environment and for consumption.</p>	
M/A3/9	Para 3.13	A greater choice in travel would enable everyone, including those that who don't own a car or cannot drive.....	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/3) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/A3/10	Para A3.15	<p align="center">SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT POLICY</p> <p>A3.15 Based on principles of sustainable development, Policy 1 is an overarching policy providing the context for more detailed policies and proposals set out in the other sections of the Local Plan.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.10
M/A3/11	Policy 1	<p align="center">POLICY 1</p> <p>Development will only be permitted where it:</p> <p>a. is accessible by a range of transport modes and is in locations which minimises the need to travel;</p> <p>b. contributes to meeting the social needs of communities or does not harm the provision of community facilities and to provides safe and socially inclusive environments (including accessible housing, community, shopping and recreational facilities);</p> <p>c. maintains or increases the economic prosperity and diversity of the District and, wherever possible, maximises employment opportunities;</p> <p>d. conserves or enhances the local character and distinctiveness of the District's City, towns and countryside and is of a high quality of design</p> <p>e. conserves natural resources, especially non-renewable resources, such as greenfield land, geology, wildlife, soil, fossil fuels, minerals, water and energy, and wherever possible uses brownfield land; and</p> <p>f. minimises pollution, including air, water, land, light, noise and ensures any waste generated is managed safely and sustainably.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.10.
M/A3/12	Para A3.17	In order to maintain the character and setting of the City in recognition of its World Heritage Site status and to meet objectives of the Bristol/Bath Green Belt, development will be	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.11

CHAPTER A3 – VISION AND STRATEGY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>restricted to within and, where it is in accordance with Green Belt policy, immediately adjacent to the built up area.</p> <p>In order to maintain the character and setting of the City, consistent with its status as a World Heritage site and with the objectives of the Bristol/Bath Green Belt, the focus for development and change will be the existing built up area. The plan makes one change to the Green Belt boundary to allow for the expansion of the University of Bath.</p>	
M/A3/ 13	Para A3.17A	<p>However, to ensure major regeneration opportunities are fulfilled it is essential to provide transport infrastructure. To meet this requirement a change to the Green Belt in the western part of the City will be necessary. The City boasts one of the premier Universities in the country which has seen considerable development of its academic, student and sporting accommodation in recent years. To help meet national expectations for higher education, further planned development at the campus can only be achieved through changes to the Green Belt.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.11
M/A3/ 14	Paras A3.18	<p>Keynsham</p> <p>A3.18 At Keynsham the Structure Plan proposes a change to the Green Belt to accommodate residential development and associated infrastructure that cannot be accommodated in Bath (see Quick Guide 3). However, the Council has carried out an urban housing capacity study which has identified significant opportunities for increased development in urban areas on previously developed (brownfield) sites. In accordance with Government Guidance this should take precedence over greenfield allocations and so no changes to the Green Belt are proposed.</p> <p>A3.18 An alteration to the Green Belt at Keynsham to accommodate new housing and associated social infrastructure and employment opportunities will facilitate the town's increasing importance within the District. Whilst it will result in some greenfield development at Keynsham there are particular advantages:</p> <p>1) New development where there is already a good range of services and where there are good public transport links to the Cities of Bath and Bristol.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.12

CHAPTER A3 – VISION AND STRATEGY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>2) It will stimulate investment to improve the vitality and viability of the town centre, and bring forward new initiative.</p> <p>3) It will provide sustainable development opportunities, with mixed uses including local employment, services and community facilities. Integrated with existing communities these will contribute to social inclusion and quality of life objectives for the residents.</p>	
M/A3/ 15	Para A3.18A	<p>Instead the emphasis is on regeneration of existing sites to enhance the town's employment opportunities and improve town centre facilities with limited residential development. This strategy will reduce the need to travel, promote social inclusion and create a more sustainable pattern of development.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.12
M/A3/ 16	Para A3.20	<p>This will reduce the need to travel, promote social inclusion and create a more sustainable pattern of development. To this end only limited further housing development is proposed, with the emphasis on economic development to meet local needs.</p> <p>To create a sustainable pattern of development within Norton-Radstock, new residential development will be limited to that required to ensure the plan is able to provide an adequate supply of housing land within the plan period. Development will be mainly on brownfield sites, and will include mixed use schemes wherever appropriate in order to contribute to the provision of modern employment facilities.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.13
M/A3/ 17	Para A3.21	<p>...the area's attractiveness and accessibility. It will also enhance the area's role for tourism based on its mining and, railway heritage and other assets. This heritage, together with the towns' distinctive landscape setting will continue to contribute to the area's attractiveness as a place to live.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/5) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

CHAPTER A4 – IMPLEMENTATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A4/1	Para 4.7	<p>Where the use of planning conditions would not be appropriate, planning obligations may be sought in order to make acceptable, development proposals which would otherwise not be granted planning permission. Another method of securing such improvements is by means of Planning Obligations. Planning obligations are (either legal agreements between the landowner and local planning authority or undertakings by the developer). Whilst generally conditions are used in preference to obligations, the latter may be particularly relevant in circumstances where financial contributions are sought, where infrastructure or land is to be transferred to the local authority, where the developer is not the owner of the site or to achieve environmental mitigation and/or gains.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.14
M/A4/2	Policy IMP.1	<p align="center">POLICY IMP.1</p> <p>In determining planning applications, planning obligations under section 106 of the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act may be sought where a development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. creates a demonstrable need for particular facilities without which the development could not take place; or ii. would otherwise have a damaging impact on the environment or other interests of acknowledged importance; or iii. would otherwise adversely affect national or local policies. <p>In determining planning applications, Planning Obligations under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 may be sought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) where a particular form of development is required to comply with policy; or ii) to provide compensatory provision for what is lost or damaged as a result of the development; or iii) to mitigate an otherwise unacceptable impact of the development on local facilities and infrastructure; or iv) to overcome any other identified harm which would make the development otherwise unacceptable. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.15
M/A4/3	Para A4.15	Where such information is relevant to the application but not provided, it may result in delays in the determination of the application.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.16

CHAPTER A4 – IMPLEMENTATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>In some cases, in the absence of the information, the Council may be more likely to conclude that the development would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance, thus possibly refusing the application resulting in the refusal of the application.</p>	
M/A4/4	Para A4.23	<p>One consideration will be whether the Local Plan policies are relevant and up to date. Where this is not the case it will point to the need for a review of the Plan. The Council intends to monitor the Plan's effectiveness (see para A4.41) and to review its policies and proposals at least every 5 years. This will enable the Plan to be responsive and flexible to changing needs and requirements.</p> <p>A new system of development plans has been introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. As a result, this "old style" Local Plan will be saved for only three years from adoption. The Council's Local Development Scheme sets out the timetable for the preparation of the documents forming the new Local Development Framework which will replace this Local Plan. The new system will provide greater flexibility for the review of policies and proposals as they become out of date.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.17
M/A4/5	Para A4.25	<p>The Council has already embarked on a number of projects, concentrating its resources to help achieve this objective. and that Many of these projects have influenced the content of the Plan and will be key in the implementation of its policies and proposals. This has involved working in partnership with other organisations, such as the Environment Agency and the South West Regional Development Agency. These are set out below:</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/7) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/A4/6	Para A4.26A	<i>Para A4.26A relocated to Chapter B9</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.18 (no change to text)
M/A4/7	Para A4.26B	<p>The Council is actively promoting the comprehensive regeneration of this site in partnership with a Master Developer Partner, the South West Regional Development Agency (SWRDA), the landowners and local groups. SPG has been produced outlining the key principles and land-use planning requirements in redeveloping the site. It is envisaged that this SPG will provide the framework for a Masterplan. The Masterplan will need to be supported by a viable</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.18

CHAPTER A4 – IMPLEMENTATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Transport Strategy capable of meeting the needs of the wider area, together with a funding strategy to secure its implementation and an Environmental Appraisal. Development of the site will need to accord with the Masterplan and is expected to take place on a phased basis over a 10 to 15 year period.</p>	
M/A4/8	Para A4.26C	<p>The regeneration of Western Riverside may also present opportunities to redevelop and improve adjoining or well related sites e.g. General Development Site B12, Land at Lower Bristol Road. Proposals relating to these areas will need to be considered against a range of policies in the Local Plan.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.18
M/A4/9	Para A4.27	<p>An application for major redevelopment of the Southgate area of Bath city centre is currently under consideration. Planning permission has been granted for the major redevelopment of the Southgate area of Bath city centre, and a Compulsory Purchase Order has been confirmed by the Secretary of State to enable the scheme to proceed. It will make an important contribution to meeting Local Plan objectives providing 35,000 sq.ms. of modern retail floorspace, leisure facilities, residential uses and a more efficient transport interchange. The Council is devoting considerable staff resources into enabling satisfactory proposals to come forward.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.20
M/A4/10	Para A4.27A	<p>...and a private sector investor / operator. The Project involves the restoration of five listed buildings and the construction of a new, contemporary style Spa building which will be open to the public from Autumn 2003. The heritage buildings include the Hot Bath – considered.....</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/9) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/A4/11	Para A4.29	<p>A successful bid through the Single Regeneration Budget was made in 1996 by the Norton-Radstock Regeneration Partnership which includes the Council and a range of other public, private and voluntary organisations. An award of £2.9 million to carry out a number of projects over a six year period ending in March 2003, will attract further funding from private and other sources giving a total of around £12 million. Part of this funding is to be used to enable the regeneration of former railway land in the centre of Radstock which will provide homes, employment, retail, railway, leisure and open space uses whilst taking account of nature conservation interests as set out in</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.21

CHAPTER A4 – IMPLEMENTATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		accordance with Policy GDS.1. The scheme is currently the subject of a A planning application was submitted in August 2006 for the railway land. Other initiatives will improve the environment of Midsomer Norton town centre.	
M/A4/12	Heading before Para A4.30	Heritage and Economic Regeneration Scheme (HERS), Radstock	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.21
M/A4/13	Heading before Para A4.31	Norton Radstock Area - Market and Coastal Towns Initiative	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.21
M/A4/14	Para A4.40	<p>Many of the Council's strategies influence the Local Plan and funding and action to implement these strategies comes from a range of sources including the Council's capital programme, Government and from other agencies. The following strategies make an important contribution to the Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Transport Plan • Housing Strategy • Economic Development Strategy • Social Inclusion Strategy • Change 21 - Local Agenda 21 Sustainable Development Strategy • Leisure Strategy • Education Asset Management and School Organisation Plans • World Heritage Site Management Plan (under preparation) • Bath Urban Archaeological Strategy (under preparation) • Biodiversity Action Plan and Wild Things Partnership • Cotswolds and Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plans • Early Years Development and Childcare Plan • Public Arts Strategy (under preparation) • Play Policy • Community Care Plan • Public Realm Strategy for Bath (under preparation) • Norton Radstock Streetscape Strategy (under preparation) • Cultural Strategy for Bath & North East Somerset. • Priority Species and Habitats for Bath & North East Somerset 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.22
M/A4/15	Target 1	<p>Target 1: Improved quality of design.</p> <p>Indicator 1: Number of planning development schemes accompanied by a design statement (see Policy D.5).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.24

CHAPTER A4 – IMPLEMENTATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A4/ 16	Target 2A	Target 2: The more efficient use of land. Indicator 2: Dwellings built at a net residential density of at least 30 or more dwellings to the hectare.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.24
M/A4/ 17	Target 3	Target 3: Planning permission will be granted on all the employment land allocated in the Plan period. Development of all allocated employment land within the Plan period. Indicator 3: Proportion of allocated employment land granted planning permission in the District development within the Plan period.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.25 Review
M/A4/ 18	Target 4	Target 4: Enabling of farm diversification schemes. Indicator 4: Number of planning permissions given for farm diversification schemes.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.25
M/A4/ 19	Target 5	Target 5: No net loss in playing fields and recreational open space. Indicator 6: Net change in playing fields and recreational open space.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.26
M/A4/ 20	Target 10	Make provision for 6,200 additional dwellings in accordance with phasing Policy HG 3. Make provision which will deliver 6,855 additional dwellings within the plan period.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.27
M/A4/ 21	Target 11	Target 11: 30% 35% of affordable homes provided on all sites of 0.5 ha. or more, or with 15 or more dwellings in Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock, Paulton and Peasedown St. John and on all sites of 0.5 ha or more, or with 10 or more dwellings in other villages. Indicator 11: Number of affordable homes built or with planning permission as a proportion of the total.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.28
M/A4/ 22	Targets 13 & 14	Target 13: Reduce the amount of industrial and commercial waste landfilled to 85% of 1998 levels by 2005. Target 14: Recycle/compost at least 33% 50% of household waste by 2003/4, rising to 36% by 2005/6 2009/10. Indicators: Quantity of demolition materials reprocessed for use on site (target 13). Number and capacity of materials recovery	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendations R1.23, R1.29 & R1.30

CHAPTER A4 – IMPLEMENTATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		facilities and composting facilities (targets 14 - 16). Reduction in quantities of household, industrial/commercial and construction/demolition wastes deposited at disposal facilities (targets 14 - 16).	
M/A4/23	Target 18	Target 18: Additional new planting in Forest of Avon area in association with new development. Indicator 18: Number of trees and length of hedgerows planted.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.23
M/A4/24	Target 19	Target 19: No loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a) other than allowed in policy GDS.1. Indicator 19: Amount of grades 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land lost to development.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.31
M/A4/25	Target 20	60% 50% of new dwellings on previously developed (brownfield) land.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.33
M/A4/26	Indicator 21	Amount of new development permitted in Environmental Agency defined floodplains. Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.23
M/A4/27	Target 23	Target 23: No net loss of visually important open space. Indicator 23: The number of planning approvals implemented which allow for the net loss of visually important open space.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.34
M/A4/28	Target 25	Target 25: Provide 15% of aggregates used in Bath & North East Somerset from secondary and recycled sources by 2006. Indicator 25: Quantity of secondary and/or recycled aggregates produced and/or consumed. Quantity and nature of extraction of virgin minerals.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.23
M/A4/29	Target 27	Increase in the number of school and major employer travel plans from 10 in 2000 to 25 by 2006. Increase in the number of travel plans to 80 for schools and 25 for major employers by 2011.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.23

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A5/1	Chapter Title	A5. DESIGN AND URBAN DESIGN	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/14) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/A5/2	Para A5.1	...and make up existing places better. Better places are not just for those people that who live or work in those places, but.....	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/15) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/A5/3	Para A5.12	Overarching these themes will be the requirement to submit a design and access statement with most certain types of planning applications and consent (see Policy D5 para A5.73).	Modification arising from Inspector's Recommendations R1.42 & R1.44 and related modifications
M/A5/4	Policy D.1	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY D.1</p> <p>Development which does not either maintain or enhance the character of an area will not be permitted.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.35
M/A5/5	Section Heading	DESIGN AND PUBLIC REALM	Modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R1.36
M/A5/6	Para A5.32	The aim of making the most efficient use of land and seeking higher density development is an important consideration. However, it is essential that a balance is achieved between the density of a development and its effect on the character of an area. Achieving this depends largely on the benefits of a higher density development in any given location, and the values placed on character.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.37
M/A5/7	Policy D.2	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY D.2</p> <p>Development will only be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) schemes are well connected to their surroundings and, where appropriate, it is easy and safe to move through the development site; b) the character of the public realm is maintained or enhanced and the development is of high quality design; c) buildings relate positively to the public realm, and a clear distinction is made between the public realm and private space; d) the density of development is maximised having regard to the character of an area; e) a mix of uses is incorporated at a level appropriate to the needs of the location, its surroundings, and to the scale of development proposed; 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.39

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>f) car parking and access roads do not dictate the design of the development, nor dominate the quality of the public realm;</p> <p>g) safe and secure environments are created for all users of the public realm, where natural surveillance is of a high level; and</p> <p>h) the amenities of the users of the proposed, existing or potential development in the area are not harmed. the proposed development will not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing or proposed occupiers of, or visitors to, residential or other sensitive premises by reason of loss of light, or increased overlooking, noise, smell, traffic or other disturbance.</p> <p>i) it provides for public art or otherwise contributes to a public realm which is attractive, enjoyable and legible.</p>	
M/A5/8	Policy D.3	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY D.3</p> <p>The Council will seek the provision of public art in all significant development schemes.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.38
M/A5/9	Para A5.56	<p>Townscape acts at a variety of levels, from the way a development responds to the landscape in which it is placed, to how a building's size may contrast with its neighbours. It is about how a development physically and visually responds to its context. The townscape approach is the mechanism to achieve the desire to maintain and enhance the character of an area. It should also be recognised that the quality of the townscape and landscape varies within the District and as such it is important that new development should complement what is attractive and should improve on what is poor.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.41
M/A5/10	Para A5.59	<p>It is important to ensure that a development responds sensitively to the landscape in which it is placed. The appearance of land includes its shape, form, ecology, natural and man-made features, colours and the way that these components combine. New planting should conserve and/or enhance the wildlife, landscape, amenity, productive and cultural value of an area, in terms of setting, layout and species selection.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/A/17) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/A5/11	Para A5.60	<p>Landscape design used creatively and as part of the design process should enhance the quality of schemes. It is inappropriate to use planting to hide developments, disguising a</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.41

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		building infers it responds poorly to its context. Landscape design also embraces hard material for example for surfacing, structures and walls. Reference to Policy NE.1. Landscaping can also help mitigate increased CO₂ emissions caused by an increase in the need to travel.	
M/A5/ 12	Heading & Para A5.61	Morphology Pattern of streets, buildings and spaces Morphology is concerned with the form and structure of things, and in this context it is used to refer to The form and structure of our settlements. This includes the pattern of streets, blocks, plots, the individual elements of buildings, and the relationships of each to each other. The morphology form and structure of places is an important aspect of their character. New development should therefore generally reflect the morphology form and structure of surrounding areas in terms of the pattern of streets, buildings and spaces , and of the development site itself.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.41
M/A5/ 13	Para A5.62	A thorough analysis of the morphology form and structure of an area should provide a suitable range of design options for new development. For example and regarding the position of a building on its plot, an analysis should determine whether it is most appropriately built directly on the back of pavements, set back behind front gardens, or a combination or range between the two.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.41
M/A5/ 14	Para A5.66	Places and buildings need to be designed to allow for, and to accommodate, change over time. Buildings originally designed for one purpose will undergo pressure to change to other uses, or simply to be adapted to accommodate a growing family. Buildings should therefore be designed with enough flexibility to allow a new use to be satisfactorily accommodated, without complete rebuilding or to enable extensions to be added when required and where appropriate. It is about providing for developments and layouts that can reasonably be adapted to help meet the demands of future generations.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.41
M/A5/ 15	Para A5.69	The general approach to be taken in Bath and North East Somerset should be a contextual one, where the visual appearance of new buildings responds appropriately to their surroundings. The attractive qualities and local distinctiveness of settlements will be	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.41

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>identified in SPG or SPD such as conservation area appraisals and village design statements (see paras A4.19 and A.20). The aim of adopting this approach is to ensure that the valued character of the District is respected and poor environments improved, whilst enabling the use of high quality innovative solutions. Extensions should respect and complement their host building.</p>	
M/A5/16	Para A5.70	<p>For extensions to existing buildings, it will generally be appropriate for the design to reflect the appearance of the existing building.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.41
M/A5/17	Policy D4	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY D.4</p> <p>Development will only be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the design does not have an adverse effect on the landscape setting and the natural and man-made features of the site; b) the landscape design of the proposal enhances the development of the site; c) the design does not have an adverse effect on the morphology of the area surrounding the site and the site itself; d) the materials, scale, height and massing of schemes respond appropriately to the character of the area, and to the type of development proposed; e) buildings and layouts are designed in an adaptable way that allows their future use to change, and where possible, allowing for future expansion; f) the appearance of new buildings responds appropriately to their context; and g) the appearance of extensions responds appropriately to the appearance of the existing building. <p>Development will be permitted only where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) it responds to the local context in terms of appearance, materials, siting, spacing and layout; reinforces or complements attractive qualities of local distinctiveness; or improves areas of poor design and layout; b) landscaping enhances the development and complements its surroundings; c) buildings and layouts are capable of adaptation; d) the appearance of extensions respect and complement their host building. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.40

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A5/ 18	Para A5.73	<p>Design statements should accompany all development proposals. The degree of detail necessary is dependent on the complexity or sensitivity of the application and the site, but it is anticipated that in most cases the Design Statement will be short and succinct. From August 2006 there is a requirement for design and access statements to accompany applications for certain types of permission and consent. The Circular provides detailed advice on exemptions to this requirement and on preparing a design and access statement. They should always be clear and precise, avoiding unnecessary waffle or ambiguity, and suitably illustrated to explain ideas with greater clarity.</p>	Modification to Para A5.73 arisen from Inspector's Recommendation R1.44 and the release Circular 01/2006 'Guidance on Changes to the Development Control System' in June 2006.
M/A5/ 19	Para A5.74	<p>The Design Statement should set out how the scheme satisfies the urban design objectives, and take account of the issues identified in Quick Guide 4A. The provision of a Design Statement design and access statement, if undertaken appropriately, should aid the decision making process and should enable a wider audience to understand the rationale for adopting a particular design approach to design and access in relation to a particular proposal.</p>	Reference to Quick Guide 4A deleted to accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.42. The remainder of the first sentence is deleted and other modifications proposed to Para A5.74 to reflect the provisions of Circular 01/2006.
M/A5/ 20	Quick Guide 4A	<p style="text-align: center;">QUICK GUIDE 4A DESIGN STATEMENTS</p> <p>A design statement should take account of the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the character of the area in which the development is sited; 2. the topography and landscape and landscape setting of the site; 3. the morphology of the area; 4. the relationship to the public realm; 5. connections to the surrounding environment; 6. the density of the development proposed; 7. the mix of uses proposed; 8. Community Safety; 9. Car Parking; and 10. Public Art. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.42
M/A5/ 21	Policy D5	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY D.5</p> <p>Planning applications for all development will be expected to be accompanied by a design statement.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.43

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/A5/ 22	Para A5.74A	<p style="text-align: center;">DESIGN AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Careful attention to design in new development will make a significant contribution in moving towards sustainability. Whilst Policy 1 sets out the overarching sustainable development requirements of all new development, a range of more detailed issues also need consideration. Some policies set out particular requirements where they relate to certain types of development e.g. Policy ES.2 on energy conservation, WM.4 on recycling facilities and GDS.1 where it relates to passive solar gain. However, best practice and technology are changing rapidly and the circumstances of different sites will vary and it would be inappropriate for the Local Plan to set out design requirements which may be technologically superseded during the life of the Plan.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.42
M/A5/ 23	Para A5.74B	<p>In order to enable flexibility whilst at the same time 'pushing the boundaries' of sustainability, Quick Guide 4B will help to serve as a check list for sustainability principles in relation to design and new development.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.42
M/A5/ 24	Quick Guide 4B	<p style="text-align: center;">Quick Guide 4B SUSTAINABILITY AND DESIGN OF NEW DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>In seeking to ensure that new development incorporates sustainable development in its design, consideration should be given to the following principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximise the use of materials that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - from local, recycled and/or sustainable sources; - not toxic or difficult to dispose of at demolition (Policy 1, D4(d); 2. Minimise energy needs through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - designing for energy efficiency, e.g. building orientation to maximise solar gain and minimise overshadowing, dwelling density, use of natural light, advanced insulation technology, wind shelter; - incorporating sustainable energy supply such as combined heat and power (CHP) (ES.2, WM.10); 3. Conserve use of water such as via the use of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sustainable drainage systems, e.g. reed beds; - on-site water recycling systems (ES.5); 4. Maintain and enhance wildlife through: 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.42

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of native species & other species of high ecological value; - creation of wildlife habitats to enhance existing wildlife corridors (NE.12, D.4(b)); 5. Allow space for recycling of waste facilities. Use of recycled materials (D.2(g), ES,9); 6. Improving health and safety by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'designing out crime'; - designing high quality living environments (D.2(g), ES.9) 7. Ensure design conserves or enhances local distinctiveness and local character (D.1, NE.1, T.16); 8. Ensure access to and within the scheme is convenient, safe & well integrated with the wider network of links for all users; 9. Benefit air quality through the retention and new planting of trees. <p>NB Although best practice may change, these principles will remain applicable to the consideration of new development proposals.</p>	

CHAPTER B1 – SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B1/1	Para B1.3	Not all development can be concentrated in Bath. In accordance with JRSP Policy 2(d), the next priority should be those settlements which have significant existing advantages over other locations in respect of public transport access to major employment areas and other important facilities. The Urban Area of Keynsham has good bus links to Bath and Bristol and significant potential to improve upon existing reasonable rail services. It also has a good range of local facilities and services. The town is therefore suitable for significant levels of development. To accommodate this, JRSP Policy 2(l) provides for a change to the Green Belt.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R2.1
M/B1/2	Para B1.4	The <i>Urban Area</i> of Norton-Radstock does not have the same level of accessibility enjoyed by Keynsham. Whilst there are good bus services to Bath there is no rail link and accessibility to Bristol is more limited. However it does have good access to a range of local facilities and services and while some development is anticipated it will be at a much lower level than in the past. and could accommodate mixed use development on some of the outdated employment sites. This would contribute to the housing land supply during the plan period, whilst contributing towards the development of a more balanced settlement in terms of homes and jobs.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R2.2

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/1	Para B2.1	As set out in PPG4 PPS1 , a key objective of sustainable development is <i>"the maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment and to ensure that the benefits of economic growth can be shared by everyone"</i> (see Overall Strategy section).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.3
M/B2/2	Para B2.5	<p>A long term vision for the District's future is described in the Local Agenda 21 Strategy for Bath & North East Somerset, Change 21. Key points highly relevant to the District's economy are summarised in Quick Guide 5.</p> <p>A long term vision for the District's future is described in the Local Agenda 21 Strategy for Bath & North East Somerset, Change 21. Key points particularly relevant to the District's economy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible local needs should be met locally, including food production. Local goods and services should be locally branded • Inward investment should encourage a wide range of sustainable businesses to develop - both industrial and commercial. • Community enterprises should be encouraged to thrive. • Sustainable tourism should increase. • People will recognise their influence on the local economy. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.3
M/B2/3	Quick Guide 5	<p align="center">Quick Guide 5</p> <p>The Change 21 'Vision' for Bath & North East Somerset The Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible local needs should be met locally, including food production. Local goods and services should be locally branded • Inward investment should encourage a wide range of sustainable businesses to develop - both industrial and commercial. • Community enterprises should be encouraged to thrive. • Sustainable tourism should increase. • People will recognise their influence on the local economy. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.3
M/B2/4	Para B2.6	The Council has a 10 year Economic Strategy "Towards 2013 - A Thriving Sustainable economy for Bath & North East Somerset" covering the period 2003 – 2013. This framework recognises the continuing high dependence on service sector employment and highlights the need to ensure adequate	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.3

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>land and buildings are made available to meet future economic and employment needs in key growth sectors. It seeks complementary action across four policy strands as set out in Quick Guide 6. The strategy has four building blocks underpinned by the themes of sustainability, partnership and inclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Business creation and growth: Supporting the creation of new businesses and promoting sustainable economic growth in key future employment sectors. ● Community Regeneration: ensuring that all sections of the community of Bath & North East Somerset can participate in and benefit from the area's prosperity ● Environment and infrastructure: Seeking an integrated approach to transportation issues which will meet future economic needs and maintain a high quality of life locally. ● Skills and Training: Promoting a lifelong learning culture amongst employers and the workforce which will address skills shortages in an ageing workforce. <p>Source: 10 year Economic Plan</p>	
M/B2/5	Quick Guide 6	<p align="center">Quick Guide 6: Bath & North East Somerset 10 Year Economic Plan</p> <p>The themes of Sustainability, Partnership & Inclusion underpin the following four building blocks of the Economic Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Business creation and growth: Supporting the creation of new businesses and promoting sustainable economic growth in key future employment sectors. ● Community Regeneration: ensuring that all sections of the community of Bath & North East Somerset can participate in and benefit from the area's prosperity ● Environment and infrastructure: Seeking an integrated approach to transportation issues which will meet future economic needs and maintain a high quality of life locally. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.3

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>● Skills and Training: Promoting a lifelong learning culture amongst employers and the workforce which will address skills shortages in an ageing workforce.</p> <p>Source: 10-year Economic Plan</p>	
M/B2/6	Para B2.14	<p>Bath is the largest employment centre in the District with almost 70% 45% of all employees in the District working in the City. It also serves as an employment centre for parts of adjoining districts such as West Wiltshire, Mendip and South Gloucestershire. The RPG and Structure Plan seek to maintain Bath's economic role in line with Government guidance on urban regeneration. Bath has the benefit of being accessible by a range of transport modes including bus and train. Furthermore the local employment opportunities in Bath help maintain local sustainability with 78% 71% of the city's workforce finding work in Bath. (2001 Census)</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3
M/B2/7	Para B2.18	<p>In seeking to maintain and enhance the economic prosperity of the District, it is necessary to ensure that there is both sufficient and readily available land to meet economic development needs. Employment generating development should take place in locations which accord with sustainable development objectives such as reducing the need to travel, and on sites which can be readily developed. There should also be a priority on using brownfield land over greenfield where possible. Provision of employment land must be seen within the wider context of the provision of land to meet other social and environmental needs within the Local Plan theme of Balanced Communities.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/8	Para B2.19	<p>Many existing employment sites within the urban areas as well as in the villages offer opportunities for local employment. In Bath for instance, the availability of employment provides jobs for over three quarters of the City's workforce (1991 Census).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/9	Para B2.20	<p>Bath, in particular, has limited land available for development of any type, particularly employment uses. The City is an important employment centre and is the centre of a relatively good bus and rail based public transport system. Whilst its economy has generally been buoyant, there remain pockets of high unemployment in certain wards.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 10	Para B2.21	Furthermore, the City is characterised by a pattern of residential uses intermingled with industrial, commercial and community uses. This juxtaposition of uses makes a significant contribution to the City's character but also facilitates shorter journeys to work as well as walking and cycling.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 11	Para B2.22	A number of employment sites have been lost to other uses in recent years. Pressure to find land for housing should not prejudice the objective of balanced communities by leading to the reduction in this mix of uses and opportunities to work locally.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 12	Para B2.23	Similar patterns of land use are also a feature of some other settlements in the District. However, in many of the villages, there are a limited number of employment sites. Once these are lost, there are very limited opportunities to identify local replacements. The ongoing loss of local employment sites exacerbates problems of out-commuting and reliance on the private car thereby undermining social and economic vitality.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 13	Para B2.24	Employment sites become available for development from time to time and, in some cases, the re-use of these sites for mixed-use schemes would not undermine opportunities for people to work locally. In such cases, the mix of uses should include opportunities for significant long term employment generation. This approach is reflected in Policy GDS.1 which allows for mixed-use schemes on a few large sites where there are greater benefits to the community and there is long term benefit to the economy.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 14	Para B2.25	Very occasionally, there may be sites where continued employment use is no longer viable or there may be insurmountable conflicts with other uses. In such circumstances, alternative uses may be acceptable.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 15	Para B2.26	Nevertheless, care must be taken to ensure the existing stock of employment land is not eroded in a way that undermines the local economic base or sustainability. The District Council will put great weight on the benefits to the community that a local employment site offers in terms of sustainable travel to work, both now and in the future.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 16	Para B2.27	Furthermore, the redevelopment of employment land for mixed uses or other uses in the short term should not lead to the need to release greenfield sites in the longer term	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		to make up for shortages of opportunities for economic expansion.	
M/B2/ 17	Para B2.28	In order therefore to ensure land is available for economic development needs, to maintain social and economic vitality, to conserve local character and to provide opportunities to walk and cycle to work, existing and committed land will be safeguarded for employment uses unless there are particular reasons to allow otherwise. This is in line with Policy 30 of the JRSP.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 18	Para B2.28A	The Business Location Requirements Study 2003 The Business Location Requirements Study 2003 (BLRS) provides an analysis of local employment trends up to 2011, how much land the market will demand and what types of site will be in demand. The study addresses the demand for office and industrial uses which are referred to as business space uses. The Local Plan uses this as a basis for defining the types of business uses which are the subject of Local Plan employment land safeguarding policies. Quick Guide 6B sets out in detail the Local Plan definition of business use. These different business uses generally, although not always, occupy different types of premises. Offices occupy office type accommodation, industrial and distribution activities occupy factories and warehouses, and other business space uses occupy a range of similar sites and premises specific to their need e.g. coach depots, car hire and builders' yards.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 19	Para B2.28B	District Wide The study concludes that between 2001-2011 industrial employment in the District will fall by 1,200 jobs (10%). Office sectors are expected to expand providing 1,200 extra jobs (6%). Non-business space activities will grow by 4,600 jobs (11%). The distribution of these changes throughout the District and anticipated changes in floorspace requirements are set out in Table 1A.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 20	Quick Guide 6B	Quick Guide 6B Definition of 'Business Uses' in the Local Plan Office/ Research & development Includes public administration, defence, other office sectors which include banking and finance, insurance, professional services,	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>computing services and other business services. Generally Use Classes* B1a & b</p> <p>Industrial: Manufacturing, generally Use Classes B1c and B2</p> <p>Storage and Distribution Primarily Use Class B8</p> <p>Other A range of employment generating business uses generally of industrial character, many of which are sui generis e.g. builders' yards, car hire, coach depots</p> <p>Specifically excluded from business space uses are retail, leisure & tourism, education, social work, public and personal services.</p> <p>Town & Country Planning (Use Classes Order) 1987</p>	
M/B2/ 21	Para B2.28C	<p>In Bath, where the greatest pressures for redevelopment of employment land exists, the floorspace figures are further influenced by continuing losses of business space floorspace to other uses. Based on recent trends for office sectors, this is estimated to be 1,500 sq ms per annum and for industrial sectors 4,500 sq ms. In addition, where there is a net requirement for additional floorspace, a 50% allowance for choice and variety is needed to ensure future economic growth can be realised.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 22	Para B2.28D	<p>Policies in this section of the Local Plan therefore aim to ensure that an adequate supply of industrial and office sectors floorspace is available to meet the projected requirements during the Plan period. They include all employment uses other than those defined as non-business space sectors as set out in para B2.28A above. It therefore includes a range of sui generis uses as well as the usual B1, B2 and B8 uses. Between them, the industrial and office sectors require a range of types and sizes of business premises. Safeguarding such a range is essential if the economy is to retain vitality and diversity.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 23	Para B2.28E	<p>Office Sectors in Bath</p> <p>While Policies ET.2 and GDS.1 make provision for new office development, these together with other potential windfall sites are not all likely to come forward in the short to</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		medium term due to market conditions. Even as part of mixed use sites, the construction of speculative office development is not guaranteed as has been witnessed over the last 10 years.	
M/B2/ 24	Para B2.28F	It is therefore important that until economic conditions result in new supply coming forward on strategic allocations in Policy GDS.1 in the longer term, particularly Western Riverside, office supply is safeguarded. The BLRS confirms that the preference is for city centre sites which are accessible and provide a variety of accommodation and it will be important to prevent any substantial losses of city centre sites during the Plan period.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 25	Para B2.28G	Pressures for uses have in the past resulted in the loss of office floorspace and residential values continue to create pressure for change of use of the existing stock of offices located within and adjacent to the central area of the city. Policy ET.1A therefore safeguards existing office floorspace in a defined core office employment area, within the central area of Bath.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 26	Policy ET.1A	<p align="center">POLICY ET.1A</p> <p>Within the Bath core office employment area defined on the Proposals Map, development for other uses of land or buildings in existing office use (Class B1a and b) or, if vacant, last used for office purposes, or committed for office use, will only be permitted where:</p> <p>i the site is no longer capable of offering accommodation for office uses; or</p> <p>ii the importance of the development outweighs the economic development benefits of the site; or</p> <p>iii the development results in suitable alternative employment opportunities or provision, of at least equivalent benefit, in easily accessible locations, well served by a range of transport modes.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 27	Para B2.28H	<p>Industrial Sectors in Bath</p> <p>Bath contains three large multi-occupied core industrial locations which are located in the River Avon, A4/A36 corridor in the western part of the City. They consist of Lower Bristol Road, Locksbrook Road and Brassmill Lane, which have a total area of some 21 hectares. The BLRS recognises that industrial sector employment will fall during the 2001-2011</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		period. This is the equivalent of about 4 hectares.	
M/B2/ 28	Para B2.28I	If the recent historical rate of industrial losses of approximately 1 hectare per year (1996-2001) continues, it is clear that the supply will shrink faster than demand. In addition, there has been no development of new industrial floorspace since the 1980s. Together, these factors suggest that industrial sectors could be forced out of Bath by a combination of higher land values, need to accommodate non business space activity and lack of alternative site provision. This will result in reduced local employment opportunities and likely increased outward commuting. Because of the local and indigenous nature of many of the small to medium sized businesses, employment land allocations in the Norton Radstock and Keynsham areas are unlikely to attract significant relocations from Bath. Closure of larger companies in Bath has seldom resulted in relocation to other parts of the District.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 29	Para B2.28J	There is a strong case to safeguard these core employment sites in order to retain sufficient land to meet industrial sector demand. However, the Lower Bristol Road core area has become run down over a long period of time. With older buildings and dereliction, there is a need to regenerate the area through the provision of mixed-use developments, including the provision of offices, housing, non business space activity, community facilities and transport infrastructure. It also presents the opportunity to enhance both the important A36 'gateway' route into the City and the riverside area. This site is therefore allocated under Policy GDS.1. Policy ET.1B safeguards for employment uses the Locksbrook Road and Brassmill Lane core employment sites.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 30	Policy ET.1B	POLICY ET.1B Development of land or buildings within the core employment areas identified on the Proposals Map for uses other than business uses, as defined in Quick Guide 6B, will not be permitted.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 31	Quick Guide 6A	Quick Guide 6A: Safeguarding Employment Land Under Policies ET.1A, ET.1C and ET.1D 1. Is the site capable of offering accommodation for employment uses: (a) access by vehicles likely to be used in servicing, visiting or using the site,	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>including parking and manoeuvring space;</p> <p>(b) condition of buildings — e.g. derelict, good condition;</p> <p>(c) adaptability of buildings for business use;</p> <p>(d) redevelopment potential for other business use;</p> <p>(e) reasons why previous occupier is moving (if relevant);</p> <p>(f) ability to make site secure — e.g. impact on Conservation Area, Listed Building issues;</p> <p>(g) accessibility by workforce.</p> <p>2. Does the use of the site for employment purposes raise unacceptable environmental or traffic problems?</p> <p>(a) traffic generation;</p> <p>(b) parking problems;</p> <p>(c) noise;</p> <p>(d) dust;</p> <p>(e) fumes;</p> <p>(f) light pollution;</p> <p>(g) working hours (e.g. 24 hour/weekend working);</p> <p>(h) proximity to sensitive uses.</p>	
M/B2/ 32	Para B2.28K	<p>Small Employment Sites in Bath Outside Core Employment Areas</p> <p>Outside these core sites, there are also a range of small employment sites spread throughout the City, often located within residential areas. For policy purposes, these are defined as being 0.4 hectares or less in area. Frequently in fairly low grade but appropriately functional and relatively inexpensive accommodation, surveys have indicated that small sites provide local jobs and services and meet local markets. These factors, together with reducing the need to travel and contributing to mixed-use environments, mean that such sites are important in meeting sustainable development objectives. Also occupiers may not be able to afford the cost of alternative replacement accommodation and there are few opportunities for alternative provision.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 33	Para B2.28L	<p>Monitoring has indicated that a number of these small sites have been developed or have come under pressure for residential development in recent years, with no replacement. Policy ET.1C therefore safeguards such sites from development except where exceptional circumstances apply.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 34	Policy ET.1C	<p align="center">POLICY ET.1C</p> <p>Outside the scope of Policies ET.1A and ET.1B, the development for other uses of land or buildings in existing business uses (as defined in Quick Guide 6B) of 0.4 ha or below in area, or if vacant, last used for business uses or committed for such uses, will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>i the site is no longer capable of offering accommodation for employment uses; or</p> <p>ii the use of the site for employment purposes raises unacceptable environmental or traffic problems; or</p> <p>iii the importance of the development outweighs the economic development benefits of the site.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 35	Para B2.28M	<p>Other Employment Sites in Bath</p> <p>There remain a limited number of existing or former employment sites over 0.4 ha in area in Bath which fall outside the scope of Policies ET.1A, ET.1B and ET.1C. These tend to be large freestanding sites which contribute to the mix of uses in the area and make a valuable contribution to employment. Some of the larger sites have fallen out of use and have been allocated for mixed-use development, e.g. at Rush Hill. Should others come forward for development in the Plan period they could provide opportunities for mixed-use developments incorporating employment uses. Any proposal will be assessed against Policy ET.1D.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 36	Policy ET.1D	<p align="center">POLICY ET.1D</p> <p>Outside the scope of Policies ET.1A, ET.1B and ET.1C, the development for alternative uses of land or buildings in existing or, if vacant, last used for business uses (as defined in Quick Guide 6B), or committed for such uses, will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>i) the site is no longer capable of offering accommodation for employment uses;</p> <p>ii) the use of the site for employment purposes raises unacceptable environmental or traffic problems; or</p> <p>iii) an alternative mix of uses offers greater potential benefits to the community and the site is not required to meet economic development or local employment needs; and</p> <p>iv) it does not have a detrimental impact on</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		the range of types and sizes of sites for employment uses in the area nor the continuing operation of existing employment sites.	
M/B2/ 37	Para B2.28N	<p>Office Sectors – Keynsham, Norton Radstock and Rural Areas</p> <p>Outside of Bath, the demand for office development is of a much smaller scale and there are opportunities in the two towns to meet demand on sites allocated in Policy GDS.1. Whereas the Somerdale site allocated at Keynsham meets more than local need, its locational advantages present the opportunity for a high profile campus which could attract demand from a much wider catchment, helping to increase local jobs and reduce outward commuting.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 38	Para B2.28O	<p>Norton Radstock and the rural areas are more likely to attract small scale office development. In rural areas, this is likely to be through conversions, rural diversification or redevelopment of existing industrial sites. Existing office uses in Keynsham, Norton Radstock and Rural Areas are subject to safeguarding Policies ET.1C and ET.1D.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 39	Para B2.28P	<p>Industrial Sectors – Keynsham, Norton Radstock and Rural Areas</p> <p>As for Bath, a decline in industrial sectors is identified in Keynsham, Norton Radstock and the rural areas.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 40	Para B2.28Q	<p>At Keynsham, there is only a limited existing supply of industrial sites, with the Somerdale Chocolate Factory and the Ashmead Park Industrial Estate in the east of the town providing the bulk of industrial sector floorspace. The retention of these sites and other employment use is essential if the large scale of outward commuting is to be tackled.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 41	Para B2.28R	<p>Allocations and existing commitments in Norton Radstock (see paras B2.35-2.36) would indicate an oversupply of land. However, Norton Radstock still retains a strong industrial presence, with around 25% of the workforce (approximately 5600 people) employed in manufacturing where printing, packaging, engineering and electronics are important sectors. Whilst there has been a gradual decline in industrial employment since 1993, when just over 7000 people were employed, there remain a number of thriving and relatively modern trading estates, notably</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>in the Westfield and Radstock Road areas. The Combend area also maintains a strong employment presence at Radstock, but its particular environmental problems need to be addressed through a separate regeneration strategy (see para B2.41A and Policy ET.3A). In addition, a number of larger industrial sites at Welton and Norton Hill retain significant employment from established companies. For the town to retain its employment base, these areas, together with small more isolated sites, need to be subject to safeguarding policies. This will accord with the JRSP strategy to enhance economic development opportunities in the area and help reduce the need to travel.</p>	
M/B2/ 42	Para B2.28S	<p>In rural areas and villages, industrial sites also provide significant industrial sector employment. They vary from large sites within or adjoining villages such as the Printing Works at Paulton, to freestanding industrial estates in the countryside, e.g. Hallatrow and Burnett Business Parks and Clutton Hill Farm. Some of these are a result of conversions of buildings formerly in other uses or consist of long established industrial sites. They often provide relatively low cost premises and make an important contribution to providing employment in rural areas. There is continuing pressure to redevelop sites within villages for housing, which if uncontrolled will undermine the objectives of providing local employment opportunities in rural areas, contrary to Local Plan objectives on providing balanced communities. It is therefore considered necessary to continue to safeguard existing industrial sector sites in Keynsham, Norton Radstock and rural areas through Policy ET.1D.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 43	Para B2.38T	<p>This notwithstanding, in some cases development of appropriate sites could provide modern offices or industrial units as part of a comprehensive mixed-use scheme. Many of the sites within or immediately adjoining settlements are therefore excluded from Housing Development Boundaries in recognition of the need to retain employment uses and economic vitality. However, Policy HG.4 recognises that if a site is no longer to be retained for employment use under Policy ET.1D or other Local Plan policies, then residential development forming part of a mixed-use scheme may be acceptable outside the Housing Development Boundary.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 44	Para B2.28U	As in Bath there are also a range of small sites outside larger employment estates which contribute to meeting sustainable development objectives. These will be subject to Policy ET.1C and if an alternative use is considered appropriate, Policy HG.4 may apply.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 45	Para B2.29	EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES As stated in para B2.16, the Council is seeking to ensure sufficient land exists to sustain a diverse and buoyant economy. At the same time JRSP Policy 31 seeks to limit the release of new greenfield sites for employment development. The Local Plan approach is therefore to retain existing employment land for employment uses, sometimes as part of a mixed uses scheme (Policies ET.1A-D above) and to release greenfield employment land only where necessary.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 46	Para B2.30	The JRSP does not set out a target requirement for employment land for the District. The Local Plan employment land provision is based on the objective of sustaining a buoyant and diverse local economy, moving towards 'Balanced Communities' and seeks to implement the Local Plan's locational strategy. Opportunities and needs vary across the District as described below.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 47	Para B2.31	Bath In Bath, due to topography, the Green Belt, and other environmental constraints and the demands of other development, there are very limited opportunities to identify new employment land. The operation of Policies ET.1A-D above is the Council's primary approach in ensuring land is available to meet economic development needs for the Plan period. There are also, in particular, three four large redevelopment opportunities in the City which can make a significant contribution to retaining and stimulating employment growth during the Plan period. These are at Western Riverside (site B1), land at Lower Bristol Road (site B12), MoD Foxhill in Combe Down (site B2) and at Rush Hill in Odd Down (site B3) (see Policy GDS.1).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 48	Para B2.33	Keynsham Keynsham has high levels of out-commuting.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		The 1991 census showed that 79% of the town's workforce commuted elsewhere for work. A key objective for Keynsham during the plan period is to identify land for employment generation opportunities. The most important such opportunity for employment development in the town is redevelopment within the grounds of the Somerdale (chocolate factory) site. Therefore, whilst a mixed-use scheme is considered acceptable, the site is proposed primarily for employment uses as set out in Policy GDS.1/K1.	
M/B2/ 49	Para B2.34	Norton Radstock area In the Norton Radstock area, employment opportunities have not kept pace with past residential development and over half of the town's workforce commute elsewhere to work (1991 census). In addition around 25% of the local workforce is employed in manufacturing for which limited growth in employment or even decline is anticipated over the Plan period.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 50	Para B2.35	In line with the JRSP therefore, the strategy for this area is aimed at regeneration to foster a range of new local employment opportunities. The Local Plan seeks to ensure that a variety of type and size of development sites are available. Development at Westfield Industrial Estate is nearing completion and very comparatively little brownfield land is available for redevelopment within Norton Radstock or neighbouring villages. There is some scope for limited development within the grounds of St. Peter's factory at Westfield.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 51	Para B2.36	Land is allocated for development for employment uses on the western edge of the urban area at Old Mills. This will be the prime employment development opportunity in the area for the Plan period. The Local Plan also allocates a smaller site at the former Sewage Works at Welton Hollow for employment uses as well as allowing for the rounding off of Midsomer Norton Enterprise Park.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 52	Para B2.37	Planning permission for 6 11 ha of employment land exists at Peasedown St. John, part of which originated through the comprehensive development scheme. There are also significant redevelopment opportunities at the printing factory site at in Paulton.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 53	Para B2.37A	Rest Of The District The only allocation outside of Bath, Keynsham and the Norton-Radstock area is the requirement for the provision of workshops as part of the Former Radfords site at Chew Stoke, as described in para C1.39. Elsewhere, smaller-scale employment opportunities will be facilitated by Policies ET.3-ET.9.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 54	Para B2.38	Summary of commitments The key employment development opportunities, both those with planning permission and allocations under Policy GDS.1 are shown on Diagram 6.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 55	Para B2.39	OTHER EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN AREAS The locational strategy identifies urban areas of Bath in particular, but also Keynsham and Norton-Radstock as the principal locations for new development. They provide the greatest scope for reducing commuting by car, being the locations best served by public transport and with the most potential for walking and cycling.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 56	Para B2.40	Focusing new employment in these areas also facilitates the objective of urban regeneration. Provision is made in the Local Plan through Policies ET.1 and ET.2 for land for economic development. However, other schemes may be acceptable within the urban areas particularly if they are accessible by modes of transport other than the private car (Policy T.1), do not harm residential amenity (Design Policies) and have appropriate access, parking and servicing (Policy T.26).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 57	Para B2.41	At Bath and Keynsham, the Green Belt boundaries limit opportunities adjoining the urban areas. At Norton-Radstock, opportunities for development adjoining the urban area are provided for in Policy GDS.1. Policy ET.3 enables further development opportunities to come forward within urban areas.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 58	Policy ET.3	POLICY ET.3 Proposals for development of office, industry or storage uses (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8) will be permitted within Bath, Keynsham and Norton-Radstock.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 59	New Para B2.18	<p><u>The general approach to employment land</u></p> <p>The JRSP does not set out a target requirement for employment land in the District and Policy 31 seeks to limit the release of new greenfield sites for employment development. Consequently the local plan's starting point is to concentrate employment-related development on land already used for such purposes, including development undertaken as part of mixed use schemes, with greenfield employment land released only where necessary.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 60	New Para B2.19	<p>The Local Plan aims to maintain and enhance the economic prosperity of the District by ensuring that sufficient employment land is always available to meet development needs so that a diverse and buoyant economy can be preserved. Employment generating development should take place in locations that best accord with sustainable development objectives such as reducing the need to travel (through proximity to public transport and potential walking/cycling routes) and moving towards 'balanced communities'.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 61	New Para B2.20	<p><u>Forecast changes in demand for employment floorspace 2001-11</u></p> <p>The Business Location Requirements Study 2003 (BLRS) provides an analysis of local employment trends up to 2011, forecasting market demand for floorspace during the period 2001-11 within the District and its four sub-areas. The study forecasts the need for an increase in office floorspace (B1a&b), mainly in Bath, and a managed reduction of industrial-type floorspace (B1c/B2/B8). These forecasts are incorporated in policy ET.1 as indicative guidance on the scale of changes which would be appropriate in employment floorspace provision. The Council will carefully monitor progress being made towards these guidance figures as a means of informing future planning decisions.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION																																				
M/B2/ 62	New Policy ET.1	<p align="center">POLICY ET.1</p> <p>Employment land: overview</p> <p>During the period 2001-2011 the Council will seek (A) to achieve the following indicative increase in office floorspace (Class B1a&b) and (B) to allow for the managed reduction in industrial-type floorspace (Class B1c/B2/B8):</p> <p>(A) a net increase in <u>office floorspace</u> (Class B1a&b) of approx 24,000sq.m distributed as follows:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th align="right">Total</th> <th align="right">Annual average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bath</td> <td align="right">18,000 sq.m</td> <td align="right">1,800 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Keynsham</td> <td align="right">No net change</td> <td align="right">No net change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Norton-Radstock</td> <td align="right">2,000 sq.m</td> <td align="right">200 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural areas</td> <td align="right">4,000 sq.m</td> <td align="right">400 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B&NES Total</td> <td align="right">24,000 sq.m</td> <td align="right">2,400 sq.m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(B) a managed net reduction in floorspace for industrial-type floorspace (Class B1c/B2/B8) of approx -45,000 sq.m distributed as follows:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th align="right">Total</th> <th align="right">Annual average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bath</td> <td align="right">-17,500 sq.m</td> <td align="right">-1,750 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Keynsham</td> <td align="right">-3,500 sq.m</td> <td align="right">-350 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Norton-Radstock</td> <td align="right">-14,000 sq.m</td> <td align="right">-1,400 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural areas</td> <td align="right">-10,500 sq.m</td> <td align="right">-1,050 sq.m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B&NES Total</td> <td align="right">-45,500 sq.m</td> <td align="right">-4,550 sq.m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Total	Annual average	Bath	18,000 sq.m	1,800 sq.m	Keynsham	No net change	No net change	Norton-Radstock	2,000 sq.m	200 sq.m	Rural areas	4,000 sq.m	400 sq.m	B&NES Total	24,000 sq.m	2,400 sq.m		Total	Annual average	Bath	-17,500 sq.m	-1,750 sq.m	Keynsham	-3,500 sq.m	-350 sq.m	Norton-Radstock	-14,000 sq.m	-1,400 sq.m	Rural areas	-10,500 sq.m	-1,050 sq.m	B&NES Total	-45,500 sq.m	-4,550 sq.m	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
	Total	Annual average																																					
Bath	18,000 sq.m	1,800 sq.m																																					
Keynsham	No net change	No net change																																					
Norton-Radstock	2,000 sq.m	200 sq.m																																					
Rural areas	4,000 sq.m	400 sq.m																																					
B&NES Total	24,000 sq.m	2,400 sq.m																																					
	Total	Annual average																																					
Bath	-17,500 sq.m	-1,750 sq.m																																					
Keynsham	-3,500 sq.m	-350 sq.m																																					
Norton-Radstock	-14,000 sq.m	-1,400 sq.m																																					
Rural areas	-10,500 sq.m	-1,050 sq.m																																					
B&NES Total	-45,500 sq.m	-4,550 sq.m																																					
M/B2/ 63	New Para B2.21	<p>However, as a means of increasing the self-sustainability of Keynsham, policy GDS.1/K1 makes provision for additional employment at the Somerdale site which will be considered as additional to the above.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4																																				
M/B2/ 64	New Para B2.22	<p>Information will be compiled and published annually, cataloguing the net changes in the above types of floorspace resulting from new build developments, redevelopments and changes of use. This information will be used to provide an important input into a plan-monitor-manage approach to achieving the objectives of this policy, implemented through policies ET.2 and ET.3 below.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4																																				

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 65	New Para B2.23	<p><u>Managing the indicative scales of change in demand for floorspace to 2011</u></p> <p>The Council will seek to work towards the indicative scales of change set out in policy ET.1 through a mix of new provision, safeguarding of sites defined as core employment sites and the adoption of a criteria-based approach to proposals for change on other existing employment sites (see paragraphs B2.24 to B2.27 below).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 66	New Para B2.24	<p><u>New employment floorspace provision</u></p> <p>The city of Bath is relatively self-contained from the employment standpoint, with 71% of residents employed locally. Opportunities to identify new employment land in the city are limited by environmental constraints such as topography, landscape and townscape considerations and the Green Belt. Nonetheless, some major redevelopment sites can make a significant contribution to retaining and stimulating employment growth during the plan period. These are listed under policy GDS.1 as Western Riverside (site B1), Lower Bristol Road (site B12), and Rush Hill, Odd Down (site B3).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 67	New Para B2.25	<p>Bath is expected to be the main focus of office development. Policies ET.1, ET.2 and GDS.1 therefore make provision for significant new office development in the city. Western Riverside has the potential to provide large capacity extending well beyond the plan period, and there may also be long term potential at MOD Foxhill, but such schemes are unlikely to be achieved in the short to medium term. In the short term the supply of offices in Central Bath is likely to remain tight as there has been relatively little speculative office development in the past 10 years. It is therefore considered important to safeguard this supply against pressures for changes of use to other purposes until alternative developments become available. Policy ET.2 therefore defines a core office employment area in the city centre within which the loss of office floorspace will be resisted unless certain criteria are met.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 68	New Para B2.26	Keynsham has a high level of out-commuting with more than 63% of its employed residents travelling elsewhere to work in 2001. Therefore a key objective during the plan period will be to make the town more self-sustaining in terms of employment. Although demand for new office floorspace outside Bath is generally expected to be on a much smaller scale, the locational advantages of the allocated site at Somerdale in Keynsham (policy GDS.1/K1) present the opportunity for a campus of high profile and quality which could attract demand from a wider area, helping to increase local jobs and reduce the high level of commuting from the town. The plan therefore promotes this development as a specific addition to the floorspace forecasts in policy ET.1.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 69	New Para B2.27	In Norton-Radstock the growth in employment opportunities has not kept pace with past rates of residential development, so that over 50% of the town's workforce commuted elsewhere to work in 2001. In addition, although numbers have fallen in recent years, around 2,700 people (about 25% of the local workforce) are still employed in manufacturing sectors such as printing, packaging, engineering and electronics. In view of these factors, and in line with the JRSP, the employment strategy for this area focuses on regeneration, aiming to foster a range of new local employment opportunities. The Local Plan seeks to ensure that a variety of types and sizes of sites are available. Development at Westfield Industrial Estate is nearing completion and there is scope for a mixed use redevelopment of St Peter's factory at Westfield. A small site is also allocated at the former sewage works at Welton Hollow and provision is made for rounding-off Midsomer Norton Enterprise Park. Otherwise there is potential for a mixed use redevelopment at the Welton Bag factory and in the Coombe End area of Radstock. There is also potential for new employment development at the printing factory site in Paulton, near Midsomer Norton.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 70	New Para B2.28	In the rural areas there is planning permission for 11ha of employment land at Peasedown St John, part of which originated through a comprehensive development scheme. In addition there is	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		a requirement for the provision of small scale employment premises as part of the former Radfords site at Chew Stoke, as described in paragraph C1.39. Office development in the rural areas is likely to be small scale, through conversions, rural diversification and redevelopment of existing sites.	
M/B2/ 71	New Para B2.29	The key employment development opportunities described above, both those with planning permission and those allocated under policy GDS.1 are shown in Diagram 6.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 72	New Para B2.30	<u>Safeguarding core employment areas</u> As part of the process of managing an orderly planned reduction in industrial floorspace the Council has identified a number of core employment areas based on factors such as their location and environment, the concentration, range and quality of their existing premises, and the scope for further consolidation by development or redevelopment within their boundaries. The Council wishes to safeguard business premises within these areas against any pressures for redevelopment or change of use to other, often higher value, purposes as an important part of ensuring that there is sufficient accommodation to meet the demands of small and medium scale local businesses and prevent the loss of local employment activities and a possible increase in out-commuting. Policies ET.2 and ET.3 give effect to this.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 73	New Para B2.31	In Bath land is identified for this purpose at Locksbrook Road and Brassmill Lane. These areas are particularly important in providing accommodation for the types of businesses which, if forced out of Bath by higher land values and a shrinking supply of alternative premises, could find it difficult to find alternative affordable options in the city. It has been found that employment land allocations in Keynsham and Norton Radstock are unlikely to attract significant relocations from Bath and that closure of larger companies in Bath has seldom resulted in relocation to other parts of the District.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 74	New Para B2.32	Also in Bath, the Lower Bristol Road area has been considered for designation as a core employment area. However, this area	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		has become run down over a long period of time and there is a need to regenerate derelict areas and older buildings through the provision of mixed use developments including the provision of offices, housing, spaces for non business activities and transport infrastructure. The area also presents an opportunity to enhance both the important A36 gateway route into the city and the riverside area. It has therefore been allocated for mixed use purposes under policy GDS.1/B12.	
M/B2/ 75	New Para B2.33	In Keynsham, the Ashmead Park Industrial Estate provides the bulk of the town's floorspace in the industrial sector. The retention of this site is essential in the interests of preventing growth in the large scale of outward commuting from the town.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 76	New Para B2.34	At Norton-Radstock there remains a number of thriving and relatively modern trading estates, notably in the Westfield and Radstock Road areas. A number of larger industrial sites at Welton and Norton Hill retain significant employment at established companies. In order for the town to retain its employment base these areas need to be safeguarded.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 77	New Para B2.35	There is also significant employment in the industrial sector in the rural areas varying from large sites within or adjoining villages such as the printing works at Paulton, to freestanding industrial estates in the countryside such as Hallatrow and Burnett Business Parks and Clutton Hill Farm. Some result from conversions of buildings formerly in other uses while others are long-established industrial sites. They often provide relatively low-cost premises and make an important contribution to providing employment in rural areas.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 78	New Para B2.36	<u>Changes within employment sites outside core employment areas</u> There is a wide range of premises used for employment purposes outside the core employment areas. Many offer important opportunities for local employment. In particular, Bath is characterised by a pattern of mixed uses with residential uses intermingled with commercial and community uses. This juxtaposition of uses makes a significant contribution to	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the City's townscape character and economic and social vitality as well as facilitating shorter journeys to work. A number of employment sites have been lost to other uses in recent years and it is important that pressure to find land for housing does not prejudice the objective of balanced communities since, once lost, such local sites are rarely replaced.</p>	
M/B2/ 79	New Para B2.37	<p>The Council will therefore strive to ensure that the managed reduction in industrial floorspace does not unduly erode the number of local employment premises which are still capable (or potentially capable) of offering viable accommodation to business occupiers in terms of location, condition, layout, vehicular access, accessibility to employees, environmental and "bad neighbour" issues, etc. Consideration will be given to the availability or otherwise of adequate alternative premises in the locality and, in Bath, particular consideration will be given to the need to retain an adequate supply of small units of 500 sq.m or less. In appropriate circumstances the Council will consider whether it would be right to support mixed use redevelopments providing opportunities for continuing employment, subject to the criteria set out in policies ET.3 (3) and HG.4.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/B2/ 80	New Policy ET.2	<p align="center">POLICY ET.2</p> <p>Office development (class B1a & b):</p> <p><u>Bath City Centre core office employment area.</u> The following policies will apply within the area defined for this purpose on the Proposals Map:</p> <p>(1) Development for new office floorspace will be focused primarily on the sites identified for mixed use development in policy GDS.1. Subject to site-specific considerations new office floorspace will also be acceptable elsewhere in the defined core area as an element of mixed use developments.</p> <p>(2) Planning permission will not be granted for developments involving the loss of established office floorspace unless:</p> <p>(i) it can be demonstrated that the aims of policy ET.1(A) for an increase in office floorspace in Bath will be met without retention</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>of the premises in question; or</p> <p>(ii) the site is no longer capable of offering office accommodation of adequate standard; or</p> <p>(iii) the proposal will secure suitable alternative employment opportunities of at least equivalent economic benefit to the city centre; or</p> <p>(iv) the proposal brings benefits to the city centre which assists the overall objectives of the plan and outweigh the loss of the office floorspace.</p> <p><u>Elsewhere in the District:</u></p> <p>(3) Proposals for net gains of office floorspace will be supported in principle provided that the site is (a) within a site identified for the purpose in policy GDS.1 or elsewhere in the plan, (b) part of a protected core business area identified in policy ET.3 below, (c) within or very closely associated with the central areas of Bath, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock or (d) in villages in accordance with policy ET.4. In all cases sites must be accessible to a range of transport modes.</p> <p>(4) Proposals for net losses in stand-alone office floorspace will not be granted in the protected core business areas or within or very close to the central areas of Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock unless:</p> <p>(i) it can be demonstrated that the aims of policy ET.1(A) for an increase in office floorspace in the relevant sub-area will be met without retention of the premises in question; or</p> <p>(ii) the site is no longer capable of offering office accommodation of adequate standard; or</p> <p>(iii) the proposal will secure suitable alternative employment opportunities of at least equivalent economic benefit to the sub-area.</p>	

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 81	New Policy ET.3	<p align="center">POLICY ET.3</p> <p>Non-office business development (class B1c, B2 and B8)</p> <p>(1) Proposals for non-office development in the business use classes will be supported in principle within:</p> <p>(a) the following core employment areas identified on the Proposals Map:</p> <p><u>Bath</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brassmill Lane - Locksbrook Road, Bath - Wessex Water Site, Calverton Down - Wansdyke Business Centre - Midford Road, Odd Down - MoD site at Ensleigh <p><u>Keynsham</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paper Mill/ Broadmead/ Ashmead/ Pixash Industrial. Estate including Keynsham Paper Mill <p><u>Norton Radstock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Westfield Industrial Estate - Mill Road, Radstock - Midsomer Enterprise Park, Radstock Road - Haydon Industrial Estate, Radstock - Norton Hill Factories (Coates and Alcan), Midsomer Norton <p><u>Villages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Old Mills, Paulton - Hallatrow Business Park - Farrington Fields, Farrington Gurney - Cloud Hill Factories, Temple Cloud - Bath Business Park, Peasedown St John <p>(b) sites identified for the purpose in GDS.1 or elsewhere in the plan, and</p> <p>(c) other appropriate sites currently or last used for such purposes, and</p> <p>(d) in villages in accordance with policy ET.4.</p> <p>(2) Planning permission will not be granted for proposals which would</p> <p>(a) result in the loss of land or floorspace for non-office</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>business use within the core employment areas identified on the Proposals Map or (b) run counter to the objectives of policy GDS.1 in cases where such uses are proposed.</p> <p>(3) In all other locations proposals for the loss of land and floorspace for the above uses will be judged against the extent of positive or negative progress being made in achieving a managed reduction in floorspace on the scale sought by policy ET.1(B) and against the following additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) whether the site is capable of continuing to offer adequate accommodation for potential business or other similar employment uses; or (ii) whether continued use of the site for business or other similar employment uses would perpetuate unacceptable environmental or traffic problems; or (iii) whether an alternative use or mix of uses offers community benefit outweighing the economic or employment advantages of retaining the site in business or other similar employment uses. <p>In weighing the above criteria, particular consideration will be given to the need to ensure retention of a sufficient supply of small units of up to 500 sq.m, especially in the urban area of Bath.</p>	
<p>M/B2/ 82 (a-q)</p>	<p>Proposals Map New Policy ET.3</p>	<p><i>Allocate the following Core Employment Site under Policy ET.3 on the Proposals Map and amend the Notation Sheet accordingly:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) & b) Brassmill Lane b) Wessex Water Site, Calverton Down c) Wansdyke Business Centre d) Midford Road, Odd Down e) MoD site at Ensleigh f) Paper Mill/ Broadmead/ Ashmead/ Pixash Industrial. Estate including Keynsham Paper Mill g) Westfield Industrial Estate h) Mill Road, Radstock i) Midsomer Enterprise Park, Radstock Road j) Haydon Industrial Estate, Radstock k) Norton Hill Factories (Coates and Alcan), Midsomer Norton l) Old Mills, Paulton 	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.4</p>

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>m) <i>Hallatrow Business Park</i> n) <i>Farrington Fields, Farrington Gurney</i> o) <i>Cloud Hill Factories, Temple Cloud</i> p) <i>Bath Business Park, Peasedown St John</i></p>	
M/B2/ 83	Para B2.41A	<p>Coomb End</p> <p>In the Coomb End area of Radstock there are particular environmental problems. This part of the town consists of a variety of intermingled uses, but notably manufacturing, residential, retail and other business uses. The area appears rundown and neglected in parts and there are severe highway constraints which cause particular problems for pedestrians and highway safety. These constraints also limit opportunities for new development. In light of the strategic objectives for the area of seeking regeneration and addressing the outcommuting, the Council normally seeks to limit the loss of employment and (Policies ET.1A-D). However, it is acknowledged that the particular problems of this area should be recognised in the Local Plan and therefore a Regeneration Area is designated at Coomb End. The objective of this Policy is to safeguard the employment benefits of the area whilst at the same time providing flexibility to facilitate environmental and infrastructure improvements.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R2.5
M/B2/ 84	Policy ET.3A	<p align="center">POLICY ET.3A</p> <p>Within the Coomb End Regeneration Area defined on the Proposals Map, development of existing businesses uses (defined in Quick Guide 6B) for other uses will be permitted only where it makes a significant contribution to improving the environment and highway safety.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R2.5
M/B2/ 85	Proposals Map Policy ET.3A	Delete 'Coomb End Employment Regeneration Area' from the Proposals Map and Notation Sheet	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R2.5
M/B2/ 86	Para B2.42	<p>In rural areas, the JRSP seeks to encourage economic and social vitality. In line with JRSP Policy 32, there are opportunities for small-scale business and industrial developments in locations well related to villages, especially those settlements which are more accessible by a range of transport modes. These villages are identified in Local Plan Policy SC.1 and fall within categories R1 & R2 of that policy. There is also scope to encourage new small scale purpose built visitor accommodation, such as self-catering, pub accommodation and caravan</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.17

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>and camping facilities. Such development can encourage rural diversification but must be compatible with the scale, character and appearance of its surroundings (Policy ET.4). Any schemes coming forward under this Policy will be subject to a range of other Local Plan policies which seek to ensure sustainability in new development, e.g. policies seeking a high standard of design, that surrounding character and amenity is protected and safe access is achieved. Greater restrictions apply in Green Belt (R3) villages.</p>	
M/B2/ 87	Para B2.77 relocated	<p>Outside Bath, there is therefore scope to encourage new developments in certain sectors, such as self-catering, pub accommodation and good quality caravan and camping facilities. Any scheme coming forward under Policy ET.12 must accord with a range of other policies in the Local Plan such as those which seek to protect local character and amenity, and ensure a high standard of design (e.g. Policies D.2, D.4, NE.1 and NE.12).</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.17
M/B2/ 88	Policy ET.4	<p align="center">POLICY ET.4</p> <p>Development proposals for office, industry or storage uses (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8) and small scale purpose built visitor accommodation will be permitted at rural settlements (i.e. defined in Policy SC.1 as R1, R2 or R3 settlements) provided that such development:</p> <p>a) is appropriate in scale and character to its surroundings; and b) in the case of R1 and R2 villages, lies within or adjoining the settlement; or c) in the case of R3 villages, is infilling in line with Policy GB.1.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R2.6
M/B2/ 89	Para B2.45	<p>...utilised for farming. In 1994 2001 the agriculture workforce was around 2000 1000. The trend has...</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/4) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B2 90	Diagram 4	<p><i>Amend Diagram 4 to show correct totals for Agriculture and fishing employment to show correct 1991 census and extrapolated 1998 figures.</i></p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/5) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B2/ 91	Diagram 5	<p><i>Amend Diagram 5 to show location of Freshford more accurately and statistical data amended to August 2006.</i></p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/6) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report. Statistical data amended to

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
			August 2006.
M/B2/ 92	Table 1A	<p><i>Amend title:</i> "Business Employment Change and Floorspace Requirements (sq. ms.) 2001-2011" <i>Amend text:</i> <i>Under the heading Employee Jobs:- All Office Sectors/Rural delete '1,200' and substitute with '200'.</i></p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/7) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B2/ 93	Policy ET.6	<p align="center">POLICY ET.6</p> <p>Development involving the erection of new, or carrying out of significant extensions or alterations to existing agricultural buildings; or installation of plant or machinery; or construction of access roads will only be permitted where:</p> <p>i) the scale, siting, design and external appearance of the new, altered or extended building or plant or machinery; and the siting and means of construction of any road will have no adverse environmental impact; and</p> <p>ii) there is adequate provision for the storage and disposal of animal waste</p> <p>will have regard to the following:</p> <p>i) any adverse environmental impact (including any conflict with other policies in the plan); and</p> <p>ii) the adequacy of provision for the storage and disposal of animal waste; and</p> <p>iii) where there is harm or conflict with other policies in the plan, the need for, or the benefits to, the enterprise or the rural economy.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R2.7
(M/B2/ 99)	Para B2.54	<i>Para B2.54 to be relocated after para B2.62 (with the last sentence deleted).</i>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.9
M/B2/ 94	Policy ET.7	<p align="center">POLICY ET.7</p> <p>Development on or in the vicinity of agricultural land will not be permitted where;</p> <p>i) it has an adverse effect on the efficient operation of an agricultural enterprise, including irrigation & drainage;</p> <p>ii) it leads to the fragmentation or severance of a farm holding;</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R2.8

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>iii) the proximity of an established livestock unit, silage or slurry facility results in an adverse environmental impact on housing or other non-agricultural buildings; or</p> <p>iv) the re-use or adaptation of existing agricultural buildings for non-agricultural purposes would lead to the proliferation of replacement buildings or to the outside storage of equipment and materials that would be detrimental to visual amenity.</p>	
M/B2/ 95	Para B2.57	Farm diversification schemes can cover a range of new uses: businesses such as food processing and packing, farm shops, equestrian facilities, sporting facilities, nature trails, craft workshops, information technology, holiday accommodation and light industrial uses. Many diversification schemes can make use of farm buildings while others will utilise farmland.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/15) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B2/ 96	New Para B2.58A	In rural areas, reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) means that subsidies will no longer be so closely linked to farm production, and this should lead to more efficient farm businesses as a result. The expansion of the second 'pillar' of the CAP, the Rural Development Regulation, is likely to encourage greater diversification away from agricultural activity, and an increased desire on the part of farmers to diversify their capital assets, for example into workspace.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.10
M/B2/ 97	New Para B2.58B	Planning applications for development related to diversification should support the continuation of a farms operation and be seen within the context of its future business plan. The choice to diversify does not mean that farmers give up their traditional role of food production. Indeed, the aim of diversification is to add value to the existing farm business and to help to retain its viability. Change that has not been properly thought through will be of little long-term benefit to the holding or to the rural economy. It may lead to future environmental problems through neglect, or the eventual establishment of inappropriate alternative businesses in premises which fall vacant if the original diversification scheme fails. Whole farm plans should, therefore be submitted with applications for significant farm diversification proposals in order to help ensure a coherent approach is undertaken,	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.10

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>and to build in some predictability about the future activities of holdings. Farm plans, would not, however, be a requirement in every case, but may be requested before considering an application.</p>	
<p>M/B2/ 98</p>	<p>Policy ET.8</p>	<p>POLICY ET.8 Proposals for farm diversification involving the use of agricultural land or buildings will only be permitted where:</p> <p>i) they retain existing or provide additional or alternative employment; and</p> <p>ii) i) existing buildings are used or replaced in accordance with the criteria in Policy ET.9.</p> <p>ii) the development would not result in a dispersal of activity which prejudices town or village viability</p> <p>Where existing buildings are not available or suitable for re-use or adaptation additional or replacement buildings will only be permitted where they are of a design and scale appropriate to their rural surroundings and, in the case of additional buildings, are located within or well related to an existing group of buildings.</p> <p>Where existing buildings cannot be reused in accordance with Policy ET.9, or replaced in accordance with Policy ET.5, new buildings will be permitted only where required for uses directly related to the use of, or products of, the associated landholding, are small in scale, well designed and grouped with existing buildings.</p>	<p>To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.11</p>
<p>M/B2/ 99</p>	<p>Para B2.54 relocated after para B2.62</p>	<p>Policy ET.9 lays down criteria for assessing proposals to re-use or adapt existing agricultural buildings outside defined settlements for non-agricultural purposes. Because of the relatively dense pattern of farm holdings in the District the erection under permitted development rights of replacement buildings could lead to a proliferation of structures and an erosion of landscape character and quality as a consequence. This is a further factor acknowledged in policy ET.7.</p> <p>Diversification into non-agricultural activities is often vital to the continuing viability of many farm enterprises. Policy ET.9 lays down criteria to be applied to</p>	<p>To accord with Inspector's recommendations R2.9 and R2.13. Former Para B2.54 redrafted to reflect advice in PPS7.</p>

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>planning applications for farm diversification projects. The Council will be supportive of well conceived farm diversification schemes that help to sustain the agricultural enterprise, and are consistent in their scale with their rural location.</p>	
<p>M/B2/100</p>	<p>Policy ET.9</p>	<p align="center">POLICY ET.9</p> <p>Outside the scope of policies HG.4, HG.5 and HG.6, the conversion of a building or buildings to a new use will be permitted unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) its form, bulk and general design are not in keeping with its surroundings and the proposals for conversion do not respect local building styles and materials; respect the style and materials of the existing building; 2) the appearance of the building would be adversely affected 3) the building: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) is of temporary or insubstantial construction; b) is not capable of conversion without substantial or complete reconstruction; c) requires major extension; 4) individually or cumulatively it results in dispersal of activity which prejudices town or village vitality; 5) In the case of a proposed residential conversion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) it would deplete the stock of buildings suitable for conversion to employment related uses and the applicant has not made every reasonable attempt to secure suitable business re-use; b) it is in a position isolated from public services and community facilities and unrelated to an established group of buildings; and <p>5A) The development would result, or be likely to result, in replacement agricultural buildings or the outside storage of plant and machinery which would be harmful to visual amenity;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6) in the case of buildings in the Green Belt, it would have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt or would conflict with the 	<p>To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.12 & R5.27 (deletion of HG.5)</p>

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>purposes of including land within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Where permission is granted for the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt, strict control will be exercised over extensions, alterations and any associated uses of land surrounding the building.</p>	
M/B2/ 101	Para B2.63	<p>Farm Shops</p> <p>Farm shops can provide a useful service and assist in farm diversification. Planning permission for farm shops is not usually needed for farms selling their own produce. Permission is required for the sale of food or goods produced elsewhere or if it has been processed.</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.14
M/B2/ 102	Para B2.64	<p>In many cases, the provision of farm shops can provide an alternative form of local shopping as well as supporting the rural economy. However they might also have an adverse impact on the viability of existing village shops. There are also issues related to their accessibility and impact on the environment and other policies in the Plan apply. Conditions may be imposed or legal agreement sought to limit the range and source of goods to be sold.</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.14
M/B2/ 103	Policy ET.10	<p align="center">POLICY ET.10</p> <p>A retailing operation on an agricultural or horticultural unit requiring planning permission will be permitted unless:</p> <p>i) it is not related to an existing group of agricultural buildings; and</p> <p>ii) there is an adverse impact on the viability of existing shops in R.1, R.2 & R.3 settlements defined under Policy SC.1.</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.14
M/B2/ 104	Para B2.65	<p>TOURISM/VISITOR ATTRACTIONS</p> <p>Tourist Attractions</p> <p>Tourism makes a major contribution to the economy of Bath & North East Somerset and its continuing growth generates a range of job opportunities. In recent years there have been around 1 million staying visitors and around 2.8 million day visitors to the area each year, who contribute over £195 million annually to the local economy. There are around 6,500 jobs in the tourism sectors.</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 105	Para B2.66	Bath especially, with its historic and architectural heritage as recognised by its World Heritage Site Status, has a vibrant tourist economy. The revival of the Spa in Bath will provide a unique opportunity to develop sustainable, year-round tourism. The high quality landscapes of the district are recognised in its two Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) designations, the country pubs, and the network of long distance footpaths also provide a tourist draw.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 106	Para B2.67	Tourism, nationally and internationally, is likely to grow, as is the competition from other traditional and emerging tourism destinations. The opening of the Bath Spa offers a unique opportunity and the potential for other 'health tourism' and associated development in the vicinity of the site. In addition, it is important to be alert to new opportunities to maintain Bath's position as a premier destination and to foster tourism in other parts of the District.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 107	Para B2.68	Norton-Radstock, as the centre of the former Somerset coalfield and its railway system has a unique heritage, which is displayed and interpreted at the Radstock Museum in the restored Market Hall. The redevelopment proposals in central Radstock have the potential to foster tourism growth and to support developments such as the Sustrans cycle trail and an Arts & Crafts Centre. The Tourism Development Plan for Norton-Radstock highlights the opportunities of developing a series of walking trails, which begin and finish in Norton-Radstock and link with established trails, such as the Limestone Link. (see Policy SR.9).	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 108	Para B2.69	Successful tourism depends on a high quality environment, which can act as a positive force for environmental protection and enhancement. It is therefore essential that a balance is maintained between realising the benefits of tourism and conserving the environment and amenity of residents.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 109	Para B2.70	A draft Tourism Strategy for Bath & North East Somerset has been completed for 2001-2006. The 'Vision' and Primary Aims for tourism are set out in Quick Guide 7. The Council has also prepared a Local Cultural Strategy which seeks to promote and achieve cultural development within the District. The Strategy's definition of culture includes a range of tourist attractions such as sport and leisure, the built heritage, museums, arts and entertainment, and the 'public realm' including	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		parks and open spaces.	
M/B2/ 110	Para B2.71	The Council, in partnership with the Economic Forum, is investigating the viability of a purpose built Conference Centre in Bath. If viable, such a Centre would strengthen Bath's position as a conference destination, encourage high value, year-round business tourism and lessen the dependence of the area as a 'leisure destination'.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 111	Para B2.72	<p>Other critical factors and opportunities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing Bath and North East Somerset's position as a centre for arts and culture, including the enhancement of the Theatre Royal, the Guildhall area and the provision of workshop/display space for local arts and craftspeople. • Maintaining and developing Bath's position as a centre of sporting excellence. • Sensitive use and promotion of the River Avon, the Kennet & Avon Canal and the Chew Valley, and allowing for ecotourism where it is done in a sustainable way and meets with the Local Plan's locational strategy. • Developing the existing network of walking and cycling routes, including an expansion of the heritage trail in Radstock. • Coach management plan, including investigation of coach drop-off points and the possible relocation of the Coach Park in Bath. • Safeguarding land for a museum in Keynsham. 	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 112	Quick Guide 7	<p align="center">Quick Guide 7 Bath & North East Somerset Tourism Strategy</p> <p>The Vision for Tourism in Bath & North East Somerset is of a competitive destination that is focussed on delivering quality experiences relevant to carefully targeted markets, taking full advantage of its historic, cultural and natural assets and using them in a sustainable way.</p> <p>The primary aims of the Strategy are to increase the economic and social benefit of tourism to the area by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing attractions that will be profitable for all market sectors. • Achieving high levels of occupancy all-year-round. • Developing Bath's tourist attractions whilst 	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>maintaining a high quality environment for residents and visitors alike.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of tourism in North East Somerset. • Ensuring that tourism employment is secured locally, through relevant, high quality training. 	
M/B2/ 113	Para B2.73	Schemes for the development of tourist facilities in urban areas will be acceptable provided they meet the requirements of Policy ET.11 and other Local Plan policies. In rural areas, such development will need to be balanced with the objective of conserving rural character.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 114	Policy ET.11	<p align="center">POLICY ET.11</p> <p>The expansion of an existing or the development of a new tourist facility will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>i)it is within the urban areas of Bath, Keynsham and Norton Radstock; or</p> <p>ii) in the rural areas, it does not have an adverse impact on rural character</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/B2/ 115	Para B2.74	Bath is served by a wide range of visitor accommodation types, including good quality hotels, guesthouses, hostels and self-catering properties. Recent hotel developments have assisted the restoration of historic buildings (e.g. the Royal York Hotel) and the regeneration of redundant land (e.g. the hotel development at Brougham Hayes/Lower Bristol Road).	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.17
M/B2/ 116	Para B2.75	With the advent of the Spa, growth in demand for tourist accommodation in Bath is projected to be at 2.5% a year. Based on this rate, Bath could accommodate additional hotel space without a detrimental effect on the existing accommodation supply. In the knowledge that Bath is already well supplied with smaller and medium size accommodation establishments, the 'need' in Bath is primarily for larger hotels. A hotel with major conference facilities or a dedicated 'spa' hotel would in particular make a positive contribution to the local tourism infrastructure and generate new business.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.17
M/B2/ 117	Para B2.76	<i>Para B2.76 to be relocated before Policy ET.4</i>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.17 (no change to text)
(M/B2/ 87)	Para B2.77	<i>Para B2.77 to be relocated before Policy ET.4</i>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.17

CHAPTER B2 – ECONOMY, TOURISM & AGRICULTURE

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B2/ 118	Policy ET.12	<p align="center">POLICY ET.12</p> <p>Development of new purpose-built visitor accommodation will be permitted where within or adjoining the urban areas of Bath, Keynsham or and Norton Radstock. Outside these urban areas, permission will only be granted for new small-scale purpose-built visitor accommodation provided that it is within or adjoining R1 and R2 settlements, or within R3 villages, as defined in Policy SC.1.</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R2.16.

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B3/1	Para B3.5	<p>COMMUNITY FACILITIES IN BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL</p> <p>Community services include a wide range of facilities crucial for the well being of the residents of Bath and North East Somerset. Provision includes community meeting places, youth centres, education facilities at schools and colleges, health care provided at hospitals, clinics and surgeries, libraries, places of worship, venues for community arts, and services delivered by post offices and some shops. They also include allotments and cemeteries, together with sports and recreation facilities (dealt with in the Sports and Recreation Chapter – B4). Community services are provided by a range of public, private and voluntary organisations.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.1
M/B3/2	Para B3.6	<p>Based on the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Region's (DETR) Indices of Local Deprivation (2000), there are a number of areas within Bath and North East Somerset that are significantly more socially and economically disadvantaged than others. These most disadvantaged areas include Twerton, Southdown and London Road area in Bath, Radstock and parts of Keynsham. Whilst there are a number of Council initiatives involved in tackling deprivation, the provision and retention of services and facilities through the Local Plan process are especially important in helping achieve balanced communities and can be a means of addressing social exclusion.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.1
M/B3/3	Para B3.7	<p>The Local Plan, therefore, has an important role to play in safeguarding existing facilities, allocating land for new facilities and services including the provision of facilities needed to serve new development. It can also play a significant part in ensuring sites for community facilities are in the most accessible locations.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.1
M/B3/4	Para B3.8	<p>Education and Health Services</p> <p>The retention and provision of education and health services are fundamental to maintaining a high quality of life and in combating social exclusion. These aspects of community provision are covered in more detail later in this chapter.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.1
M/B3/5	Para B3.9	<p>Social Services</p> <p>The Council's Social Services function is based at offices in Bath, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton. The service is responsible for a number of specialist areas including safeguarding and promoting the welfare of</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.1

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>disabled and vulnerable adults, children and the elderly through a range of provision including community and day care, residential homes, family support, home and nursing care. Paras B3.72 B3.73 and Policy CF.6 deal more specifically with Community Care provision.</p>	
M/B3/6	Para B3.10	<p>Emergency Services Bath and North East Somerset is served by the Avon and Somerset Police Authority with police stations located in Bath, Keynsham and Radstock. The Magistrates Courts in the District are located in Bath. Ambulance and Fire Services are also concentrated in the City and towns as well as Paulton and Chew Magna. No changes in the pattern of service are anticipated within the Plan period.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.1
M/B3/7	New Para B3.11A	<p>Community facilities include a wide range of facilities crucial for the well being of the residents of Bath and North East Somerset. Provision includes community meeting places, youth centres, education facilities at schools and colleges, health care provided at hospitals, clinics and surgeries, libraries, places of worship and venues for community arts.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.4
M/B3/8	Para B3.12	<p>When considering planning applications involving the loss or change of use of buildings in community use, it is crucial to ascertain whether an alternative community use can be found for the land or building(s) concerned. Policy CF.1 seeks to prevent the loss of valuable community facilities.</p> <p>The Local Plan and its application in development control decisions can play only a limited role in ensuring the retention of needed community facilities and the services they provide. Whilst the plan can seek to prevent the loss of existing sites and premises from community use, it cannot ensure that any particular facility continues to be made available to the public or any particular service continues to be provided. The proposed loss of community facilities used for public services may be part of wider proposals to improve the provision of services. Health and Education Authorities have their own procedures for planning changes in the provision of facilities and consulting the public, often on a wider basis than any one local community. In the public interest, it is important to take into account changes that might have an overall, wider benefit.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.2

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>The policy thus sets out a variety of circumstances where the loss of a community facility would be acceptable.</p>	
M/B3/9	Policy CF.1	<p align="center">POLICY CF.1</p> <p>Development involving the loss or change of use of land or buildings presently used or last used for community purposes will only be permitted where:</p> <p>(i) it would not seriously affect the availability of community facilities in the locality; or and</p> <p>(ii) no suitable alternative community uses can be found for the land or buildings in question; or</p> <p>(iii) the proposal would result in the provision of alternative facilities of equivalent community benefit.</p> <p>Development involving the loss of a site used, or last used, for community purposes will be permitted only where:</p> <p>i) there is adequate existing local provision of community facilities; or</p> <p>ii) there is a local need for additional community facilities, but the site is unsuitable to serve that need or there is no realistic prospect of it being used for that local need; or</p> <p>iii) alternative facilities of equivalent community benefit will be provided; or</p> <p>iv) the proposed loss is an integral part of changes by a public service provider which will improve the overall quality or accessibility of public services in the District.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.5
M/B3/10	Policy CF.3	<p align="center">POLICY CF.3</p> <p>Where local provision for community, educational and/or health care purposes is inadequate to serve the projected needs arising from occupants of new development proposals, the Council will negotiate with developers to secure provision related in scale and kind to meet these needs. This may take the form of on-site provision or contributions to the provision of additional or enhancement of existing facilities.</p> <p>Where existing community facilities are inadequate to meet the needs of future residents of new development, planning permission will be refused unless additional provision, related in scale and in</p>	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.6

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		kind to the proposed development, to meet those needs is, or will be, made.	
M/B3/ 11	Para B3.20	Bath is fortunate in having a variety of community meeting places available to serve the needs of different geographical areas of the City and immediate surrounding areas. Accommodation ranges from small church rooms, community halls and the use of some schools to the larger more central venues such as the Pavilion and the Forum that serve a much wider area as well as the residents of Bath. The local authority Youth Centres also contribute to the provision of meeting places in Bath (see paras B3.29-B3.32).	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 12	Para B3.21	Meeting places in Keynsham are mainly located in and around the town centre. Venues include the Council's Riverside Suite, the Fear Institute, the Key Centre, St John's Parish Hall as well as other smaller buildings. In addition Keynsham's two secondary schools provide facilities for community activities. A proposed development at Charlton Road/ St John's Court for a food store (see Policies S.3 and GDS.1) includes provision of a new community facility. If approved and implemented, this community facility will further improve provision for Keynsham residents.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 13	Para B3.22	Norton Radstock is served by a number of community meeting places including the Town Hall, church halls of St John the Baptist and Central Methodist Church in Midsomer Norton and the Victoria Hall, Methodist Hall and the Youth Centre in Radstock. Facilities provided by the area's three secondary schools are also regularly utilised. Provision has been improved with the opening of the Somer Centre on land adjoining the South Wansdyke Sports Centre.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 14	Para B3.23	For the Westfield area, land continues to be safeguarded under Policy CF.4 for community use on land previously used for a doctor's surgery. It is envisaged that a permanent building will be erected during the Plan period to offer alternative community provision.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 15	Para B3.24	Welton has seen an increase in house building in recent years and, with limited facilities in this area, a need could arise for a new community meeting place to meet current deficiencies. Similarly, although a new community hall has been built for those in the Tynning/Springfield area, Clandown is still lacking in a community meeting place of its	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		own.	
M/B3/ 16	Para B3.25	The majority of villages within the District have some form of meeting place for community activities. These can range from village halls to the more informal village pub (see Policy CF.7). Timsbury and Saltford have good meeting facilities. A new community hall has been provided at Peasedown St John in association with the major housing development that has greatly expanded the village. Peasedown St John also has a local authority Youth Centre. Bishop Sutton, Temple Cloud and Farrington Gurney all have new halls to replace their previously sub-standard facilities. The extension to the village hall at Paulton has helped to improve that community's facilities.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 17	Para B3.26	For its size, Chew Magna has relatively small community facilities: The Old School Room is its principal venue. Batheaston has no village hall as such but can make use of church halls and the new replacement Scout Hut. Bathford has a small but well used Parish Hall.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 18	Para B3.27	The former Oriel Hall, Upper Swainswick that was demolished when the Batheaston Bypass was built. Permission was granted in 2001 for a replacement hall in the Larkhall area of Bath.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 19	Para B3.28	Of the larger villages, High Littleton has no community hall but use is made of the hall attached to the Methodist Church. Provision of another community meeting place in this area could also serve the needs of Hallatrow.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 20	Para B3.29	In terms of Youth Provision the Council's Youth and Community Service seeks to work with young people between the ages of 11 and 25 with the 13-19 age range as a priority. It is primarily concerned with their personal and social development through various programmes and projects in a range of venues including Youth Centres, community halls and village halls as well as in their own environment e.g. parks, pubs and cafes where the building is not the focal point.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 21	Para B3.30	In Bath youth provision is accommodated at the Riverside, Odd Down, Southside and Centre 69 Youth Clubs. Keynsham's youth activities take place in Broadlands School sports hall. The Radstock Youth Centre serves the Norton Radstock area.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B3/ 22	Para B3.31	In terms of the villages there is a full time Youth Centre at Peasedown St John and a range of part time youth clubs across the District run by the Council some of which have their own buildings. Other youth provision in the District relies on voluntarily organisations and specialist activity clubs.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 23	Para B3.32	The Council's Community Safety Action Plan includes a proposal to support the development of youth shelters and associated facilities as one means of reducing nuisance and disorder. The grounds of the Youth Centre at Peasedown St John has been identified as a suitable location for a skateboard facility. A youth shelter has now been installed.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 24	Para B3.33	The Community Bus serving Bath and North Somerset is a mobile facility, mainly Council funded, working throughout the District especially in areas lacking in community provision and in communities that are socially or geographically isolated.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3 25	Para B3.34	The Council will continue to monitor the provision of all types of community meeting places and respond positively where there is an acknowledged shortfall, where possible identifying suitable sites. The availability of bus services will be an important aspect of the monitoring process. Planning permission for new, extensions to or replacement community facilities will be determined against the criteria set out in Policy CF.2.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 26	Para B3.35	COMMUNITY ARTS PROVISION Bath & North East Somerset has a range of venues for community arts provision largely based in Bath. The 850 seat historic Theatre Royal in central Bath and two large scale venues, the Forum and the Pavilion are used for performing arts. There are also three small scale (200 seats or less) performing arts venues (Ustinov, Windows, Rondo) in Bath.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 27	Para B3.36	A variety of non-arts spaces in Bath are used for concerts including the Guildhall and Assembly Rooms to secondary schools, parks and community centres. However there is no large scale concert venue in the District to accommodate, for example, a full symphony orchestra.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 28	Para B3.37	There are currently six commercial cinema screens. Planning permission has also been granted for a multiplex cinema in central Bath. Currently there is no cinema provision outside	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		central Bath. Applications for commercial leisure development will be considered within the context of Policy SR.7.	
M/B3/ 29	Para B3.38	The two professional public galleries in Bath – Victoria Art Gallery and Hot Bath Gallery – are complemented by six smaller commercial galleries.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 30	Para B3.39	Schools and community halls throughout the District are used sporadically for amateur and occasionally professional performances.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3 31	Para B3.40	Although some aspects of arts provision appear well catered for, there is still a need to provide venues for arts events and activities especially outside Bath. There is an overall shortage of affordable studio provision and exhibition space for local artists. There is also a need for large studio spaces that can be used for educational and community arts uses.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 32	Para B3.41	Similarly there is no middle-scale venue (350-650 seats) for the contemporary performing arts, especially dance, and a lack of a centre for Cultural Cinema. Appropriate multi-professional arts facilities in Norton Radstock and Keynsham are limited. However, investigations are taking place into the provision of community arts facilities in Radstock.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 33	Para B3.42	These shortfalls in provision as outlined above are identified in the Council's Arts Strategy which encourages their development and provision. Development proposals for new and replacement arts facilities or enhancement of existing facilities will be considered in the context of Policy CF.2 above or Policy SR.7 if the proposal relates to commercial leisure development.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 34	Para B3.43	PLACES OF WORSHIP Places of Worship provide an important focal point for the local community and a base for a range of other local activities. Although a number of churches and chapels have closed for worship in recent decades, some denominations have experienced an upsurge in congregation sizes leading to alternative venues being sought to better meet their requirements. The Council will support such provision providing it is sensitively located so as not to be detrimental to residential amenity and should meet the other criteria in Policy CF.2 and other relevant policies in the Plan.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B3/ 35	Para B3.44	LIBRARIES The Council's Library service is responsible for managing eight permanent libraries in the District. Three of these are in Bath, namely the Central Library at the Podium, Moorland Road and Weston Village. The others are located in Keynsham, Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Saltford and Paulton. This is supplemented by a regular mobile library service that is particularly important for rural areas.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 36	Para B3.45	A Library Vision has been agreed by the Executive Member (March 2003) which aims to improve and extend library facilities throughout the authority, and build on the Department for Culture Media and Sport's plans for Libraries as outlined in their document "Framework for the Future". Our Vision is to ensure a balanced provision of services in line with local population size and need, particularly supporting areas with an identified and unmet need. Therefore future developments with an impact on demographics will have to be taken into account. Libraries will work in partnership wherever possible to deliver services, and are looking for co-location opportunities in all areas.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 37	Para B3.46	Any proposals to relocate or replace a library or for any other improvements to existing provision will be supported. Planning applications will be considered within the context of Policies CF.1 and CF.2, as appropriate.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.7
M/B3/ 38	Para B3.54	The University of Bath is a purpose built development located on the outskirts of the City. It currently has 7,930 students. Its Campus is also home to the English Institute of Sport (S.W.). Current and future plans for the University include the development of conference facilities, extended academic facilities and further student residences. A Master Plan and Transport Strategy for the site as well as an assessment of the site's environmental capacity was endorsed by the Council in March 2001 university-related non-residential development for uses including learning, research and allied business incubation and knowledge transfer, conferences, university administration and IT and sports, health, creative arts, social, recreational and catering purposes and additional student residential accommodation.	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R3.8 and R9.4

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B3/39	Para B3.54A	<p>Future development as outlined in the Master Plan endorsed by the Council in 2001 will not meet the University's expansion requirements for the whole Local Plan period. Therefore, in order to enable its expansion, the Green Belt boundary is proposed to be changed and land is allocated on the eastern side of the campus for University related uses under Policy GDS.1. Therefore Policy GDS.1/B11 allows for further development on the campus including some development on land now to be excluded from the Green Belt. The Council will require that a revised Masterplan is prepared and agreed by the Council, setting out a long term development and transportation strategy for the whole campus. This will help to facilitate the future expansion of the University, including development of the site allocated under Policy GDS.1.</p>	To accord with Inspector's recommendation R3.8 and R9.4 incorporating Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/23) which has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B3/40	Para B3.55	<p>Bath Spa University College is based in the grounds of the historic Newton Park at Newton St Loe and has a further campus at Sion Hill/Somerset Place in Bath. The College has around 4,000 students and provides a range of full and part time pre-degree study, undergraduate and postgraduate courses. Although within the Green Belt, the College is identified as a Major Developed Site under Policy GB.3 which will allow opportunities for the improvement of facilities under the terms of the policy. The University College is currently undertaking the preparation of a Masterplan which will set out future needs for academic and student accommodation.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/24) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B3/41	Policy CF.5	<p align="center">POLICY CF.5</p> <p>The following land is allocated for primary educational purposes:</p> <p>Bath</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oldfield Park Junior, Claude Avenue: Reservation of 0.53 ha. to allow for extension. 2. St John's RC Primary, Oldfield Lane (0.74 ha.) and Lymore Avenue Playing Field (1.84 ha.): Total reservation of 2.58 ha. to allow for replacement school. 3. St Andrew's CE Primary, Northampton Buildings: Reservation of 0.46 ha. to allow for extension. 4. St Saviour's Primary, Larkhall: Reservation of 0.1 ha. to allow for extension. <p>Norton-Radstock</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.9

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>5. Welton Primary: Reservation of 1.1 ha. to allow for extension.</p> <p>6. St. Mary's Primary, Writhlington: Reservation of 1.0 ha. to allow for provision of playing field.</p> <p>6a Woodborough Lane: Reservation of 1.76 ha site to allow for development of new Primary School.</p> <p>Villages</p> <p>7. Camerton Primary: Reservation of 0.6 ha. to allow for extension.</p> <p>8. Clutton Primary: Reservation of 0.6 ha. to allow for extension.</p> <p>9. East Harptree Primary: Reservation of 0.25 ha. to allow for provision of playing field.</p> <p>10. Farrington Gurney Primary: Reservation of 0.6 ha. to allow for long-term replacement.</p> <p>11. Freshford Primary: Reservation of 0.3 ha. next to existing school for provision of a playing field.</p> <p>12. High Littleton Primary: Reservation of 0.1 ha. to allow for provision of playing field.</p> <p>13. Marksbury Primary: Reservation of 0.8 ha. to allow for site extension.</p> <p>14. Pensford Primary: Reservation of 0.6 ha. to allow for site extension – flooding constraints to be investigated.</p> <p>15. Shoscombe Primary: Reservation of 0.4 ha. to allow for extension.</p> <p>16. Stanton Drew: Reservation of 0.4 ha. for new school of 80 places.</p>	
M/B3/ 42	Proposals Map Policy CF.5	<i>Delete St Johns RC Primary School allocation from Lymore Avenue Playing Fields, Bath from the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.9
M/B3/ 43	Proposals Map Policy CF.5	<i>Delete Pensford Primary School allocation from the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.9
M/B3/ 44	Para B3.63	<p>HEALTH FACILITIES</p> <p>Health provision in the District is the principally the responsibility of the Bath and North East Somerset Primary Care Trust (PCT). The PCT is a statutory body responsible for planning and providing local primary care health services and many of the community services in B&NES Bath & North East Somerset. Bath & North East Somerset. The PCT operates in partnership with the Council and other Trusts in the area, including the Royal United Hospital Bath NHS Trust, Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust and the Royal National Hospital for</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		Rheumatic Diseases NHS Trust. There are also numerous other charitable, voluntary and private health care organisations that provide health care in the District	
M/B3/ 45	Para B3.64	Hospitals The Royal United Hospital (RUH) in Bath serves a catchment area of 500,000 population. Services at the RUH are provided by the RUH Bath NHS Trust. This acute general hospital has an accident and emergency department and 14 surgical theatres. Hospital staff provide out-patient services in eleven community hospitals including Paulton.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11
M/B3/ 46	Para B3.65	The RUH is undergoing extensive refurbishment and redevelopment. The aim is to significantly improve its facilities to meet the demands of modern health care	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11
M/B3/ 47	Para B3.66	The Royal National Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases NHS Trust is situated in the centre of Bath and provides specialist care services for rheumatology and neuro-rehabilitation.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11
M/B3/ 48	Para B3.67	St Martins Hospital provides physical and mental care for the elderly. During the Plan period the hospital intends to transfer some of its services to the Royal United Hospital, consolidating the remaining on part of the existing site. Part of the site is thus allocated for a mixed-use development under Policy GDS.1.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11
M/B3/ 49	Para B3.68	Keynsham Hospital provides services for the young disabled and elderly as well as outpatient physiotherapy and day hospital facilities. It is expected to continue to provide health care during the Plan period.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11
M/B3/ 50	Para B3.69	Paulton Community Hospital provides an accident and emergency department as well as a range of other services. Since 1997 services have been consolidated on one site following a rationalisation and modernisation programme. It will continue to serve as a community hospital.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11
M/B3/ 51	Para B3.70	Other Health Facilities Bath has a comprehensive range of health care services to cater for its inhabitants and beyond. There are four NHS dental clinics in Norton Radstock and is a health clinic in Keynsham. Both towns also have group practice doctor's surgeries. The rural areas are served by practices in a number of the larger settlements or travel to Bath and the	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		towns. Chemists and dentists are available in the towns and larger villages whilst opticians are represented primarily in Bath, Keynsham and Norton Radstock.	
M/B3/ 52	Para B3.71	As with other community facilities health care facilities are an important local resource and their loss should be resisted unless there is no longer a demonstrable need for the particular facility or service (Policy CF.1). The increase in residential development may put pressure on existing resources and result in the need for additional facilities. With Social Services working more closely with the Health Authority there may be opportunities for the joint use of buildings and sites. Proposals for new health care facilities will be considered under Policy CF.2.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.11
M/B3/ 53	B3.73A (previously B3.72 in Deposit Draft Plan) (page 77)	<i>Replace text omitted in error from Revised Deposit Draft Plan:</i> New residential care homes or day care facilities that are likely to be required during the Plan period will be considered against the criteria in Policy CF.5 CF.6 and other relevant policies in the Plan. Other community care facilities will be considered under Policy CF.4 CF.2.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/25) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B3/ 54	Para B3.75	In a changing economic climate many pubs may be also able to provide additional community facilities or services such as a cash back facility, and public information and Information Technology (IT) access. The Council is able to exercise some control to ensure a public house is not lost to another use(s), especially if it is the only one in the settlement or locality. Proposals for their redevelopment or change of use will be considered against Policy CF.7. The following factors will be taken into account to assess whether a public house provides a valuable community facility: its size, layout, and facilities and thus its actual or potential for providing a useful and attractive place for local people to meet; its location and accessibility to the local community; the availability of other community facilities in the village or locality, including any other public houses and their suitability for serving the community. There is no benefit in a public house being protected from redevelopment if there is no realistic prospect of a public house being successfully and attractively operated from the premises. The policy thus allows for viability to be taken into account.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R3.12

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Unsuccessful marketing will be one consideration in assessing viability. When this criterion applies, applicants will be expected to demonstrate that the marketing was undertaken in accordance with expert advice and effectively targeted at potential operators.</p>	
<p>M/B3/ 55</p>	<p>Policy CF.7</p>	<p align="center">POLICY CF.7</p> <p>Development which results in the loss of a public house, especially where it is the only one in the village or locality, and any ancillary building with a potential community use, will only be permitted where:</p> <p>(i) the business is genuinely non-viable and every reasonable attempt to market the premises as a public house has been made; and either</p> <p>ii) development would result in the provision of alternative facilities of equivalent or greater community benefit; or</p> <p>(iii) it would not seriously affect the availability of community facilities in the locality.</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for the redevelopment or change of use of a public house which would result in the loss of premises which provide, or could provide, a needed community facility in that locality, unless:</p> <p>i) the operation of a public house serving the local community is not viable and the premises have been effectively marketed as a public house without success; or</p> <p>ii) the development or change of use would result in the provision of alternative facilities of equivalent or greater benefit to the local community.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R3.13</p>
<p>M/B3/ 56</p>	<p>Para B3.77</p>	<p>There have been concerns in the past over the loss of allotment land throughout the District to other uses and development. The Council's Green Space Strategy referred to in Chapter B4: Sport and Recreation identifies existing allotments provision in the District and includes local standards for future provision. The current level of provision in Bath is 2.22 sq.m. per person, in Keynsham 1.13 sq.m. per person and in Norton Radstock 0.55 sq.m. per person. Research underpinning the Green Space Strategy clearly demonstrates that over</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R3.14</p>

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the last 5 years there has been a large increase in demand for allotments with nearly every site across the District now full with a waiting list. The local standards will be reviewed regularly to ensure that provision is progressing towards meeting demand. Although the trend for allotment gardening generally appears stable with supply meeting demand, any gradual Any erosion of this valuable resource should be resisted, as once lost, this land is unlikely to be replaced.</p>	
M/B3/ 57	Para B3.79	<p>Policy CF.8 sets out the Council's approach to the retention of allotments and encourages the provision of new allotment sites should demand increase to meet increasing demand during the Plan period unless otherwise allowed in the Plan. Development involving the loss of an existing or vacant allotment will only be permitted where its importance outweighs the community value of the site as an allotment. Developers will also be required to provide equivalent replacement allotments on land that is suitable for horticultural use. New and replacement allotments should be in accessible locations (i.e. within 1000 metres of the majority of their potential users).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R3.14
M/B3/ 58	Policy CF.8	<p align="center">POLICY CF.8</p> <p>Development on or affecting land in allotment use or, if vacant, last used for allotments including those shown on the Proposals Map will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>(i) the importance of the development outweighs the community value of the site as an allotment and suitable, equivalent, alternative provision is made; or (ii) the site is proposed for another use in the Local Plan.</p> <p>New or replacement allotments will be permitted provided they are in accessible locations.</p> <p>Development resulting in the loss of land used for allotments will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>(i) the importance of the development outweighs the community value of the site as allotments and suitable, equivalent and accessible alternative provision is made; or</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R3.15

CHAPTER B3 – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>(ii) the site is allocated for another use in the Local Plan and suitable, equivalent and accessible alternative provision is made.</p> <p>Development resulting in the loss of vacant land last used for allotments will not be permitted unless the existing and foreseeable local demand for allotments can be met by existing suitable and accessible sites.</p> <p>New allotments will be permitted provided that they are accessible to the area they are intended to serve and suitable for productive use.</p>	
M/B3/ 59	Proposals Map Policy CF.8 Lansdown View Allotments	<i>Reinstate allotment designation at Lansdown View (Allotments north of King George's Road) on the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendations R5.18 & R8.3 (reflects PIC/B/27)
M/B3/ 60	Proposals Map Policy CF.8 R/O 46-64 Bloomfield Drive	<i>Allocate land R/O 46-64 Bloomfield Drive as allotments under Policy CF.8 on the Proposals Map</i>	Proposed Modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R7.17

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B4/1	Para. B4.1	Sport and recreation play an important role in helping ensure a healthy lifestyle and improving the quality of life as well as having a valuable social and economic role. Providing opportunities for a wide range of leisure activities for everyone, including equality of access, in locations best placed to serve the community is therefore of key importance.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.17
M/B4/2	Para B4.2	The demand for sport, recreation and leisure grew steadily throughout the 1980s and 1990s and this trend is likely to continue. Principal areas of growth include the participation of women, the middle-aged and elderly and non-professional workers. Although membership of clubs for formal sports remains low there is a considerable growth in the participation in informal recreation. This is reflected in Bath and North East Somerset where walking in the countryside and swimming are the most popular activities.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.17
M/B4/3	Para B4.4	Sport England's planning policy statement, 'Planning Policies for Sport' (1999) is intended to promote a wide understanding of the land use requirements of sport and to assist local planning authorities in the preparation of development plan policies and the development control process.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.17
M/B4/4	Para B4.5	The National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) 'The Six Acre Standard' has been applied by a range of local authorities throughout the country. PPG17 'Sport and Recreation' says that councils should formulate local standards. , and the Council has carried out its own Playing Pitch Assessment to develop a local standard for playing fields. The Council has prepared and is proceeding towards adoption of a Green Space Strategy based on a comprehensive assessment and audit of recreation space, including allotments but not land used exclusively for outdoor sport. The assessment and audit were carried out in line with PPG 17 and its Companion Guide. A Playing Pitch Assessment has also been carried out towards developing local standards for these facilities to be included in a Council Sports Facilities Strategy which will cover indoor and outdoor provision. However until studies on other forms of recreation are complete Green Space Strategy is adopted the NPFA standard should be adopted used in the plan as a basis for calculating the requirements for other forms of outdoor sport	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.18

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		provision and children's play space.	
M/B4/5	Para B4.6	Advice on countryside recreation is provided through a range of documents produced by the Countryside Agency and Sport England.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.17
M/B4/6	Para B4.8	The Council's Sport and Recreation Strategy (1999) provides a framework for the provision and development of sporting and recreational opportunities over a five year period through its Action Plans to be achieved through partnership with the private and voluntary sectors (Quick Guide 8).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.17
M/B4/7	Quick Guide 8	<p align="center">Quick Guide 8 Sports and Recreation Strategy 1999</p> <p>The Council plays a crucial role in increasing the quality of life of the community by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating life enhancing skills and opportunities. • Improving both physical and mental health and promoting the concept of preventative care. • Promoting active citizenship and empowering communities to act for themselves within the framework of local democracy. • Providing the opportunity for personal self-development which is a lifelong process. • Generating civic and local pride • — 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.17
M/B4/8	Para B4.9	Government guidance in PPG 17 advises local authorities to resist the loss of open space, sports and recreational facilities unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown it to be surplus to requirements. Surplus to requirements should include consideration of all the functions that open space can perform. Sports facilities not only have recreation and amenity value but also make a vital contribution to the conservation of the natural and built heritage of the area. Many are also safeguarded under policy BH.15 as visually important open space.	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R11.19.
M/B4/9	New Para B4.12C	The types of green space not used exclusively for playing fields and covered by the Council's Green Space Strategy include parks and gardens, soft surface open spaces for less formal activities, recreation grounds, natural areas (e.g. woodland, natural and semi-natural areas), allotments and spaces designed for children and young people.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendations R3.18 and R3.28

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B4/ 10	New Para B4.12D	The Strategy identifies where the supply or quality is deficient, so that resources and funding bids can be concentrated into those areas. This will assist in protecting existing green space from development, and ensure that where development does take place, an appropriate level of green space is provided. Often this will involve improving existing facilities rather than simply providing new ones.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.18
M/B4/ 11	New Para B4.12E	A key part of the Green Space Strategy is the establishment of a set of standards for green space provision that will be applied across Bath & North East Somerset. Local standards are set out in guidance that the Council proposes adopting as part of a Supplementary Planning Document. Background data providing the justification for the standards is contained in the Green Space Strategy. The provision standards define the quantity, distribution and quality required for a range green space types. Also, the Strategy provides a management framework to enable the owners of all publicly accessible green space to manage their spaces to the full benefit of the community.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.18
M/B4/ 12	Para B4.13	Thus, Policy SR.1A seeks to protect formal recreational open space land throughout the District, including that not currently available for public use such as some school playing fields. There may, however, be circumstances where the development of existing land of recreational value can be justified, but in such cases the existing facility will have to be suitably enhanced or appropriate alternative provision found elsewhere to recompense the loss. However, before accepting the loss of an existing formal recreational site to built up development, the Council will consider other recreational uses appropriate to these sites such as community open space, allotments etc. <i>(Para B4.13 to be relocated after Para B4.13A)</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.19
M/B4/ 13	Para B4.13A (relocated)	Informal recreation and leisure comprises a range of pursuits including walking, playing, cycling and other activities that are not formally organised. Facilities available for such activity range from parks and amenity open spaces including common land, to equipped play areas. As with sports grounds, these open spaces are often as important for their amenity value as for their recreational value and contribute to the enhancement of	Proposed modification to Para B4.13A arising from Inspector's Recommendation R3.23 and R11.19

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the environments in which they are located, making them attractive places to be in or pass through. Many of these areas are safeguarded under Policy BH.15 as Visually Important Open Spaces. Policy SR.1B aims to ensure that this valuable recreational resource is safeguarded.</p> <p><i>(Para B4.13A to be relocated to before Policy SR.1A)</i></p>	
M/B4/14	Policy SR.1A	<p>POLICY SR.1A</p> <p>Development involving the loss of all or any part of playing fields or other formal recreational open space land, including those shown on the Proposals Map, or land last used for such purposes will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) there is no longer a demand or prospect of demand evidence of future need for the recreational use of the site and a deficiency would not be created in the short or long term by the development; or ii) the proposed development only affects land which is incapable of being used for recreation; or iii) suitable replacement facilities of at least equivalent quality, quantity and community benefit are provided in an easily accessible locations well served by a range of transport modes; or iv) the proposed development is for an indoor or outdoor sports facility with at least equal community benefit to the development of sport to outweigh the loss of the existing or former recreational use. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.20
M/B4/15	Policy SR.1A Notation Sheet	<i>Amend Notation sheet to refer to "Sites used as playing fields subject to Policy SR.1A" instead of "Protection of Land of Recreational Value (Policy SR.1)"</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.21
M/B4/16	Policy SR.1A Proposals Map Inset 31	<i>Amend Proposals Map, Inset 31 by deleting playing field safeguarding designation at St Martins Hospital.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/28) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B4/17	Policy SR.1A Proposals Map Inset 31	<i>Amend Proposals Map, Inset 31 by adding playing field safeguarding designation at Weston Park Playing Fields.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/29) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B4/18	Heading before Para B4.13A	Protection of Land Used for Informal Recreation and Play	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.22

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION												
(M/B4/13)	Para B4.13A	<i>Para B4.13A to be relocated to before Policy SR.1A</i>	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R.3.22												
M/B4/19	Policy SR.1B	<p align="center">POLICY SR.1B</p> <p>Development involving the loss of land used or last used for informal recreation, including children's playing space, will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>i) there is no longer a demand or prospect of demand for the recreational use of the site and a deficiency would not be created in the short or long term by the development; or</p> <p>ii) suitable, equally accessible alternative provision of equivalent community benefit is made.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.23												
M/B4/20	Quick Guide 9	<p align="center">Quick Guide 9</p> <p align="center">National Playing Fields Association (NPFA) Standards-</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>CATEGORY OF PROVISION</th> <th>MINIMUM PROVISION PER 1000 POPULATION</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Children's Playing Space:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(i) outdoor equipped playgrounds/</td> <td>0.2-0.3ha. (0.5-0.7 acres)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(ii) other designated play facilities</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(iii) casual or informal playing space within housing areas</td> <td>0.4-0.5 ha. (1.0-1.25 acres)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Playing Space</td> <td>0.6-0.8ha (1.5-1.95 acres)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CATEGORY OF PROVISION	MINIMUM PROVISION PER 1000 POPULATION	Children's Playing Space:		(i) outdoor equipped playgrounds/	0.2-0.3ha. (0.5-0.7 acres)	(ii) other designated play facilities		(iii) casual or informal playing space within housing areas	0.4-0.5 ha. (1.0-1.25 acres)	Total Playing Space	0.6-0.8ha (1.5-1.95 acres)	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.24
CATEGORY OF PROVISION	MINIMUM PROVISION PER 1000 POPULATION														
Children's Playing Space:															
(i) outdoor equipped playgrounds/	0.2-0.3ha. (0.5-0.7 acres)														
(ii) other designated play facilities															
(iii) casual or informal playing space within housing areas	0.4-0.5 ha. (1.0-1.25 acres)														
Total Playing Space	0.6-0.8ha (1.5-1.95 acres)														
M/B4/21	Para B4.15	There is a range of outdoor sports facilities in Bath including recreation grounds, cricket grounds, playing fields for pitch sports, courts and golf courses. Some outdoor facilities are in private ownership but available for public use on a membership basis. Bath University has some 23 ha outdoor sports facilities and several of the schools also have outdoor facilities available for community use.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25												
M/B4/22	Para B4.23	The Sports and Leisure Centre in the centre of Bath is the main venue for indoor sports activities. Community use of some schools in the City including Culverhay complements this provision, by providing access to sports facilities in the outer urban areas. There are a number of independent schools in Bath and private clubs with good sports facilities, some of which are available for use by the public by arrangement.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25												

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B4/ 23	Para B4.24	The Leisure Centre in Keynsham and the Whitchurch Sports Centre in south Bristol provide good indoor facilities serving the north-west of the District which are supplemented by community use of school facilities.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 24	Para B4.26	The villages rely largely on community halls and other smaller scale facilities for organised indoor sports. There is a dual use agreement with Chew Valley School which serves the west of the District for the use of the sports hall and squash courts, and public access to the swimming pool at Paulton in the south of the District. Those settlements near Bath will rely on indoor facilities in the City.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 25	Para B4.29	Bath has a number of large open spaces that are regularly used for informal recreation including Royal Victoria Park, Alice Park, Sydney Gardens, Henrietta Park, Alexandra Park and Parade Gardens. There are also a number of recreation grounds and many other smaller areas of amenity open space accessible to the public.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 26	Para B4.30	The Memorial and Chew Parks provide the principal areas for informal recreational use in Keynsham. In Keynsham Open space adjacent to the River Avon at County Bridge is allocated under Policy SR.2 for additional recreational use.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 27	Para B4.31	Informal public open space provision in Norton-Radstock largely comprises small amenity areas and playing fields. Land off Clevedon Road, Welton is allocated under Policy SR.2 and will improve provision. (Note: second sentence of B4.31 moved to end of B4.32)	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 28	Para B4.32	Although there is access to the countryside for informal recreation pursuits there is a recognised need for a centrally located park to serve this urban the Norton-Radstock area. Land for a <i>Town Park</i> is allocated under Policy SR.2 between Midsomer Norton town centre and Radstock Road along the Somer Valley. Here there are opportunities for improvement of the whole area by including a formal amenity area taking advantage of the River Somer together with the potential for an informal parkland area and riverside walk. Land is also set aside at Foxhills, Radstock for informal public open space as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the former railway and wagon works (Policy GDS.1). <i>(Note: last sentence of B4.32 relocated from</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<i>B4.31)</i>	
M/B4/ 29	Para B4.33	The only formal park in the <i>villages</i> is Paulton Memorial Park. Elsewhere in the rural settlements provision for informal recreation generally takes the form of recreation grounds, village greens and other areas of amenity open space.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 30	Para B4.34	Children's Play Areas Play is crucial for all aspects of a child's development. This is recognised in the Council's Play Policy and Strategy. The Council has an important role in providing opportunities for children 'to explore, manipulate, experience and affect their environment within challenging but secure settings' Bath & North East Somerset Play Policy - 2000).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 31	Para B4.34	Play is crucial for all aspects of a child's development. This is recognised in the Council's Play Policy and Strategy. The Council has an important role in providing opportunities for children 'to explore, manipulate, experience and affect their environment within challenging but secure settings' (Bath & North East Somerset Play Policy - 2000).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 32	Para B4.35	In accordance with the NPFA standards, children's playing space should be accessible by foot without having to cross busy roads and within a recommended walking distance from home. The three categories of playing space are Local Area for Play (LAP), Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) and Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP), see 'Schedule to Policy SR.3 for Minimum Standard for Children's Play Provision'.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 33	Para B4.36	In <i>Bath</i> there are opportunities for play in parks and many other open spaces including equipped play areas. When assessed against the NPFA standards (see Quick Guide 9) there is only a small overall shortfall of existing children's playing space provision City wide. However there is a need for further LEAPs in a number of areas including Upper Weston, Lower Weston/Locksbrook Road, Upper Oldfield Park and the City centre where accessible play areas would meet not only the needs of local residents but those visitors with children.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 34	Para B4.37	There are currently two NEAPs in Bath: Royal Victoria Park and Roseworn Close, Whiteway. There may be opportunities during the Plan	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		period to upgrade the existing LEAPS at Alice Park, Weston Recreation Ground and provide another south of the River.	
M/B4/ 35	Para B4.38	Keynsham currently has 7 LEAPs and one NEAP (Memorial Park). But assessing this provision against the NPFA standards there is a need to provide further LEAPs. Although no sites have been identified, the areas in need are in the vicinity of the Lays Drive Estate, south of Coronation Road, the Hawthorne Close area, and west of Chandag Road near Keynsham Cricket Ground. The existing LEAPs at Manor Road and Kelston Road could also be upgraded to provide two more NEAPs for the town.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 36	Para B4.39	Norton Radstock has 17 LEAPs and one NEAP (The Tom Huyton Memorial Children's Park). However there is still a need for LEAPs in the Charlton Park and Nightingales areas of Midsomer Norton. Land is allocated under Policy SR.2 to upgrade the LEAP at Waterford Park, Westfield and there may be scope for a NEAP at South Wansdyke Sports Centre.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 37	Para B4.40	Children's playing space provision in the villages appears inadequate if assessed strictly against the NPFA minimum standard. However provision also needs to take account of accessibility, the availability of recreation grounds for casual play and opportunities for informal play in the surrounding countryside. There is a need for new LEAPs in Peasedown St John, Paulton, the northern part of High Littleton, Pensford, Compton Martin, Ubley, Temple Cloud, Chew Magna and Saltford.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.25
M/B4/ 38	Heading before Para B4.42	Children's Playing Space and New Residential Development Provision of recreational facilities to meet the needs of new development	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.27
M/B4/ 39	Para B4.42	During the Plan period new areas of equipped children's playing space will be required to be provided as part of new housing development proposed under Policy GDS.1, as well as in association with windfall sites and from the renewal of planning permissions for residential development. The level of provision will be based on the NPFA recommended minimum standard as set out in Quick Guide 9 above.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.28
M/B4/ 40	Para B4.43	Depending on the size of the site it may not always be appropriate to make provision on site or to justify the provision of full play	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.28

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>facilities. In such cases it may be more appropriate to provide accessible alternatives or make a financial contribution to the provision or enhancement of suitably located alternative sites. <i>(last sentence relocated to end of B4.52)</i></p>	
<p>M/B4/ 41</p>	<p>Para B4.44</p>	<p>Where the children's playing space is principally of benefit for the development itself, developers will also be required to maintain the playing space if retained in their ownership, and if dedicated to the District or Parish Council, make a commuted capital contribution to cover maintenance costs for a 10 year period. The level of contribution will depend upon the amount and category of playing space provided. Provision and/or contributions will be sought by means of planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) or through planning conditions.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.28</p>
<p>M/B4/ 42</p>	<p>Para B4.45</p>	<p>In providing land for children's playing space the developer will also be required to make provision to lay out and equip the playing space and provide a buffer zone between it and the nearest residential properties (see Quick Guide 10). Schedule 4 to Policy SR.3: Minimum Standard for Children's Play Provision details these requirements in line with the NPFA minimum standards which will be used pending the adoption of the local standards set out in the Green Space Strategy. Proposals for new residential development will be assessed within the context of Policy SR.3 and para B4.12C defines the types of recreational open space encompassed by the policy which also includes playing fields and other formal recreational land. <i>(Para B4.45 to be relocated immediately before Policy SR.3)</i></p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.28</p>
<p>M/B4/ 43</p>	<p>Para B4.51</p>	<p><i>(Para B4.51 to be relocated after deleted Para B4.42)</i></p>	<p>To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.27 (no change to text)</p>
<p>M/B4/ 44</p>	<p>Para B4.52</p>	<p>The Council will assess the availability of existing facilities to serve the development. Where replacement, additional or enhanced facilities are required, the developer will be expected to make provision directly related in scale and kind to the need generated by the development. This may take the form of on-site provision or where the need cannot be met on site developers will be expected to make provision off-site and/or contributions to the provision of additional or enhancement of existing facilities in the locality of the</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.28</p>

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		development including the recreational areas identified in Policy SR.2. This is in accordance with the guidance contained in Circular 4/97 05/05 'Planning Obligations'. <i>(Para B4.52 to be relocated after Para B4.51)</i>	
M/B4/ 45	Para B4.53	Provision may also be secured through major office and retail development, development associated with reclaimed land, regeneration schemes such as the redevelopment of Western Riverside and MoD Foxhill in Bath, and former mineral workings other development sites identified under Policy GDS.1 . In some circumstances, because of the type of occupier a proposed development caters for, e.g. accommodation for the elderly, it may not be appropriate to seek provision of children's playing space and such cases will be considered on their merits. <i>(last sentence relocated from end of B4.43)</i> <i>(Para B4.53 to be relocated after Para B4.52)</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.28
M/B4/ 46	Quick Guide 10	<p style="text-align: center;">Buffer Zones</p> <p>A buffer zone surrounds the playing space, and protects adjacent dwellings from disturbance from the play facility. They are in addition to those areas used for children's play and should be designed to discourage children from using them for actual play purposes. The buffer zone may consist of planted areas and can include footpaths. Playing space located adjacent to other compatible land uses can help reduce the overall requirement, e.g. next to school sites or playing fields. The National Playing Fields Association 1992 Six Acre Standard publication gives further advice on buffer zones. Factors such as the design and layout of the playing space and neighbouring houses and local topography will be taken into account.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.26
M/B4/ 47	Policy SR.3	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY SR.3</p> <p>Residential Development which generates a need for children's playing space will only be permitted where safely accessible and suitable provision in accordance with the standard of 0.8 ha children's playing space per 1000 population is provided and secured on site as set out in the schedule to the policy.</p> <p>Where the site is too small to justify provision of a full facility or the facility cannot be physically located on site, appropriate financial contributions will be sought either</p> <p>a) towards providing and securing, new,</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.29

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>conveniently located and safely accessible off-site provision; or</p> <p>b) where the need is of a purely qualitative nature, towards the enhancement of existing, conveniently and safely accessible children's play space.</p> <p>Where new development generates a need for recreational open space and facilities which cannot be met by existing provision, the developer will be required to either provide for, or to contribute financially to, the provision of recreational open space and/or facilities to meet the need arising from the new development.</p> <p>Where the need is for children's play space, provision should be made on the basis of 0.8ha per 1,000 population in accordance with the standards set out in the accompanying schedule until superseded by the local standards set out in the Green Space Strategy when adopted.</p> <p>Where the need is for outdoor and indoor sport facilities, provision should be made on the basis of 1.6-1.8ha for outdoor sports (of which 1.24ha is for pitch sports) and 0.77ha for indoor sports, per 1000 population, as set out in the accompanying schedule.</p> <p>The requirement for any other form of recreational open space or facilities will be assessed on a case by case basis until superseded by the local standards set out in the Green Space Strategy when adopted.</p> <p>Where the development site is too small to justify or accommodate the provision of a facility, contributions will be sought either:</p> <p>i) towards providing and securing new, conveniently located and safely accessible off-site provision; or</p> <p>ii) where the need is of a qualitative nature, towards the enhancement of existing facilities.</p>	
M/B4/48	Schedules to Policies SR.3 & SR.6	<i>Revised Schedule to Policy SR.3 is set out in Annex 1 appended to this section</i>	Proposed modification to combine the Schedule to Policy SR.3 and the Schedule to Policy SR.6 reflects the provisions of the single Policy SR.3 (R3.29)

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
(M/B4/43-45)	Paras B4.51 – B4.53	<i>(Paras B4.51 – B4.53 to be relocated immediately after deleted Para B4.42).</i>	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.27
M/B4/49	Policy SR.4	<p>POLICY SR.4</p> <p>Development for sport or recreational facilities will be permitted within or adjoining a settlement defined in Policy SC.1 provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) it complements the existing pattern of recreational facilities; ii) it is in readily accessible locations well served by transport modes; iii) there would be no adverse impact on public safety; and iv) the amenities of local residents are not adversely affected by air, noise or light pollution. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.30
M/B4/50	Policy SR.6	<p>POLICY SR.6</p> <p>Where local provision for recreational purposes is inadequate to serve the projected needs arising from occupants of new development proposals, development will not be permitted unless provision related in kind and scale to meet these needs is secured.</p> <p>Development which generates a need for outdoor and indoor sport will only be permitted where conveniently accessible and suitable provision in accordance with the standard of 1.26ha outdoor sport and 7.7 sq.m. NPFA minimum standard of 1.6 – 1.8 ha for outdoor sports, of which 1.24 ha should be for pitch sports, plus 0.77 ha (1.9 acres) for indoor sport per 1000 population is provided and secured on site as set out in the Schedule to the policy. Where the site is too small to justify full outdoor or indoor sports facilities, or the facilities cannot be physically located on-site, appropriate financial contributions will be sought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) towards providing new, conveniently accessible off-site provision; or b) where the need is of a purely qualitative nature, towards the enhancement of existing, conveniently accessible provision. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.29
M/B4/51	Schedule to Policy SR.6	'1.6-1.8 ha (4 – 4.5 acres) of which 4.26 1.24 ha (3.1 acres) should be for sport pitches. In addition, 7.7 sq.m. 0.77 ha (1.9 acres) should be for indoor sport.'	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/30) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B4/52	Para B4.56	This reflects guidance in PPG6 'Town Centres and Retail Development' which advises that large scale commercial leisure	Further Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/1) has been endorsed by the Inspector as

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		proposals will be directed to accessible locations such as town centres. <i>Note: last sentence of para B4.56 moved to B4.56A)</i>	confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B4/ 53	Para B4.56A	Commercial leisure facilities in Bath will be improved through the proposed scheme on the former Kingsmead Motors site on James Street West, which includes the provision of a multiplex cinema and a fitness and leisure facility. The 2004 City & Town Centres Study suggests that there is scope to further improve the range of commercial leisure facilities in Bath e.g. through the provision of a ten-pin bowling facility not currently on offer in the City. Proposals that come forward will be considered within the context of policy SR.7 and other relevant policies in the Plan. There may be potential to provide appropriate commercial leisure uses within the edge-of-centre Avon Street car park site allocated for mixed use development under policy GDS.1 (see also paragraph B5.32F). Such provision will be subject to demonstration of it not harming the vitality and viability of the central shopping area.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.31 (which endorses FPIC/B/1)
M/B4/ 54	Section heading & Para B4.57	MAJOR SPORTS STADIUM Government guidance advises that local planning authorities give sympathetic consideration to development proposals for all-seater stadia, particularly where existing facilities are substandard or a club is seeking relocation. This is in line with JRSP Policy 44 which supports the provision of a stadium in Bath to accommodate approximately 20,000 spectators. There are two existing stadia in Bath: at the Recreation Ground, currently home to Bath Rugby Plc, with a capacity of approximately 9,980 and the Bath City's Football Club ground at Twerton Park, with a capacity of approximately 9,000. both clubs are investigating the possibility of new facilities or stadia. The option of sharing facilities should also be considered. The National Facilities Strategy for Rugby Union in England published in 2001 indicates that the minimum capacity for Premiership rugby club stadiums should be 10,000 during the season 2004/4. in the light of this, the environmental constraints of the City and the current levels of patronage, it is considered that a more realistic capacity is a stadium of about 15,000. this would also be adequate to accommodate the football club's needs.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.32

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B4/ 55	Para B4.58	Whilst no site has been identified, proposals for a single sports stadium and a wide range of sporting activities will be considered within the context of Policy SR.8. Consideration will also be given to its suitability for the requirements of the sport and the level at which it is played and to increase its long term flexibility. It should be capable of future extension or adaptation. Favourable consideration will be given to proposals that provide opportunities for multiple use of the premises for the benefit of the community.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.32
M/B4/ 56	Para B4.59	As with other major development proposals within an urban area, the Council will expect the facility to be highly accessible by various modes of travel especially public transport. It should be demonstrated that any development ancillary to the main facility likely to accommodate a retail or leisure use would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the City centre. Consideration should also be given to minimising the impact of the development proposal as a whole on the environment and amenity. In this respect the Council would expect the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment as part of the application for planning permission.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.32
M/B4/ 57	Policy SR.8	POLICY SR.8 Proposals for the development of one major all-seater sports stadium will be permitted in Bath provided: i) it can provide accommodation for approximately 15,000 spectators and a range of sporting activities and other leisure events; ii) the majority of the sports facilities and all leisure facilities are made available for use by the community; iii) the proposal would not give rise to an unacceptable environmental impact; iv) commercial or retail uses associated with the scheme do not have an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the shopping centres identified under Policy S.1; v) the facilities will be served by public transport.	To accord with Inspector's Recommendation R3.32
M/B4/ 58	Para B4.63	Bath and North East Somerset has an extensive network of PROW, which form an integral part of the overall leisure facilities. A number of long distance and circular routes have been established which go through the District forming part of the network. The off-road sections of these recreational routes are shown on the Proposals Map and Policy SR.9	Proposed modification arising from the proposed amendment to Policy SR.9 (R3.33)

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		seeks to ensure that any existing and proposed publicly accessible routes are not adversely affected by development proposals.	
M/B4/59	Para B4.64	Where a recreational route follows the line of a former railway, its course is protected as a sustainable transport route under Policy T.9 as designated on the Proposals Map. This applies to parts of routes 1 and 3 in Policy SR.9. The presence of the Avon Valley Railway alongside the Bath and Bristol Railway Path demonstrates that these uses can coexist.	Proposed modification arising from the proposed amendment to Policy SR.9 (R3.33)
M/B4/60	Para B4.65	Where potential exists, the Council will support any opportunities to create further recreational routes during the Plan period through initiatives with private landowners in co-operation with public sector organisations. Proposals for a foot/cycle bridge across the Avon between Victoria Bridge and Widcombe Bridge and a new bridge Freshford have been mooted but are insufficiently advanced to include in the Local Plan. The Riverside Walk in Bath between Cleveland & Pulteney Bridges is a longstanding Council objective and, having been substantially implemented, is safeguarded under Policy SR.9. Any development proposals that affect existing or proposed publicly accessible routes identified in Policy SR.9 and any other PROW will be expected to maintain and/or incorporate the route within the scheme and, depending on the location, the Council will seek to negotiate the provision of additional linkages between urban areas and the wider countryside, open spaces, the River or Canal and other water based recreational areas.	Proposed modification arising from the proposed amendment to Policy SR.9 (R3.33 R3.34)
M/B4/61	Policy SR.9	POLICY SR.9 Development which adversely affects the recreational and amenity value of or access to existing and proposed routes for walking, cycling or horse riding including those shown on the Proposals Map and other public rights of way will not be permitted. <u>Existing</u> 1. Avon Walkway: North of Saltford along Bristol and Bath Railway Path to Newbridge; along River Avon path to Churchill Bridge; along Kennet and Avon Canal towpath to Dundas Aqueduct. 2. The Cotswold Way (designated National Trail): Bath Abbey through Weston to Lansdown. 3. Limestone Link: Compton Martin to Hinton Blewett and along Cam Valley to Dundas	In line with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.33

CHAPTER B4 – SPORT & RECREATION

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Aqueduct; along Kennet and Avon canal towpath and St. Catherine's Valley to Monkswood Reservoir.</p> <p>4. Two Rivers Way: Along the Chew Valley from Keynsham to west of Chew Stoke; then through Nempnett Thrubwell parish to the District Boundary.</p> <p>5. Bristol and Bath Railway Path: from River Avon at Saltford to Newbridge, Bath.</p> <p>6. Three Peaks Way: Circular route between Maes Knoll, on Dundry Hill, Knowle Hill south of Chew Magna and Blackberry Hill near Farmborough.</p> <p>7. Community Forest Path: From the Two Rivers Way at Pensford to Norton Malreward, Norton Hawkfield and then crossing the District boundary into North Somerset.</p> <p>8. Bath Skyline Walk: circular walk between Rainbow Wood, Widcombe, Bathwick Wood, Bathampton Wood and Bushey Norwood.</p> <p><u>Proposed</u></p> <p>9. 12. Riverside Walk, Bath: Pulteney Bridge to Cleveland Bridge.</p> <p>Development which adversely affects the recreational value and amenity value of, or access to, existing public rights of way and other publicly accessible routes for walking, cycling and riding will not be permitted.</p> <p>Development which compromises the provision of the Riverside Walk, Bath (Pulteney Bridge to Cleveland Bridge) will not be permitted</p>	
M/B4/ 62	Policy SR.9 Proposals Map	<i>Delete the Recreational Routes (Policy SR.9) from the Proposals Map and from the Notation Sheet</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R3.35

ANNEX 1 TO CHAPTER B4

SCHEDULE TO POLICY SR.6

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>SCHEDULE TO POLICY SR.3 MINIMUM STANDARD FOR CHILDREN'S PLAY PROVISION (based on the recommendations of the National Playing Fields association 1992)</i></p>			
<p><i>CATEGORY OF PROVISION</i></p>		<p><i>MINIMUM PROVISION PER 1,000 POPULATION (EXCLUDING BUFFER ZONES)</i></p>	<p><i>EXAMPLES OF FACILITIES</i></p>
<p>(i) <i>Outdoor equipped playgrounds and other designated play facilities</i></p>		<p>))))) 0.8 ha</p>	<p><i>Local Area for Play (LAP): for 4-6 year olds Small low-key games area of at least 100 sq.m. 1 minute walking time (100 metres) from home.</i></p>
<p>(ii) <i>casual or informal playing space within housing areas</i></p>		<p>)))</p>	<p><i>Local Equipped Area for Play (LEAP): Mainly for 4-8 years olds; about 5 types of equipment: small games area of at least 400 sq.m. 5 minutes walking time (400 metres) from home.</i></p> <p><i>Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP): Mainly for older children 15 minute walking time (1,000 metres) from home.</i></p>
<p><i>BUFFER ZONE REQUIREMENTS</i></p>		<p><i>POPULATION OF ANY DEVELOPMENT WILL BE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING OCCUPANCY RATES:</i></p>	
<p><i>TYPE OF FACILITY:</i></p>	<p><i>MINIMUM DISTANCE FROM PLAYING SPACE TO CURTILAGE OF NEAREST DWELLING:</i></p>	<p><i>TYPE OF DWELLING:</i></p>	<p><i>OCCUPANCY:</i></p>
<p>LAP LEAP NEAP</p>	<p>5 metres 20 metres 30 metres</p>	<p>1 bedroom 2 bedroom 3 bedroom 4 bedrooms 5 or more bedrooms</p>	<p>2 persons 3 2 persons 3 persons 3 persons 4 persons</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>SCHEDULE TO POLICY S.6: MINIMUM STANDARD FOR OUTDOOR PLAYING SPACE FOR SPORT (based on the recommendations of the National Playing Fields association 1992)</i></p>			
<p><i>CATEGORY OF PROVISION</i></p>		<p><i>MINIMUM PROVISION PER 1,000 POPULATION</i></p>	<p><i>EXAMPLES OF FACILITIES</i></p>
<p><i>Youth and Adult Outdoor playing space for Sport:</i></p>		<p>1.6-1.8 ha. (4-4.5 acres) of which 1.24 ha (3.1 acres) should be for pitch sports. In addition, 0.77 ha (1.9 acres) should be for indoor sport</p>	<p><i>Sports pitches, tennis courts, bowling greens, athletic tracks, training areas etc.</i></p>
<p><i>POPULATION OF ANY DEVELOPMENT WILL BE BASED ON THE FOLLOWING OCCUPANCY RATES:</i></p>			
<p><i>TYPE OF DWELLING:</i></p>	<p><i>OCCUPANCY:</i></p>		
<p>1 bedroom 2 bedroom 3 bedroom 4 or more bedrooms 5 or more bedrooms</p>	<p>2 persons 3 2 persons 4 3 persons 5 3 persons 4 persons</p>		

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B5/1	Para B5.6	Local plans should be based on up to date information. A City and Town Centres study (C&TCS) was undertaken on behalf of the Council in July 2000 and reviewed in 2004 . The study ies considered the relationships between the existing centres in Bath & North East Somerset and assessed the District's retail needs.	Further Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/2) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B5/2	Policies S.1 & S.8 Proposals Map Inset 31a	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31a to ensure the whole of the Bathwick Street local shopping centre is shown (properties to the west of Daniel Mews were omitted from the Deposit Draft Proposals Map)</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/34) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B5/3	Para B5.23	The C&TCS included a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the need for new retail floorspace in the District during the Local Plan period. The assessment took account of the needs of the wide variety of groups who shop in the District, focusing on meeting the needs of local residents as the first priority. The projected quantitative capacity for additional floorspace to 2011 is set out in table 1 below.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/4	Para B5.24	The projected capacity is detailed for convenience and comparison shops. Comparison retail floorspace is split into two categories; high street comparison and bulky goods. High street comparison floorspace relates to provision that is normally made via shops located within the existing centres. Bulky goods shops sell items such as carpets, furniture and D.I.Y. goods which often require large sites that may not be available within existing centres. Therefore, such provision may need to be made in edge or out of centre locations.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/5	Para B5.25	The projections set out in table 1 detail the quantitative capacity for additional retail floorspace over and above the floorspace gains which will result from the redevelopment of Southgate (site allocated under policies S.3 and GDS.1 which now has the benefit of planning permission), the proposed foodstore at Charlton Road, Keynsham (see policies S.3 and GDS.1) and the proposed extension of the Tesco store at Old Mills, Paulton. These projections represent maximum capacity figures and it is important that in providing additional retail floorspace qualitative considerations are taken into account in establishing the quantity that should be provided.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B5/6	Para B5.25A	The additional retail floorspace required is primarily focussed within Bath, with only small levels of provision required in Keynsham and Norton Radstock (see table 1B below).	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/7	Para B5.26	Having identified the scope for additional retail floorspace provision, locations have been assessed for meeting the requirement within a sequential framework (see policy S.4).	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/8	Para B5.27	In accordance with PPG6 new retail development is directed towards the centres identified in policy S.1. New provision can help to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability. Such development will need to respect the relevant centre's environmental quality and ensure that it is maintained and enhanced. It will also need to be fully integrated with existing shopping facilities in terms of pedestrian access and links to public transport services and car parking. In all cases new provision must be of a scale and nature appropriate to the centre concerned.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/9	Policy S.2	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY S.2</p> <p>Retail development within the shopping centres listed in policy S.1 and defined on the Proposals Map will be permitted where it:</p> <p>i) is of a scale and type that is consistent with the existing retail function of the centre; and</p> <p>ii) is well integrated into the existing shopping pattern.</p> <p>Retail development within the shopping centres listed in policy S.1 and defined on the Proposals Map will be permitted where it is:</p> <p>(i) of a scale and type consistent with the existing retail function of the centre and</p> <p>(ii) well integrated into the existing pattern of the centre.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.1
M/B5/10	Para B5.28	The proposed provision of additional convenience floorspace within the three sites referred to in paragraph B5.25 will help to meet the District's capacity during the Plan period. Two of these sites (Southgate and Charlton Road, Keynsham) lie within existing centres. The provision of a foodstore in Keynsham will largely meet requirements in that town up to 2011 and should help to reduce the existing high level of expenditure outflow to Bristol and increase town centre attractiveness.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B5/11	Para B5.29	The quantitative capacity for additional convenience floorspace over and above that provided through the proposals referred to above arises almost entirely within Bath (as set out in table 1B). It is likely that some of the quantitative capacity will be met through relocations and extensions to existing stores e.g. relocation and potential expansion of the Sainsbury's store at Green Park (see also paragraph B5.321). It is not possible to be certain of the amount of floorspace that could be provided from such sources; nor therefore, of the scale of the residual capacity.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/12	Para B5.29A	Should an additional medium or large foodstore be required in order to meet the quantitative capacity in Bath an out-of-centre location may need to be considered as no city centre or edge-of-centre sites are allocated for such development. Given that the southern part of the city appears to be currently most poorly served for large food stores and that many residents need to travel through the city centre to use such a facility it is suggested that, if appropriate, provision should be made in south Bath. Such provision would also meet a qualitative deficiency. Proposals will need to ensure that the vitality and viability of existing centres is not harmed and will be considered against policy S.4.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/13	Para B5.30	Further provision in Midsomer Norton and Radstock is not proposed as existing provision is regarded as being sufficient to substantially meet the needs of residents of the town and surrounding villages. However, projections suggest there is scope for a small level of additional convenience floorspace during the plan period and proposals to provide additional convenience shopping may come forward. These will be considered against policies S.2 (within the town centres) and S.4 (outside the town centres).	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/14	Para B5.31	The proposed redevelopment of the Southgate area, which lies within the city central shopping area, will help to meet the quantitative and qualitative need for additional high street comparison floorspace in the District in sequentially the most appropriate location. This redevelopment will help to improve the quality of Bath's retail offer and enhance the vitality and viability of this part of the City centre.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B5/15	Para B5.32	<p>As shown in tables 1 and 1B there remains quantitative capacity for significant additional high street comparison floorspace in the District, predominantly within Bath. The provision of additional floorspace must also address qualitative needs. In seeking to allocate sites opportunities have been assessed on a sequential basis. The sequential approach gives preference to city and town centre sites; followed by edge-of-centre sites; sites in district and local centres; and only then out-of-centre sites that are accessible by a variety of means of transport. An edge of centre site is one that is within easy walking distance of the primary shopping area, which, dependent on topography and other factors, is about 200-300 metres. <i>(Note: last two sentences of para B5.32 above have been moved from para B5.35).</i></p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/16	Para B5.32A	<p>Bath The central shopping area is compact and historic in nature and therefore it contains few opportunities to provide additional retail floorspace. Following analysis it is considered that there are no sites located entirely within the central shopping area that should be allocated. It is considered that opportunities are available that could provide some additional floorspace and proposals will be considered against the provisions of policy S.2, which broadly supports the principle of retail development.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/17	Para B5.32B	<p>Whilst no sites are allocated that are entirely located within the central shopping area the Podium/Cattlemarket site, which lies partly within and partly adjoining the central shopping area, is allocated for mixed use development under policy GDS.1. Redevelopment of this site could potentially provide additional high street comparison and convenience retail floorspace. It would also help to improve linkages between the central shopping area and Walcot Street.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/18	Para B5.32C	<p>The site is currently occupied by a range of uses including a hotel, library, shops, restaurants and car parking. Archaeological interests are known to exist on the Cattlemarket part of the site and these will need to be assessed and satisfactorily addressed in accordance with policy BH.13. Redevelopment would also need to make provision for a replacement library as this is an important community facility and replacement car parking. Access arrangements will need to ensure that 'on-</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		street' vehicular waiting problems are not exacerbated.	
M/B5/19	Para B5.32D	The delivery of 'windfall' opportunities within the central shopping area and the allocated Podium/Cattlemarket site will need to follow a strategy of reinforcing the existing and emerging retail offer and character of different parts of the city centre, rather than simply adding retail uses.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/20	Para B5.32E	Application of the sequential approach means that edge-of-centre and then out-of-centre sites, accessible by a range of transport modes, should be considered. It is important that, in planning for the growth of the city centre shopping core, a long-term strategy is followed. The physical layout of the city and the associated constraints and opportunities means that the most appropriate direction for growth is westwards towards the existing (and potentially enhanced) retail offer at Green Park Station.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/21	Para B5.32F	Within this context the edge-of-centre site at Avon Street car park is identified. It offers the opportunity to provide comparison retail floorspace within a mixed use scheme.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/22	Para B5.32G	In developing this site it will be important to ensure that the retail element does not harm the vitality and viability of the central shopping area. Retail provision should address qualitative needs and reflect the retail character emerging in this part of the city centre through the proposed redevelopment of Southgate. Further studies will be needed in order to establish the quantity and type of retail provision that should be made.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/23	Para B5.32H	It will be necessary to phase the development of Avon Street car park to follow redevelopment of the sequentially preferable Southgate area, which is scheduled to open in phases between 2007 and 2009. It is vital that Avon Street continues to be available as a city centre car park whilst the Southgate area, including the Ham Gardens car park, is being redeveloped. Redevelopment of Avon Street and the associated short term loss of car parking can only take place once the replacement car park in Southgate is open. In addition proposals must not prejudice redevelopment of a wider 'Bath Riverside' area which is the subject of masterplanning work. A scheme is capable of being delivered by 2011, however, as a result of the factors referred to above, completion of retail	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		floorspace available for trading will, at the earliest, be achieved towards the end of the plan period.	
M/B5/24	Para B5.32I	The site is allocated under policy GDS.1 for mixed use development. Appropriate uses will be those that are compatible with a city centre location and in addition to retail could, subject to the provisions of policy SR.7, include commercial leisure uses (see also paragraph B4.56A in Chapter 4: Sport and Recreation). The amount of retail floorspace which can be appropriately included within this mix will emerge through masterplanning of the 'Bath Riverside' area. Policy GDS.1 sets out the development requirements which include the need to replace existing car parking provided on the site, as well as providing additional transport infrastructure to serve the new floorspace.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/25	Para B5.32J	Western Riverside is a major mixed use regeneration site which must be highly accessible by public transport. The eastern end of Western Riverside includes Green Park Station and the existing Sainsbury's supermarket. The entrance to the station is within 300 metres of the central shopping area reached along James Street West. The Green Park Station area, including the existing Sainsbury's site is considered to be edge-of-centre. The remainder of the Western Riverside site, west of the river, is considered to be out-of-centre.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/26	Para B5.32K	Western Riverside, as a part edge and part out-of-centre opportunity, to be developed on a comprehensive masterplanned basis, represents the best sequentially available location for additional retail development after the Podium/Cattlemarket site and the Avon Street car park site. It lies close to the city centre with the potential for linked trips to the central shopping area, principally via James Street West, which has been the subject of recent leisure development and public realm improvements. Additional enhancement of the public realm, which could be secured through the use of conditions, in order to provide more attractive pedestrian and cycle connections to the city centre, would, in conjunction with public transport improvements, help to increase this potential.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/27	Para B5.32M	Comparison shopping at Green Park station will require the relocation of the existing Sainsbury's store (see also paragraph B5.29). The provision of retail floorspace at Western	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Riverside will be subject to the need to ensure that it does not harm the vitality and viability of city centre shopping or other existing centres identified under policy S.1. It is envisaged that this should be achieved through the use of conditions to control the type of comparison retailing provided e.g. by restricting the range of goods sold and/or the size of units. Further studies, which will accompany development proposals, will be required to establish the acceptable retail quantity and type. This will assist in ensuring that Western Riverside remains a complementary rather than competing destination, broadening the range and quality of retailing within Bath, thereby strengthening its sub-regional position and providing more sustainable shopping opportunities for local residents.</p>	
M/B5/28	Para B5.32N	<p>Western Riverside has the potential to provide a significant quantum of high street comparison retailing at its eastern end on both sides of the River Avon subject to the criteria detailed under policy GDS.1.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/29	Para B5.32O	<p>The city centre shopping area has not changed significantly for about 30 years and viable retail uses play a fundamental role in helping to maintain the city's historic core. Care will therefore need to be taken to ensure that the phasing of retail provision at Western Riverside in conjunction with the planned implementation of more central proposals, does not have an unacceptable cumulative effect on the central shopping area or prejudice the planned implementation of more central proposals.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/30	Para B5.32P	<p>The provision of retail floorspace at Western Riverside will help to deliver the wider regeneration benefits of redeveloping the site and this may be a material consideration relevant to the phasing of retail development.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/31	Para B5.32Q	<p>Development of the allocated sites referred to above and the windfall opportunities within the central shopping area will potentially enable the quantitative and qualitative need for additional retail comparison floorspace in Bath to be met.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/32	Para B5.32R	<p>Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock</p> <p>The scale of the projected requirement in the towns is substantially smaller than for Bath. There are several opportunities within the defined town centres that could meet much of this requirement. However, it is not</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		considered appropriate to allocate these sites. Proposals that come forward would be determined within the context of Policy S.2 which is supportive of retail provision in such locations.	
M/B5/33	Para B5.32S (previously B5.36)	Bulky goods provision Residents living within the District have a more limited choice of bulky goods shopping than for other forms of comparison retailing. There is significant diversion of expenditure to provision in Bristol and Wiltshire. Therefore, there is quantitative and qualitative scope for some bulky goods floorspace provision in the District (see Table 1).	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/34	Para B5.32T (previously B5.37)	This provision should primarily be made in Bath, which is the largest centre of population within the District and is currently the main destination for comparison shopping. Provision would serve the needs of local residents and would reduce the number of long distance, often car borne, journeys to competing centres.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/35	Para B5.32U (previously B5.38)	Traditionally bulky goods shopping has been provided via retail warehouses, usually with substantial on-site car parking provision. These stores require large sites. However, the supply of land in Bath is very limited. In addition some bulky goods shops have opened in local centres within the City and therefore, the impact of retail warehouse type provision on these shops will need to be carefully considered.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/36	Para B5.32V (previously B5.39)	Within Bath the restricted opportunities within and on the edge of the central shopping area mean that bulky goods provision will need to be made in an out-of-centre location. Western Riverside provides the most appropriate opportunity to meet much of the quantitative and qualitative need for bulky goods floorspace. It is estimated that within a mixed use scheme Western Riverside has the scope to accommodate up to 11,900m ² net of this type of floorspace (see policies GDS.1 and S.3).	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/37	Para B5.32W	Further provision should be made on the site on the Lower Bristol Road allocated under Policy GDS.1 for comprehensive mixed use development (site B12). Quantitative capacity assessments suggest around 2,100m ² net in addition to that accommodated at Western Riverside. This could potentially be delivered either as a consolidation of existing retail	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>provision at the Weston Lock Retail Park or at the eastern end of the site closer to provision on Western Riverside. Particular attention will need to be focussed on resolving the adverse impacts of the likely significant traffic generation arising from bulky goods floorspace provision on both this site and Western Riverside.</p>	
M/B5/38	Para B5.32X (previously B5.40)	<p>In providing bulky goods shops on these sites the range and type of goods offered for sale will need to be carefully controlled in order to ensure that they do not compete directly with shops in existing centres, thereby adversely affecting their vitality and viability. This will be done through conditions imposed when granting planning permission. Furthermore, any subsequent applications for either subdividing bulky goods shop units or varying the conditions imposed will need to be tested against the sequential approach and the vitality and viability impacts set out in policy S.4.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/39	New Para B5.23	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>NEW RETAIL DEVELOPMENT</u></p> <p>The C&TCS, as reviewed in 2004, identified a significant projected quantitative capacity for additional retail floorspace to 2011. That growth could accommodate the levels of additional retail floorspace shown in tables 1 and 1B below, in addition to the floorspace gains arising from the redevelopment of Southgate in Bath, the proposed foodstore at Charlton Road, Keynsham and the proposed extension to Tesco at Old Mills, Paulton. However, the projections were made at the end of a long period of steady growth and optimism in retail markets and expenditure on retailing is subject to significant fluctuations as evidenced by the well-publicised downturn in retail performance and confidence after the spring of 2005. Moreover, the projections represent maximum capacity figures rather than a "needs" target which the plan should necessarily aim to meet because the impact of any scheme outside the city centre shopping area will need to be carefully assessed.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/40	New Para B5.24	<p>The projections also separately identify "large format/retail warehouse" stores. This division of the comparison shopping element is based on the assumption made in the C&TCS that spending on DIY, hardware, furniture, floor coverings, carpets and electrical goods accounts for</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION																			
		<p>35-40% of total national comparison goods expenditure. The report further assumes that as about half of the national spending in these categories takes place in retail warehouses up to 20% of total surplus comparison goods expenditure in B&NES could be accommodated in large format stores. However, it is not clear that this is necessarily an appropriate assumption as PPS6 requires consideration of whether there are constituent units on any proposed retail park on an edge-of-centre or out-of-centre site which could be accommodated on a sequentially preferable site. This is a matter that needs to be further explored in the course of the retail strategy discussed at paragraph B5.30 below.</p>																				
M/B5/41	Table 1	<p>Table 1: Projected Quantitative Capacity for Additional Retail Floorspace for Bath & North East Somerset</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Approximate sales floor space (sq.m. net)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Type</th> <th>2004-2011</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Convenience</td> <td>4,250 to 4,550</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Street Comparison</td> <td>26,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>large format/retail warehouse stores</td> <td>15,100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Approximate sales floor space (sq.m. net)		Type	2004-2011	Convenience	4,250 to 4,550	High Street Comparison	26,000	large format/retail warehouse stores	15,100	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4.</p> <p>Incorporates FPIC/B/5.</p>									
Approximate sales floor space (sq.m. net)																						
Type	2004-2011																					
Convenience	4,250 to 4,550																					
High Street Comparison	26,000																					
large format/retail warehouse stores	15,100																					
M/B5/42	Table 1B	<p>Table 1B: Distribution of Projected Quantitative Capacity for Additional Retail Floorspace</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Type</th> <th colspan="3">Approximate Net Sales Floorspace (m²) 2004-2011</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Bath</th> <th>Keynsham</th> <th>Midsomer Norton/ Radstock</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Convenience</td> <td>3,800 – 4,100</td> <td>100</td> <td>350</td> </tr> <tr> <td>High Street Comparison</td> <td>23,400</td> <td>1,400</td> <td>1,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>large format/retail warehouse stores</td> <td>14,000</td> <td>600</td> <td>500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type	Approximate Net Sales Floorspace (m ²) 2004-2011			Bath	Keynsham	Midsomer Norton/ Radstock	Convenience	3,800 – 4,100	100	350	High Street Comparison	23,400	1,400	1,200	large format/retail warehouse stores	14,000	600	500	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4.</p> <p>Incorporates FPIC/B/8</p>
Type	Approximate Net Sales Floorspace (m ²) 2004-2011																					
	Bath	Keynsham	Midsomer Norton/ Radstock																			
Convenience	3,800 – 4,100	100	350																			
High Street Comparison	23,400	1,400	1,200																			
large format/retail warehouse stores	14,000	600	500																			
M/B5/43	New Para B5.25	<p><u>Comparison shopping: Bath</u></p> <p>The majority of the forecast growth is focussed on Bath. However, in considering the extent to which new</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4</p>																			

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		shopping floorspace should be allocated to meet this potential growth in expenditure to 2011 it is important to have regard to the unique characteristics of the core shopping centre, the contribution which will be made to the city centre by the Southgate redevelopment and its effect, and the timescale for the implementation of Southgate.	
M/B5/44	New Para B5.26	Located as it is within the World Heritage Site, the city centre relies to a large extent on the success of its retail function to provide economic support to its historic buildings. Many of the shops in the historic centre are far from ideal to support modern retailing and therefore to ensure that its attraction to retailers is maintained, new development outside the core which could divert shoppers and therefore reduce the attraction of the core area should be avoided. The redevelopment of Southgate will provide modern shopping units within the core shopping area and therefore support the retail function of the city centre. It will be a development of high quality and its success will depend upon the attraction of retailers confident of a secure economic return. The forecast levels of retail expenditure will help to attract retailers to the new scheme but any competing scheme which is outside the main shopping centre could dilute the attraction of Southgate to retailers and put the implementation of the scheme at risk.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/45	New Para B5.27	Furthermore, with the completion of the Southgate scheme there will inevitably be some change within the historic core as retailers relocate into new units and older shops are left vacant. It is essential to the future health of the historic core that such units are quickly taken up by new occupants to safeguard the fabric of the buildings.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/46	New Para B5.28	The plan therefore takes a precautionary approach to the firm allocation of additional retail floorspace in the city centre during the period to 2011. Other than Southgate only the potential redevelopment of the city centre site at The Podium/Cattlemarket is identified for retail development during the plan period. This is likely to be a mixed use scheme providing for an increase in the quantity	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		of comparison and convenience goods floorspace and a mix of other city centre uses including a replacement library and hotel as described in more detail in policy GDS1/B16. No other sites are firmly identified at this time but any further proposals for retail consolidation within the defined city centre shopping area will be supported in principle and determined on their site-specific merits.	
M/B5/47	New Para B5.29	The precautionary approach will also apply to the development of retail warehouses/large format stores in Bath. There may be some potential outside the city centre shopping area for retail warehouse developments of certain kinds but it is not expected that planning permission will be granted for large format stores selling clothing, fashion or sports goods, or variety goods of the kind typically found in the city centre. It is difficult to identify suitable edge-of-centre or out-of-centre sites for retail warehouses as this form of development is generally incompatible with the image, character and appearance of the WHS. While BWR represents a major brownfield opportunity, retail warehouse development surrounded by open car parking would not be appropriate for a site which should form an exemplary high-density, high-quality development area enhancing the character and status of the WHS. There is already some retail warehouse development along Lower Bristol Road and if further development of this kind is justified in terms of the sequential approach and the impact test it may be more appropriate to consolidate provision there. Suitable sites for this purpose will be examined in the course of future master-planning for the Lower Bristol Road area.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/48	New Para B5.30	The Council will commence work on a retail strategy to show how Bath city centre will be developed to provide new shopping floorspace in the longer term, following the completion of Southgate and a period of consolidation for the centre as a whole. This will form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF). The strategy will be firmly based on the sequential approach set out in PPS6. It will thoroughly explore opportunities for securing the best use of under-used central sites that have the	To reflect the Inspector's recommendation R4.4 but amended with reference to future work on a retail strategy as set out in the Statement of Decisions.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>most to contribute to the city's retail offer and to the image, repair and conservation of the urban fabric at the heart of the World Heritage Site. At an appropriate date it may also aim to make the most of the retail potential of any suitable edge-of-centre sites, provided that they form a natural extension of the city centre shopping area, can be truly integrated into it and do not have an adverse impact on its vitality and viability. The strategy will provide for commitments to be made in a series of well-defined steps, subject to (and preceded by) regular monitoring and review. It will also be backed by concerted and clearly identified measures to drive through and secure implementation, including the use of compulsory purchase powers to assemble sites if necessary.</p>	
M/B5/49	New Para B5.31	<p><u>Comparison shopping: Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock</u></p> <p>Table 1B, taken from the C&TCS study, assesses that it is appropriate to distribute only a limited part of the projected quantitative capacity to these second tier town centres within the District's retail hierarchy. There are several opportunities within the defined town centres where this provision could be made and such development would contribute to the self sufficiency of these towns. However, it is not considered appropriate to allocate these sites. Proposals that come forward would be determined within the context of policy S2 which is supportive of development in such locations.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/50	New Para B5.32	<p>Convenience shopping</p> <p>The C&TCS assessments found substantial scope for the development of new convenience floorspace in Bath and this is supported by the pressure commonly agreed to be experienced by the Sainsbury's store at Green Park. Some of this pressure and scope will be absorbed by the replacement convenience store at Southgate and by extension of the Waitrose store at The Podium. It would also be assisted by take-up of the allocation at Keynsham which would help to reduce the existing high level of convenience expenditure outflow from Keynsham to Bristol and</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		increase the attractiveness of the town.	
M/B5/51	New Para B5.32A	Despite reservations about using the C&TCS projections as a basis for firm comparison retail allocations the above developments are unlikely to absorb even the minimum figure for the potential capacity for convenience shopping development to 2011. No other suitable sites have been identified within Bath city centre or at edge-of-centre sites and although PPS6 advises against out-of-centre shopping the particular circumstances of Bath justify the provision of additional convenience shopping floorspace in the southern part of the densely-developed southern sector of the city where there is very little alternative provision at present. A site is therefore allocated for that purpose as part of a mixed use development at land currently occupied by St. Martin's Garden Primary School and Hayesfield School playing fields. This will take pressure off Sainsbury's and the congested road network around the city centre and provide good opportunities for travel to the new shopping floorspace by bus, by cycle or on foot as well as by car.	To reflect the Inspector's recommendation R4.4 but amended to refer provision of additional convenience shopping floorspace in southern Bath in order to give greater flexibility in meeting this need.
M/B5/52	New Para B5.32X	No firm allocations are made for further convenience floorspace in Midsomer Norton and Radstock but the projections suggest that there is scope for a small level of additional development of this kind during the plan period. Any proposals that come forward will be determined against policies S.2 and S.4 as appropriate.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.4
M/B5/53	Policy S.3	Land is allocated for retail development (use class A1) within the following redevelopment opportunity sites: In Bath: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southgate Area • The Podium/Cattlemarket • Avon Street Car Park • Western Riverside • Land at Lower Bristol Road For convenience shopping only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land currently occupied by St. Martin's Garden Primary School and Hayesfield School playing fields at Odd Down as part of a mixed use development. In Keynsham: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between St. John's Court and 	To reflect Inspector's recommendation R4.2 but clarified to refer to site occupied by St. Martin's Garden primary school and Hayesfield school playing field being allocated for mixed use development. <i>NB Southgate is Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. See Council's response to Inspector's recommendation R7.14.</i>

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Charlton Road</p> <p>Site development requirements are set out in Policy GDS.4</p>	
M/B5/54	Para B5.33A	<p>Proposals for Retail Development outside existing centres</p> <p>Projected convenience and comparison retail floorspace requirements can be met primarily within existing centres. Paragraphs B5.25 to B5.32X set out how the identified quantitative and qualitative need for retail floorspace within the District is intended to be met. This includes the need for provision on edge and out-of-centre sites, some of which are allocated. However, Other retail proposals, including large-scale development, outside existing centres may still come forward.</p>	Further Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/21) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B5/55	Para B5.34	<p>These proposals will only be permitted if a need can be clearly demonstrated in line with PPS6, which cannot be met within the centres identified under policy S.1 or on the sites allocated under Policy S.3 and if the proposal, <i>either by itself or together with other shopping proposals</i>, would not adversely affect their the vitality and viability of existing centres. If need can be demonstrated proposals will be considered within the sequential framework outlined in PPS6 and amplified in paragraph B5.32.</p>	Further Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/22) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report. In addition further modification proposed to refer to the impact of a proposal, either singly or cumulatively with other proposals, to the vitality and viability of existing centres in order to help clarify the application of modified policy S.4.
M/B5/56	Para B5.35A	<p>In applying the sequential approach, the relevant centres in which to search for sites will depend on the nature and scale of the proposed development and the catchment that the development seeks to serve. If an out-of-centre site is proposed it should also be in an area that best meets an identified deficiency in provision e.g. food stores in south Bath (see paragraph B5.29B).</p> <p><i>(Note: the last sentence of previous paragraph B5.35A above was previously the last sentence of paragraph B5.35 in the Revised Deposit Draft Plan).</i></p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/23) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B5/57	Policy S.4	<p>POLICY S.4</p> <p>Subject to the provisions of Policy S.9, retail proposals, including large scale development and any extensions to existing retail units, outside Bath central shopping area and other centres defined in Policy S.1 will only be permitted where:</p>	Policy S4 modified as recommended by the Inspector except for criterion iii) which is amended slightly for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>i) there is a demonstrable need for the development;</p> <p>iiia) the proposal is located in accordance with the sequential approach, where first preference is for suitable city/town centre sites, followed by edge of city/town centre sites, district and local centre sites and only then out-of-centre sites;</p> <p>iv) the proposal, either by itself or together with other shopping proposals, will not harm the vitality and viability of any of the shopping centres identified under Policy S.1.</p> <p>Subject to policy S.9, retail development (including extensions to existing retail units) outside the shopping centres identified in policy S.1 and defined on the Proposals Map will only be permitted where:</p> <p>i) there is a demonstrable quantitative and qualitative need for the development;</p> <p>ii) the scale of the development relates to and complements the role and function of the centre;</p> <p>iii) the proposal is located in accordance with the sequential approach such that:</p> <p>an appropriate site or sites cannot be made available within the city or town centre under policy S.2; and</p> <p>as a first preference alternative, the site is within an edge-of centre location forming a natural, well-connected extension to the town centre; or</p> <p>as a second preference alternative, the site is within an out-of-centre location, is well-connected with it and provides for a high likelihood of linked shopping trips;</p> <p>iv) in the case of proposed developments within edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations, there would be no unacceptable impact on the vitality and viability</p>	

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>of other centres; and</p> <p>v) in all cases, the site is or will be accessible by a choice of means of transport (especially public transport, walking and cycling) and will not unacceptably rely on private transport or add unacceptably to traffic and congestion.</p>	
M/B5/58	Para B5.41	A diversity of uses and attractions within a city or town centre can help to maintain and enhance its vitality and viability. Uses that are complementary to shopping (A1 Use Class), such as banks, building societies, restaurants, cafes and pubs (A2, and A3 and A4 Use Classes) can reinforce all day activity and increase attractiveness. Museums, libraries and leisure facilities (D1 and D2 uses), as well as residential use e.g. through the creation of dwellings above shops, can also play a useful role (see Policy HG.12 in the Housing Section).	Modification proposed to refer to use classes A4 and A5. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with revision to use classes order as it was drafted at a time when A3 use included new use classes.
M/B5/59	Para B5.46	Outside the primary shopping frontage, but within the shopping areas of the City and town centres, a greater diversification of uses is appropriate. The introduction of other complementary A2, A3, A-use class and D1 and D2 uses may help to make the centre more attractive.	Modification proposed to refer to all A-use class uses rather than just A3 uses. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with revision to use classes order as it was drafted at a time when A3 use included new use classes.
M/B5/60	Heading preceding para B5.47	A3, A4 and A5 Uses	Modification proposed to refer to use classes A4 and A5. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with revision to use classes order as it was drafted at a time when A3 use included new use classes.
M/B5/61	Para B5.47	Whilst greater diversification of uses outside the primary shopping areas should be encouraged an over concentration of one particular use can be harmful and should be avoided. In the centre of Bath A3, A4 and A5 uses (pubs in particular) have clustered on the edge of the primary shopping area. This trend is reinforced by local plan policy which protects retail use within identified frontages.	Modification proposed to refer to use classes A4 and A5. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with revision to use classes order as it was drafted at a time when A3 use included new use classes.
M/B5/62	Para B5.48	A3, A4 and A5 uses complement the shopping function of the primary areas and encourage customers to walk through them. They contribute to the vibrant mix of uses	Modification proposed to refer to use classes A4 and A5. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		within the City centre and also help to maintain its historic fabric through the conversion and occupation of large often listed buildings.	revision to use classes order as it was drafted at a time when A3 use included new use classes.
M/B5/63	Para B5.50	In considering applications for A3, A4 and A5 uses, including variations to existing A3 consents, within and adjoining Bath central shopping area, it is crucial that the impacts on the character of the Conservation Area and on residential amenity are carefully assessed. Where permission is granted it may be necessary, in the interests of safeguarding residential amenity, for conditions to be attached restricting the type of operation carried out and/or the hours of operation.	Modification proposed to refer to use classes A4 and A5. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with revision to use classes order as it was drafted at a time when A3 use included new use classes.
M/B5/64	Policy S.6	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY S.6</p> <p>Proposals for A3 uses, including variations to existing consents, within and adjoining Bath central shopping area will only be permitted where either singly or cumulatively with other existing similar uses they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of that part of the Conservation Area; and (ii) do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residential occupiers. <p>Subject to policy S.5 proposals for A3, A4 and A5 uses within and adjoining the city centre shopping area defined on the Proposals Map will be permitted, provided that (either singly or in cumulatively with other similar existing uses) they preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the relevant part of the Conservation Area and do not have an unacceptable impact on the retail viability and vitality of the centre or the amenity of local residents. This policy also covers proposals to vary existing consents.</p>	<p>To reflect Inspector's Recommendation R4.8.</p> <p>Additional modification proposed; firstly, in response to Inspector's recommendation R4.7 to clarify that policies S.5 and S.6 operate together (see Statement of Decisions for full reasons) and secondly, to refer to use classes A4 and A5. This modification is necessary to ensure policy accords with revision to use classes order (which came into effect in April 2005 after the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan was approved).</p>
M/B5/65	Para B5.51	Bath City centre's role as a major international tourist destination has led to growth in the number of cafes, restaurants and other food outlets (principally A3 and A4 use classes). Increasingly operators are setting up tables and chairs outside their premises, with appropriate consents, thereby extending the use onto adjoining pavements.	Modification proposed to refer to use class A4. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with revision to use classes order (which came into effect in April 2005 after the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan was approved).
M/B5/66	Para B5.52	This practice helps to increase street activity and can create a pleasant atmosphere. Where appropriate such activity should be supported. However, in some locations it can	Modification proposed to refer to use class A4. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>have unacceptable safety and amenity impacts and detract from the City's historic environment. Whilst such activity is focussed mainly within Bath City Centre, operators of A3 and A4 uses elsewhere in the District may wish to set up tables and chairs outside their premises. In these areas, the same potential adverse impacts need to be avoided.</p>	<p>revision to use classes order (which came into effect in April 2005 after the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan was approved).</p>
M/B5/67	Policy S.7	<p>POLICY S.7 Development involving the siting of tables and chairs outside a ground floor A3 or A4 use will be permitted except where it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. adversely affects highway or pedestrian safety; ii. results in nuisance or loss of amenity to other occupiers; or iii. adversely affects the character or appearance of that part of a Conservation Area and/or the setting of an individual group of historic buildings. 	<p>Modification proposed to refer to use class A4. This modification necessary to ensure plan accords with revision to use classes order (which came into effect in April 2005 after the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan was approved).</p>
M/B5/68	Para B5.62	<p>Small shops, either singly or in small groups, are also spread throughout the District, both within the urban areas and in villages. These shops also provide a useful service for day to day needs and offer valuable social and community benefits (see also Chapter B3, particularly Policy CF.1). Whilst many of the factors that contribute to their closure lie outside the Council's control, where possible their loss should be resisted.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.9</p>
M/B5/69	Para B5.63	<p>Outside the centres identified in the shopping hierarchy the emphasis will be on protecting existing provision. However, there may be opportunities to provide new small-scale local shops or extend existing small shops e.g. in conjunction with new residential or mixed use development.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.9</p>
M/B5/70	New Para	<p>Outside the centres identified in policy S1 and on the Proposals Map there are many small shops spread throughout the District both within the urban areas and in villages. These can often serve day to day needs and offer valuable social and community benefits but a wide range of factors has contributed to a gradual reduction in the number of such units. While most of these factors are beyond the scope of planning powers the Council will seek to encourage the provision of new small shops in suitable cases and will resist the change of use of units with the potential to provide continuing key retail services to their local residential communities. Examples could be a well-located village shop or a unit</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.9</p>

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		capable of serving a large residential area on the edge of a town.	
M/B5/71	Policy S.9	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY S.9</p> <p>Outside the shopping centres defined on the Proposals Map, the change of use of an existing shop (A1 use class) to another use will not be permitted.</p> <p>The development of small scale local shops within the settlements defined in policy SC1 and outside the shopping centres defined on the Proposals Map will be permitted where residential amenity is not adversely affected.</p> <p>Outside the shopping centres defined on the Proposals Map the Council will:</p> <p>a) grant planning permission for the development of appropriately located small-scale local shops within the settlements defined in policy SC.1 provided that there is no adverse effect on residential amenity; and</p> <p>b) refuse planning permission for the change of use of existing buildings in A1 use in cases where these have a realistic potential to perform a continuing key role in meeting the retail needs of the local area in a sustainable manner.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.10

CHAPTER B6 – ENERGY, UTILITIES, HEALTH & SAFETY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B6/1	Para B6.6	PPG 22 states that proposals which aim to utilise renewables should be considered in the context of existing planning policy relating to Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Conservation Areas and related matters, although the possible contribution of the proposal to the reduction in greenhouse gases should be a material consideration. This approach is carried forward in Policy ES.1.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.11
M/B6/2	Para B6.6A	A report entitled 'Renewable Energy Assessment & Targets for the South West' was produced in 2001 by GOSW and provides regional guidance for Local Authorities. The report advises that the south west region should be working towards procuring between 11% and 15% of its electricity from renewable sources by 2010. Where there is the potential for adverse impacts, the significance of these will be weighed against the contribution that will be made to the regional target for renewable energy and the potential economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposed development.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.12
M/B6/3	Policy ES.1	<p align="center">POLICY ES.1</p> <p>Proposals for the utilisation of renewable energy sources will be permitted unless:</p> <p>i)they would have an adverse impact on residential amenities or public health and safety; and</p> <p>ii)they would have an adverse cumulative impact on the environment by reason of proximity to other existing or proposed renewable energy developments.</p> <p>Should the development fall into disuse any structures will be dismantled and the land restored to a beneficial afteruse.</p> <p>Developments that generate energy from renewable sources, including any ancillary infrastructure or buildings, will be assessed against the following criteria.</p> <p>i) any significant conflict with other policies in the plan;</p> <p>ii) the extent to which the design and siting of the development minimises any adverse impacts and, where there is harm and conflict with other policies, whether that harm can be removed at the end of the economic</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.13

CHAPTER B6 – ENERGY, UTILITIES, HEALTH & SAFETY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>life of the development or when it ceases to be used for energy production;</p> <p>iii) the contribution that will be made to the regional target for renewable energy;</p> <p>iv) any wider environmental, social and economic benefits.</p>	
M/B6/4	Para B6.8	<p>Paragraph 4.4 of PPG12 'Development Plans' identifies energy conservation and the efficient use of energy as one of the environmental considerations that development plans should take into account. Section 2 of Quick Guide 4B suggests how buildings can be designed to minimise energy needs. The proposed Design Guide SPD Further could incorporate further guidance on energy efficiency in the design and layout of buildings (see para A4.20).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.14.
M/B6/5	Policy ES.2	<p align="center">POLICY ES.2</p> <p>Development of new buildings or significant refurbishments will only be permitted where the design, orientation, siting and layout of buildings and associated landscape proposals incorporate measures to achieve energy conservation and the protection of environmental resources.</p> <p>Permission for new buildings will be granted only where, within the other constraints on the development, the design, orientation, and layout of the buildings and outside areas have taken into account the need to minimise energy consumption over the lifetime of the development.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.15
M/B6/6	Para B6.14	<p>In instances where the companies are exercising their permitted development rights Circulars 15/92 (all utilities) and 14/90 (electricity) advises them that they should inform both local planning authorities and the public of their intentions and give them the opportunity to comment on proposals. When considering such proposals or applications for other development in proximity to existing utilities infrastructure, the Local Planning Authority will be particularly concerned about residential and visual amenity and, in addition, public safety. It will take advice from the Health and Safety Executive about adequate clearance. In response to public concerns about the effects of electromagnetic fields associated with overhead electricity cables,</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.16

CHAPTER B6 – ENERGY, UTILITIES, HEALTH & SAFETY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the Local Planning authority will, where appropriate, take advice from the National Radiological Protection Board. As in the case of telecommunications proposals, concern can be reduced by the submission of a "Health Radiation Impact Assessment" (H.R.I.A.) with each proposal or application. An H.R.I.A. should provide full and publicly accessible information about the expected electromagnetic radiation from the installation, any cumulative impact, and set out proposals for regular monitoring.</p>	
M/B6/7	Policy ES.3	<p align="center">POLICY ES.3</p> <p>Development by gas and electricity companies which involves the erection or alteration of any machinery, plant, apparatus or building should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. be designed to safeguard the amenities of nearby residents and/or the occupiers or users of neighbouring land; ii. maintain or enhance the visual amenity of the area; and iii. comply with national and European Union guidelines on public exposure to electromagnetic fields. <p>Development in close proximity to existing infrastructure will only be permitted where there is no unacceptable risk to public safety and where appropriate planning conditions will be imposed requiring regular monitoring of microwave radiation.</p> <p>The potential dangers from existing gas and electricity infrastructure will be taken into account in determining applications for other developments. Development will not be permitted where it would increase the number of people exposed to unacceptable risks.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.17
M/B6/8	Para B6.19	<p>There are many opportunities for dealing with surface water drainage in a more sustainable manner rather than the traditional hard sewerage systems. Modern Sustainable Drainage systems (SuDs) can collect all runoff from a development site, storing it in a way that removes sediments which trap pollutants, then releasing them slowly via natural cleaning facilities or local watercourses.</p> <p>SUDs are designed to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of surface water at or close to source, prior to discharge. This minimises pollution discharged into watercourses, and reduces the volume of water discharged to sewers or outfalls, whilst increasing water infiltration to the</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.18

CHAPTER B6 – ENERGY, UTILITIES, HEALTH & SAFETY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		ground and underlying aquifers. Such systems can thus control pollution, reduce flood risk and provide other benefits. Further advice is available from the Environment Agency.	
M/B6/9	Para B6.20	WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE Development may require the provision of new water supply and sewerage infrastructure such as new pipelines, boreholes, or sewage treatment works. These can have a detrimental effect on the environment and such effects need to be carefully examined. Policy ES.6 provides the basis for this assessment but policies on Design, the Built and Historic Environment and the Natural Environment will also be of particular relevance.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.19
M/B6/10	Policy ES.6	POLICY ES.6 Development of water supply and sewerage infrastructure will be permitted unless it will: i) have an unacceptably detrimental impact upon the general amenities of the area; and ii) have an adverse effect on the water environment.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.19
M/B6/11	Para B6.23	Permitted development rights for telecommunications development are reduced or removed in sensitive areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation Areas, as well as for Listed Buildings and scheduled Ancient Monuments. In these cases, or if the proposed development measures more than 15 metres in height, "full" planning permission will be required. Planning applications will be determined in accordance with a range of policies set out in the Plan, including Policy ES.7.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.20
M/B6/12	Para B6.25	PPG 8 recognises that proposals for the location of new masts pose challenges to the protection of Green Belts, high quality landscapes including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the World Heritage Site of Bath. Siting and design are particular concerns. When seeking prior approval or planning permission, telecommunications operators will be required to provide clear evidence both for the need for the installation and also that they have fully explored the options for mast sharing and using existing buildings and other structures. In Green Belt areas new masts may be inappropriate development and very special	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/38) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

CHAPTER B6 – ENERGY, UTILITIES, HEALTH & SAFETY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>circumstances must be demonstrated to justify such a location. For the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty the developer will be expected to show that there are no suitable alternative locations outside these areas. In all these sensitive locations the visual impact of the proposal will be a key factor.</p>	
<p>M/B6/13</p>	<p>Para B6.25B</p>	<p>Concern has been expressed that radiation associated with a proliferation of transmitters could threaten public health. A Government commissioned report published in 2000 concluded that "the balance of evidence indicates that there is no general risk to the health of people living near base stations" but that the possibility of harm could not be ruled out with confidence. The Government accepts that more research is required but it advises that any risk to health should be regulated under Health and Safety legislation rather than by the planning system and therefore in this context the only responsibility of the Planning Authority is to ensure that proposed installations comply with current European Union guidelines on public exposure to electromagnetic fields. The only material consideration for the Planning Authority should be compliance with current European Union guidelines on exposure to electromagnetic fields. Planning applications should therefore include a statement explaining how the proposed installation will comply with the radiation limits recommended by the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) which were adopted by the E.U. Council in 1999.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.21 (incorporating PIC/B/37 as endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report).</p>
<p>M/B6/14</p>	<p>Para B6.25C</p>	<p>Revised PPG8 does, however, acknowledge that in principle, public concern about health can be a material consideration when determining applications for prior approval and planning permission. The Council believes that this concern can be reduced by the submission of a 'Health Radiation Impact Assessment' (H.R.I.A.) with each application. An H.R.I.A. should provide full and publicly accessible information about the expected microwave radiation from the proposed development, cumulative impact and proposals to regularly monitor the equipment following installation. It should also demonstrate how the proposal complies with the Telecommunication Industry's Ten Commandments (its own agreed code of practice).</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.22</p>

CHAPTER B6 – ENERGY, UTILITIES, HEALTH & SAFETY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B6/15	Policy ES.7	<p align="center">POLICY ES.7</p> <p>Telecommunications development which requires planning permission or prior approval will only be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the applicant has demonstrated both the need for the installation and that the possibility of mast sharing, or of erecting equipment on existing buildings or other structures has been fully explored; ii) the equipment or any landscaping requirements associated with the development are sited and designed to minimise the impact upon the amenity, character and appearance of the built and natural environment; iii) the proposals comply with national and European Union guidelines on public exposure to electromagnetic fields; and iv) arrangements are put in place to ensure that, if such development falls into disuse, any structures are removed and the land restored to its condition before development took place or other agreed beneficial use. <p>Planning conditions will be imposed requiring regular monitoring of the microwave radiation emitted from the equipment, where appropriate.</p> <p>Telecommunications development which requires planning permission or prior approval will be permitted provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the applicant has demonstrated a need for the development; ii) the installation has been sited and designed to minimise its environmental impact; iii) the application is accompanied by a certificate confirming that the proposed installation meets the emission guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection; iv) where the development would result in harm or conflict with other policies, the applicant has demonstrated that there are no available alternatives which would be materially less harmful (to include consideration of mast or site sharing, the use of 	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.23

CHAPTER B6 – ENERGY, UTILITIES, HEALTH & SAFETY

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		existing buildings or structures and streetworks installations).	
M/B6/ 16	Policy ES.8	POLICY ES.8 Development will only be permitted where adequate provision is made to accommodate the foreseeable demand for telecommunications services.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.24
M/B6/ 17	Para B6.32	Sewage Treatment Works Sewage treatment works can cause nuisance as a result of smells and noise where they are located near residential or industrial areas. Wessex Water has produced a series of buffer zone maps which define 'Development Restraint Areas' for existing sewage treatment works in which new development could suffer nuisance. These areas are shown on the Proposals Map. Policy ES.11 sets out how development proposals in these areas will be considered.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.25
M/B6/ 18	Policy ES.11	POLICY ES.11 Development will only be permitted in the sewage treatment works development restraint areas shown on the Proposals map where the proposed use would not suffer unacceptable nuisance.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.25
M/B6/ 19	Proposals Map Policy ES.11	<i>Delete the "Sewage Treatment Restraint Areas" from the Proposals Map and amend the Notation Sheet accordingly</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R4.25

CHAPTER B7 – HOUSING

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B7/1	Para B7.4	The Joint replacement Structure Plan (JRSP) reflects this approach (see Quick Guide 3 para 2.12A) in a range of polices.	Quick Guide 3 proposed to be deleted for the sake of consistency with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in her Report to delete other Quick Guides (see para 1.11 of Report). The text is proposed to be included in new para 2.12A.
M/B7/2	Para B7.6	The main aims of the Council's '2001 and future years' Housing Strategy are: set out in Quick Guide 11. Promoting the economy, and tackling poverty; Building a healthier and safer community; and Improving the quality of life and the environment. These complement objectives set out in the Overall Strategy for the Local Plan.	Quick Guide 11 proposed to be deleted for the sake of consistency with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in her Report to delete other Quick Guides (see para 1.11 of Report). The text is proposed to be included in para B7.6.
M/B7/3	Quick Guide 11	Quick Guide 11 Housing Strategy Objectives 1: Promoting the economy, and tackling poverty; 2: Building a healthier and safer community; and 3: Improving the quality of life and the environment	Quick Guide 11 proposed to be deleted for the sake of consistency with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in her Report to delete other Quick Guides (see para 1.11 of Report). The text is proposed to be included in para B7.6.
M/B7/4	Para B7.7	Policy 33 of the adopted JRSP requires that an additional 6,200 6,855 dwellings be provided between 1996 and 2011 through new development and the conversion of existing buildings. This figure represents less than 10% of the total housing stock in 1996, which was of the order of 70,700.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.1
M/B7/5	Policy HG.1	POLICY HG.1 Provision will be made for the construction of 6,200 6,855 dwellings in the period 1996-2011. The provision will incorporate a mix of dwelling size, type, tenure and affordability to meet the needs of specific groups such as the elderly or first time buyers. New housing developments should avoid the creation of large areas of housing of similar characteristics.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.1 and R5.10
M/B7/6	Para 7.11	Changing trends in the composition of households and the types of accommodation required means that up to date assessments of local housing need should be carried out to assist in determining the type and size of additional housing needed in the area. The Council's Housing Survey 2000 gives an	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.31

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		assessment of composition of the current stock and future households. A summary of conclusions is set out in Quick Guide 12.	
M/B7/7	Quick Guide 12	<p>Quick Guide 12 Housing Survey 2000 and West of England Housing Need and Affordability Model 2005 Summary of Conclusion</p> <p>Housing Survey 2000 Suitability of Homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.25% of all surveyed felt that their accommodation was not adequate for their needs • 25% of those who thought the property inadequate said that it needed improvement or repair, (representing about 4,033 properties in all); over 25% (4,099) that it was too small; 12% (1,966) that it was too costly to heat • 14% of households in the area contain someone with a special need, suggesting about 9,400 households in all • 914 households contain someone who is a wheelchair user, but only around 46% of households affected live in an adapted dwelling <p>Housing Need Survey 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See para B7.70 under 'Affordable Homes' section. 	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.31
M/B7/8	Diagram 8:	Delete Diagram 8 'Meeting the Joint Replacement Structure Plan requirement' as set out in Annex 1 appended to this section	This could have been updated to accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.31. It has though been removed to streamline the plan.
M/B7/9	Para B7.14	The West of England Housing Need and Affordability Model 2005 shows that there is a need for an average of 721 affordable homes per annum between 2002-2009 in the District.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.31
M/B7/10	Para B7.15	About three quarters of these will need to be social rented accommodation and a quarter will be able to be in the intermediate housing sector e.g. shared ownership and home buy.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.31
M/B7/11	Para B7.17A	The numbers of elderly people, especially those over 80 years of age, within Bath & North East Somerset is significant and is projected to grow during the Plan period. These households will tend to require smaller dwellings and will also need property that is capable of adaptation, as well as specially	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.4

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		designed forms of accommodation including sheltered housing.	
M/B7/ 12	Para B7.17B	In order to meet the special needs of the households referred to above, policies should address the provision of residential care, nursing and sheltered accommodation and provision of accommodation to meet the general preferences of the elderly, including flats and bungalows. There are significant numbers of elderly people within the District, especially those over 80 years of age. These numbers are projected to grow during the plan period. The mix of dwellings to be provided under Policy HG.1 should include accommodation to meet the needs of the elderly including sheltered housing, flats and bungalows.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.5
M/B7/ 13	Para B7.17C	Accommodation also needs to be provided in order to tackle the problem of homelessness within the District. There is concern regarding the increasing number of homeless households, particularly those including children, living in Bed and Breakfast accommodation. The Council's Strategic Housing Service, in conjunction with other organisations, is seeking to promote alternative solutions and reduce the use of Bed and Breakfast accommodation.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.6
M/B7/ 14	Para B7.17D	In terms of the role of the Local Plan, the provision of affordable housing through Policies HG.8 and HG.9 may help to address homelessness. A variety of forms of temporary accommodation can also provide a preferable alternative, e.g. living over the shop type accommodation, which is encouraged through Policy HG.12. Proposals for purpose built temporary accommodation (e.g. hostels) will be treated on their merits and will be judged against a range of policies in the Plan. The increasing incidence of homelessness within the District will be addressed through the provision of a supply of housing in accordance with regional requirements. This will include a proportion of affordable housing through policies HG.8 and the exceptions policy HG.9, together with residential accommodation over retail units through Policy HG.12. Proposals for temporary accommodation will be assessed against a range of policies in the Plan.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.7
M/B7/ 15	Para B7.18	PPG3 promotes the creation of mixed and inclusive communities which offer a choice of	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.8

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		housing and lifestyle. It advises that policies should ensure that new housing developments help to secure a better social mix by avoiding the creation of large areas of housing of similar characteristics. Policy HG.2 acknowledges this and takes account of the Housing 2000 Survey to secure a better mix of size, type and affordability in both new developments and conversions to meet the changing composition of households in the area. The survey gives an indication of the composition of the existing housing stock in terms of numbers of bedrooms and also the requirements of those wishing to move within the next five years (see tables 2 and 3):	
M/B7/ 16	Tables 2 and 3	<i>Delete Tables 2 and 3 as set out in Annex 2 appended to this section</i>	Proposed modification to delete Tables 2 and 3 arising from recommendation R5.9
M/B7/ 17	Para B7.18A	This indicates a need for new housing to provide a mix of dwelling types and sizes and also that a greater representation of smaller accommodation is needed. This is consistent throughout the District. Other data from the survey shows that for concealed households the greatest need is for 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation with a particularly high need in Bath.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.9
M/B7/ 18	Policy HG.2	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG.2</p> Residential development will be permitted where: 1. it contributes to the provision of a mix of dwelling size, type, tenure and affordability reflecting where possible the identified needs set out in the Plan, and including meeting the needs of specific groups referred to; 2. it avoids the creation or consolidation of large areas of housing of similar size and type, tenure and affordability.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.11
M/B7/ 19	Para B7.19	In the first 7 8 years of the Plan period about 2,870 3,250 dwellings were completed in the District – 1,210–1,382 in Bath, 460 170 in Keynsham, 400 526 in Norton-Radstock and 4,100 1,168 in the rural areas.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.14
M/B7/ 20	Para B7.20	To meet the requirements of the JRSP as carried through in Local Plan policy HG.1 there is a need to identify further sites for about 3,360 3605 new homes in the period to 2003 2004 to 2011.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.14
M/B7/ 21	Para B7.23	The national target for additional homes from brownfield sites and through conversions is	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.12

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION																																
		60% whilst draft Regional Planning Guidance for the South West sets a 50% target. Based on the UHCS it is anticipated that a target for Bath & North East Somerset of 60% 50% is realistic and attainable during the Plan period.																																	
M/B7/ 22	Para B7.24	In meeting the 6,200 6,855 dwelling requirement the capacity of a range of sources has been established in line with the sequential approach to site identification advocated in PPG3.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.14																																
M/B7/ 23	After Para B7.25	<p>Meeting the JRSP Dwelling Requirement</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1. Dwellings completions 1996-2004</td> <td>2,870</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. On large sites (with planning permission)</td> <td>580</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. On large brownfield sites allocated in policy GDS.1</td> <td>1,820</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. On large brownfield windfall sites - Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock & Rural</td> <td>270</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. On small brownfield windfall sites including sub-division of existing residential properties (residential conversion)</td> <td>580</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. From re-use of empty properties. This figure is already allowed for in setting the JRSP requirement and so is not added to the total</td> <td>(90)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. From large greenfield sites allocated in policy GDS.1</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>6,240</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">After allowing for demolitions of 30 the net figure is about</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>6,210</td> </tr> </table> <p>Meeting the JRSP Dwelling Requirement for Bath & North East Somerset 1996-2011 (as at April 2004)</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td>Dwellings completions 1996-2004</td> <td>3,250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td>On large sites (with planning permission)</td> <td>690</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>Requirement from allocated sites listed in Table 3A allocated in policy GDS.1</td> <td>2,115</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.</td> <td>On large brownfield windfall sites - Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock & Rural</td> <td>290</td> </tr> </table>	1. Dwellings completions 1996-2004	2,870	2. On large sites (with planning permission)	580	3. On large brownfield sites allocated in policy GDS.1	1,820	4. On large brownfield windfall sites - Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock & Rural	270	5. On small brownfield windfall sites including sub-division of existing residential properties (residential conversion)	580	6. From re-use of empty properties. This figure is already allowed for in setting the JRSP requirement and so is not added to the total	(90)	7. From large greenfield sites allocated in policy GDS.1	120	TOTAL	6,240	After allowing for demolitions of 30 the net figure is about		TOTAL	6,210	1.	Dwellings completions 1996-2004	3,250	2.	On large sites (with planning permission)	690	3.	Requirement from allocated sites listed in Table 3A allocated in policy GDS.1	2,115	4.	On large brownfield windfall sites - Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock & Rural	290	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.13 and R5.14
1. Dwellings completions 1996-2004	2,870																																		
2. On large sites (with planning permission)	580																																		
3. On large brownfield sites allocated in policy GDS.1	1,820																																		
4. On large brownfield windfall sites - Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock & Rural	270																																		
5. On small brownfield windfall sites including sub-division of existing residential properties (residential conversion)	580																																		
6. From re-use of empty properties. This figure is already allowed for in setting the JRSP requirement and so is not added to the total	(90)																																		
7. From large greenfield sites allocated in policy GDS.1	120																																		
TOTAL	6,240																																		
After allowing for demolitions of 30 the net figure is about																																			
TOTAL	6,210																																		
1.	Dwellings completions 1996-2004	3,250																																	
2.	On large sites (with planning permission)	690																																	
3.	Requirement from allocated sites listed in Table 3A allocated in policy GDS.1	2,115																																	
4.	On large brownfield windfall sites - Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock & Rural	290																																	

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION															
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>5.</td> <td>On small brownfield windfall sites including sub division of existing residential properties (residential conversion)</td> <td>510</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.</td> <td>From re-use of empty properties. This figure is already allowed for in setting the JRSP requirement and so is not added to the total</td> <td>(80)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">TOTAL</td> <td>6,855</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">After allowing for demolitions of 30 the net figure is about</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">TOTAL</td> <td>6,825</td> </tr> </table>	5.	On small brownfield windfall sites including sub division of existing residential properties (residential conversion)	510	6.	From re-use of empty properties. This figure is already allowed for in setting the JRSP requirement and so is not added to the total	(80)	TOTAL		6,855	After allowing for demolitions of 30 the net figure is about			TOTAL		6,825	
5.	On small brownfield windfall sites including sub division of existing residential properties (residential conversion)	510																
6.	From re-use of empty properties. This figure is already allowed for in setting the JRSP requirement and so is not added to the total	(80)																
TOTAL		6,855																
After allowing for demolitions of 30 the net figure is about																		
TOTAL		6,825																
M/B7/ 24	Para B7.27	Sites of 0.5 ha or more or with a dwelling capacity of ten or more are defined as large sites. Large sites which had planning permissions on the 1 st April 2003 2004 are identified on the Proposals Map and together have a capacity of around 580 750 dwellings. Around 340 450 of this total is within Bath and about 220 160 in Norton-Radstock where it represents a substantial existing commitment.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.14															
M/B7/ 25	B7.29	In accordance with the Plan's Overall Strategy Bath offers the greatest potential and sites with a total capacity of about 1,400 dwellings are identified under policy GDS.1 Key among these are large mixed use developments on land at Western Riverside to the west of the City centre and the MoD site at Foxhill. Together these sites are expected to contribute around 1,000 dwellings during the Plan period. Table 3A sets out the dwelling capacity of large previously developed sites allocated in Bath, Keynsham, Norton Radstock and in the Rural Areas.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15															
M/B7/ 26	Para B7.30	At Keynsham there is a limited number of large brownfield sites, primarily the Somerdale factory. At Norton-Radstock the regeneration development of the Radstock railway land site for mixed-use development is integral to the regeneration of Radstock and will contribute around 100 dwellings, although the capacity could be greater at least 50 dwellings during the Plan period but substantially more provided a robust mixed-use scheme is achieved, ecological interests are taken into account, the character of the town is maintained or enhanced and the transport corridor is retained in accordance with Policy GDS.1/NR2 . Development of this	In line with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15															

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		site will have a significant impact on the rest of the town centre. Any proposals coming forward for development on other town centre sites and their relationship with the railway land site will need to be assessed carefully against the Local Plan policy framework. In rural settlements there are few opportunities for sustainable development on brownfield land. Two sites are identified; one at Paulton which utilises former printing work buildings; and one at the Major Existing Developed Site at Chew Stoke (see policy GB.3).	
M/B7/ 27	Para B7.31	PPG3 advises that an allowance should be made for windfall sites which comprise previously developed sites that unexpectedly come forward. Based on assessment of future potential through the UHCS and analysing past trends this source is expected to provide some 270 290 dwellings over the next 8 7 years. Over half of this total is expected to arise within Bath with more limited contributions in the towns and rural areas. Proposals can come forward within the ambit of policies HG.4, 5, and 6. HG.4 and 6	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.14
M/B7/ 28	Para B7.32	An allowance is also made for the contribution that will be made by small windfall sites and residential conversions within the Plan period. These are sites with an area of under 0.5 ha and with a dwellings capacity of under 10. Based on past experience and an assessment of potential an average of around 73 dwellings will be built each year on such sites until 2011. This gives a total of 580 510 and most of these will come forward as infill sites in Bath, the towns and villages, within the ambit of policies HG.3, 4, 5 and 6 HG.4 and 6	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.14
M/B7/ 29	Para B7.35	With more than 200 long term empty properties in the District in 2003 it is clear there is great potential for their re-use to make a significant contribution to the housing stock. The Council is proactively seeking to reduce the number of empty properties and it is estimated that about 90 80 (11 per year) can be brought back into use by 2011.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.14
M/B7/ 30	Para B7.36	Whilst the emphasis is the use of previously developed sites there is insufficient supply from such sources to meet the Structure Plan dwelling requirement. Table 3A sets out the dwelling capacity of greenfield allocated in Bath, Keynsham, Norton Radstock and in the Rural Areas.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15
M/B7/ 31	Para B7.37	In Bath there is limited capacity for greenfield development because of character and Green	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		Belt constraints. One site is identified which is carried forward from the previous local plan after assessment against PPG3 sustainability criteria. The site in the Bailbrook area has a capacity of about 20 dwellings. Requirements needed to bring the site forward are set out in policy GDS.1.	
M/B7/ 32	Para B7.40	With considerable existing housing commitments the priority in Norton Radstock is to promote additional economic development. Only two greenfield housing sites are identified, these being at Folly Hill, Chilcompton Road and Kilmersdon Road, Haydon, both of which carry a forward previous commitment. Policy GDS.1 sets out site requirements to enable development.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15
M/B7/ 33	Para B7.41	In accordance with JRSP policy 2(h) only limited development is anticipated in rural areas aimed at maintaining economic and social vitality of rural areas. Policy SC.1 defines a number of villages (R1 villages) as having the existing social and physical infrastructure to enable them to successfully absorb limited new development in this way.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15
M/B7/ 35	Para B7.42	The scope for development varies depending on the circumstances of each village but in all cases the aim has been to allocate sites which are well related to existing development, compatible with village character and which meet other environmental and functional criteria.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15
M/B7/ 36	Para B7.43	In addition to the brownfield sites allocated at Paulton and Chew Stoke, greenfield sites are identified in Policy GDS.1 at Batheaston, and High Littleton.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.15
M/B7/ 37	New Table after Para B7.43	<i>New Table 3A of sites allocated in Policy GDS.1 is set out in Annex 3 appended to this section</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.3
M/B7/ 38	Para B7.45A	Whilst the development of sites allocated under Policy GDS.1 provides the main opportunity to influence the phasing of development in order to achieve the priority set out in PPG3, this is not considered to be necessary. Seven years of the Plan period have elapsed and in addition only five greenfield sites are allocated for development under Policy GDS.1. Of these, four are well advanced in the planning application process. It is unlikely that that development of the remaining greenfield site would prejudice the implementation of the allocated brownfield sites.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.20

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B7/ 39	Para B7.45B	<p>The development of both brownfield and greenfield sites will be carefully monitored to assess whether the phasing objectives are being achieved and that a continuing supply of housing land is coming forward.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.20
M/B7/ 40	Para B7.56	<p>Urban Areas and R.1 Settlements</p> <p>Paras B7.31 – B7.34 above recognise that not all brownfield sites, both large and small, can be accurately identified and allowances are made for the contribution that will be made as windfall sites. Large site opportunities are most likely to emerge in Bath but some opportunities could arise in Keynsham and Norton Radstock and in the 13 R.1 villages identified in policy SC.1. In the R.1 villages such opportunities are likely to be more limited, but may help to maintain social and economic vitality of the rural areas and contribute towards meeting affordable housing needs (see paras B7.68-7.82A). Small windfall sites through development of infill plots and through conversion or sub-divisions can also make a valuable contribution to meeting housing needs in all of these settlements.</p> <p>Urban areas and R.1 and R.2 Settlements</p> <p>The allowance for windfall development to meet the strategic housing requirement is based on the redevelopment of previously developed land in accordance with Government advice. However, windfalls may also occur on sites which were not previously developed, subject to the other policies of the plan which seek to protect greenfield sites which are, for example, in use for recreation or as allotments, or which are of amenity or nature conservation importance. Large site opportunities are most likely to emerge in Bath but some may also arise in Keynsham and Norton Radstock and the 13 R.1 villages identified in policy SC.1. Opportunities are likely to be more limited in the 8 villages identified as R.2 settlements.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.22
M/B7/ 41	Para B7.57	<p>The scale and location of such schemes is critical to ensure that they can be satisfactorily integrated into the pattern of the settlement, taking account of local character and distinctiveness of the City, town or village.</p> <p>Windfall developments in the R.1 and R.2 villages may help to maintain the social</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.22

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		and economic vitality of the rural areas to contribute towards meeting affordable housing needs. However, the scale and location of such schemes is critical to ensure that they can be satisfactorily integrated into the pattern of the settlement, taking account of local character and distinctiveness of the settlement. To ensure that any windfall development is in keeping with the character of the settlement, and to prevent unsustainable patterns of development, a scheme will not be permitted unless it is appropriate to the scale of the settlement in terms of the availability of facilities and employment opportunities, and accessibility to public transport.	
M/B7/ 42	Para B7.59	At Keynsham, Norton-Radstock and R.1 and R.2 villages housing development boundaries (HDBs) are defined on the Proposals Map within which residential schemes will generally be acceptable provided they accord with other policies of the Plan. They define the limits for residential development during the Plan period. They also enable areas to be retained for other uses such as employment, recreation or community uses in order to help sustain balanced communities as well as protecting the surrounding countryside.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.23
M/B7/ 43	Policy HG.4	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG.4</p> <p>Residential development in Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock and those villages defined in Policy SC.1 as R.1 settlements will be permitted if:</p> <p>i) it is on previously developed land and</p> <p>i) it is lies within the built up area of Bath or within the defined housing development boundary; or</p> <p>ii) it forms an element of;</p> <p>a) a comprehensive scheme for a major mixed use site defined in Policy GDS.1; or</p> <p>(b) a scheme coming forward under Policies ET.1C, ET.1D or 3A. ET. 2 (2&3), ET.3(3);</p> <p>iii) and it is appropriate to the scale of the settlement in terms of the availability of facilities and employment opportunities and accessibility to public transport.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.21
M/B7/	Policy	<i>Modify the Proposals Map to include the</i>	To accord with the Inspector's

CHAPTER B7 – HOUSING

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
44	HG.4 Proposals Map	<i>garden of 43 Bath Road, Clandown together with the dwellings and their curtilages to the north west in the HDB</i>	recommendation R5.25
M/B7/45	Policy HG.4 Proposals Map	<i>Modify the Proposals Map to include allocated land at Coomb End Radstock in the HDB.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.25
M/B7/46	Policy HG.4 Proposals Map	<i>Modify the Proposals Map to include land to R/O 45 Millards Hill, Welton within the HDB.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R8.6
M/B7/47	Policy HG.4 Proposals Map	<i>Include land between Wellow Lane and the bypass, Peasedown St John (allocated under Policy GDS) in the HDB</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.25 & R8.8
M/B7/48	Policy HG.4 Proposals Map	<i>Modify the Proposals Map to follow the boundary of the Green Belt and to include land to the south east at Whitchurch in the HDB</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.25
M/B7/49	Para B7.61	In the 8 villages identified in SC.1 as R.2 settlements housing schemes are limited to small groups of dwellings or infilling of brownfield sites within the limits of development in order to maintain village character and prevent unsustainable patterns of development. In practice the scope for future development in these villages is very limited and areas within which schemes may be acceptable are defined on the Proposals Map by an HDB. Reference also needs to be made to other relevant local plan policies, particularly policies ET.1(A-D) and CF.1 and the need for careful design and protection of environment.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.27

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B7/ 50	Policy HG.5	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG.5</p> <p>Residential development in those villages defined as R.2 settlements in policy SC.1 will be permitted if</p> <p>i) it is on previously developed land; and</p> <p>ii) it is infilling or limited to a small group of dwellings, or represents the sub-division of an existing dwelling or its replacement within the same site, or it involves the conversion of a non-residential building; and</p> <p>iii) it lies within the defined housing development boundary.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.27
M/B7/ 51	Policy HG.6	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG.6</p> <p>Residential development in those villages defined as R.3 settlements in policy SC.1 will be permitted if</p> <p>i) it is on previously developed land; and</p> <p>ii) i) it is infilling, or represents the sub-division of an existing dwelling or its replacement within the same site, or it involves the conversion of a non-residential building; and</p> <p>iii) ii) it lies within the defined housing development boundary.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.28
M/B7/ 52	New Para B7.67A	<p>Net site density includes only those areas which will be developed for housing and directly associated uses such as access roads within the site, private garden space, car parking areas, incidental open space and landscaping and children's playing space where it is to be provided. It excludes major distributor roads, primary schools, open spaces serving a wider area, significant landscaped areas, wooded areas and significant hedgerows.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.30
M/B7/ 53	Policy HG.7	<p style="text-align: center;">Policy HG.7</p> <p>Within settlements defined under policy SC.1 residential development will not be permitted unless the minimum net site density is 30 dwellings to the hectare or greater except where:</p> <p>i) local distinctiveness and character of the area would be adversely affected; or</p> <p>ii) the amenity of existing residents or future occupants would be adversely affected.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.29

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Residential development will only be permitted where the maximum density compatible with the site, its location, its accessibility and its surroundings is achieved. Densities in excess of 30 dwellings per hectare will be expected in order to maximise the use of housing sites.</p> <p>Densities in excess of 50 dwellings per hectare will be encouraged in appropriate, well accessed, locations.</p>	
<p>M/B7/ 54</p>	<p>Policy HG.7A</p>	<p>Policy HG.7A Residential development with a net site density of 50 dwellings to the hectare or greater will be permitted where it:</p> <p>i) meets the requirements of HG.7; and</p> <p>ii) contributes to a more sustainable pattern of development by being at a location with</p> <p>a) good public transport accessibility; and</p> <p>b) good access by means other than the private car to employment and other important facilities</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.29</p>
<p>M/B7/ 55</p>	<p>Quick Guide 13</p>	<p>Quick Guide 13 Residential Density</p> <p>Net site density includes only those areas which will be developed for housing and directly associated uses which will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access roads within the site; • private garden space; • car parking areas; • incidental open space and landscaping; and • children's playing space where it is to be provided. <p>It excludes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • major distributor roads; • primary schools; <p>open spaces serving a wider area; significant landscaped areas; wooded areas and significant hedgerows.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.30</p> <p>It is incorporated as new para. B7.67a.</p>
<p>M/B7/ 56</p>	<p>Para B7.69</p>	<p>Housing Survey 2000-2005</p> <p>In order to assess need the Council carried out a detailed affordable housing survey needs study in 2000 2005 – The West of</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32</p>

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>England Housing Need and Affordability Model 2005 (WEHNAM). The study's key objective was to identify and assess the full range of housing need within the District and the need for affordable housing over the next five years the affordable housing need in each District within the West of England area (consisting of Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Unitary Authorities), the proportion of different tenures required to meet this need and the dwelling size mix required. It covers the period 2002-2009.</p>	
<p>M/B7/ 57</p>	<p>Para B7.70</p>	<p>For Bath & North East Somerset its its main conclusions were are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 1.4.99 there were 2,428 households on the Common Housing Register (waiting list) and it was estimated that in addition 290 homeless households would need housing per annum. • In addition there are 2,925 concealed households (households living within an existing household e.g. young people wishing to set up their own homes). • Of the 2,925 concealed households only 775 (26%) earn over £20,000 and 60% have annual incomes below £17,500 and there is a need for affordable rented housing for a large number of such households. • The average price paid by first time buyers in 1999 was £70,958 with average annual incomes of £23,503, and there is a considerable under supply of affordable properties for households on incomes of £20,000 or below. • Between 2002-2009 an average of 721 affordable homes per annum required. This is 5,047 over the seven year period. • 76% of the need is for social rented sector accommodation and 24% for the intermediate sector. • Affordability is generally more difficult in Bath & North East Somerset than in the West of England as a whole. Between 2002-2009 only an average of 	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32</p>

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>36% of new households per annum are able to buy their homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordability is most acute in Bath, followed by Keynsham & Saltford area. • House prices in Bath are higher with the threshold house price¹ for a 2 bedroom house estimated to be about £136,500 in 2006. • Nearly half the overall net need in Bath & North East Somerset is concentrated in Bath (401 homes per annum) with the next highest in the Norton-Radstock and surrounding parishes area (184 homes per annum). In all identified zones (Bath, Keynsham & Saltford, Norton-Radstock & surrounding wards, and remaining rural areas) net need exceeds projected new dwellings. • Relet rates are generally low in the District at 565 in 2006, with 373 of these in Bath. • Newly forming households unable to afford to buy are the dominant group contributing to needs in the District (867 in 2006). Meeting the backlog of need is highest in Bath (173 in 2006). • In Bath social rented needs proportionally are skewed towards smaller 1 bedroom accommodation. In the other areas there is a more even spread across the size range. Intermediate sector need is generally skewed towards 1 and 2 bedroom units. • Need exceeds dwelling growth by a considerable margin. <p>Threshold house prices are based on the ability to afford lower quartile house prices from the Land Registry, adjusted for size, against an income based on a leading multiplier of 3.5 for a single earner and 0.85 x 3.5 for two earners, subject to test that residual income after housing costs exceeds 120% of Housing Benefit Applicable Amount.</p>	
M/B7/ 58	Para B7.71	<p>The survey concluded that the private rented sector makes little contribution to meeting the need for affordable homes. Rental levels</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		would not be affordable to many concealed households unless they contribute a very high proportion of their disposable income.	
M/B7/ 59	Para B7.72	After excluding concealed households which can afford to purchase a dwelling and those on the waiting list and making a discount for two person households the affordable concealed need is 1,554 in 1999. Taking account of those on the Common Housing Register, homeless, the re-lets available from the current stock, and projections for population growth, the affordable housing need at April 2006 is estimated to be 1,732. This excludes 935 households planning to leave the area because of a lack of affordable housing.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32
M/B7/ 60	Para B7.73	As a result of the relationship between house prices and wages in the area all of these will need to be subsidised housing. As well as rented accommodation, this The major proportion of the identified need is for social rented sector accommodation but the intermediate sector is also expected to contribute to meeting needs. This could include shared-ownership equity dwellings where the occupant part-owns and part-rents a new the property from a registered social landlord, and Homebuy which is a scheme where the occupant purchases the greatest share of a second hand dwelling using an 'equity loan mechanism' to cover the remainder. Self build housing may be considered as a form of affordable housing if it can be secured as affordable in perpetuity. In addition there is scope for a limited number of low cost market dwellings to meet the needs of those concealed households which are able to access the housing market. However, the affordability of low cost market dwellings will be dependent upon the relationship between household income and local house prices, which can vary considerably over time. Self-build housing may be considered as a form of affordable housing if it can be secured as affordable in perpetuity.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32
M/B7/ 61	Para B7.74	Based on the income/dwelling price relationship affordable housing for the purpose of policy HG.8 is defined as: "the range of both subsidised and market housing homes that will be available for those whose incomes generally deny them the opportunity to purchase or rent houses on the	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		open market as a result of the local relationship between income and market price".	
M/B7/ 62	Para B7.75	In terms of the type of accommodation needed the 2005 Study shows a strong need for smaller 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation (35% and 37% respectively). Table 3A shows the variations by sub areas with, for example, proportionally greater needs for 1 bedroom accommodation in Bath and 2 bedrooms in the Keynsham area preferred by concealed households there was a strong demand (57%) for small accommodation, especially flats, reflecting the predominance of single people or childless couples. 83% prefer small units with one or two bedrooms, although this varies across the District.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32
M/B7/ 63	New Table after Para B7.75	<i>New Table 3B of Size Mix of Affordable housing Need set out in Annex 4 appended to this section</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.32
M/B7/ 64	Para B7.76	Government advice in PPG3 states that where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable homes on suitable developments. In line with this and JRSP Policy 35 an element of affordable homes will be sought on suitable sites in Bath, Keynsham, Norton Radstock, rural settlements and elsewhere, both those allocated in Policy GDS.1 and windfalls. where planning permission is sought for development including the provision of dwellings on any suitable sites in settlements identified within policy SC.1.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 65	Para B7.77	The selection of suitable sites depends on a number of factors including the proximity of local services and facilities, access to public transport; whether there will be particular costs associated with development of the site; whether the provision of affordable housing would prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives that need to be given priority in development of the sites; and distribution of need for affordable homes.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33 Consult Housing Services
M/B7/ 66	Para B7.78	A target of 5,047 additional affordable homes for the 2002-2009 period represents more than the residual large site housing requirement at 1.4.2002. It will not therefore be possible to meet the projected needs even allowing for registered social landlord	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		provision through conversions or purchase.	
M/B7/ 67	Para B7.79	Policy HG.8 is supported by Supplementary Planning Guidance, which gives more detail in terms of the proportion of affordable homes that will be sought on sites falling within the thresholds set out below. The percentage figure is based on the most recent Housing Needs Survey and, if necessary, will be amended to reflect the findings of future Surveys. Developers are encouraged to contact the Local Planning Authority in order to discuss affordable housing requirements at the earliest possible stage.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 68	Para B7.80	Government guidance on site size thresholds on which an element of affordable housing can be sought is set out in Circular 06/98 on Planning and Affordable Housing. Restricting provision in the urban areas and larger villages to sites of 25 or more dwellings or 1 ha or more, as set out in the Circular, would further diminish potential supply.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 69	Para B7.80A	However, Circular 06/98 (paragraph 10)e) also advises that Local Planning Authorities outside London may require contributions towards affordable homes on developments of 15 dwellings or more, or on residential sites of 0.5 ha or more, if this can be justified by exceptional circumstances. Given the level of need for affordable homes in the District, and taking account of the need to consider issues of site suitability and viability, it is justifiable to set a threshold at this level on sites that are allocated or that come forward as windfalls in Bath, Keynsham, Norton Radstock, Salford, Peasedown St. John and Paulton.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 70	Para B7.81	For the same reasons, in smaller villages with a population of less than 3,000, where there will be more limited opportunities, the site threshold will be residential developments of 10 or more dwellings or residential sites of 0.5 ha or more. The same threshold will apply to windfall sites coming forward outside settlements defined in Policy SC.1. On-site provision will be a priority in all cases where an affordable homes contribution is sought. However, in exceptional circumstances the Council will consider off-site provision.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 71	Para B7.82	In Bath this should deliver around 570 affordable homes, in Keynsham 30, in Norton Radstock 110 and around 90 in rural villages. These figures take account of residential development coming forward on sites allocated in Policy GDS.1, windfall sites and	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		sites with an outstanding planning permission at April 2003.	
M/B7/ 72	Para B7.82A	Prior to granting planning permission, the Council will wish to satisfy itself that the affordable homes will be occupied initially and in perpetuity by people who in the first instance are in need of such accommodation and are either already a resident of, or have strong local connections with, the District. Being employed within the District will be considered to represent a strong local connection and will enable key workers to access affordable accommodation. Examples of arrangements to ensure that these requirements are met are given in para B7.89 below.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 73	New Para B7.76A	It would not be possible to provide 4795 additional affordable homes for the period 2002-2009 (the need suggested by WEHNAM) because this represents substantially more than the residual housing requirement for the remainder of the plan period. It will therefore not be possible to meet the projected needs even allowing for registered social landlord provision through conversions or purchase of existing dwellings. However, the Council will seek to negotiate to ensure that 35% of all new permitted dwellings are within the affordable category. Developers are advised to take this level of provision into account in negotiating the purchase of sites for development. It will normally be considered that provision of affordable dwellings will be about 75% social rented and 25% intermediate forms of ownership. In certain cases a limited number of low-cost market homes for purchase may be appropriate, provided that there are mechanisms for preserving their affordability in perpetuity, but this will depend on the relationship between local house prices and local incomes of those in need of affordable housing.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 74	New Para B7.76B	The 35% target will be regarded as an average proportion to be achieved across all sites granted permission from now until the end of the plan period. The Council will take account of any abnormal site costs associated with the development which may justify an upwards or downwards adjustment of the average. Standard development costs will not generally be considered as	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>abnormal. Account will also be taken of the proximity of local services, and facilities, access to public transport, the distribution of need for affordable housing, and whether or not the provision of affordable housing would prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives that need to be given priority in a particular case. It will normally be expected that such affordable dwellings will be provided on-site in order to help create balanced communities, but in very exceptional circumstances the Council will consider provision in lieu through a financial contribution towards affordable housing on an alternative site within the District.</p>	
M/B7/ 75	New Para B7.76C	<p>In view of the overall level of need for affordable housing in the District revealed by WEHNAM the Council considers it appropriate to seek the provision of affordable dwellings on any site where planning permission is sought for a minimum of 15 dwellings (or on a site of a minimum of 0.5ha) in Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock, Saltford, Peasedown St John and Paulton.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 76	New Para B7.76D	<p>For the same reason the Council considers it appropriate to seek the provision of affordable dwellings on any site where planning permission is sought for a minimum of 10 dwellings (or on a site of a minimum of 0.5ha) in all smaller villages with populations of fewer than 3000, including those not identified in policy SC.1.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 77	New Para B7.76E	<p>It is expected that this policy will result in delivery of about 310-360 affordable homes in Bath, 210-260 in Keynsham, 105 in Norton-Radstock and around 145-215 in rural villages.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 78	New Para B7.76F	<p>Before granting planning permission for any affordable housing the Council will require suitable arrangements to be in place to secure the occupation of the dwellings both initially and in perpetuity by people with a genuine need for such accommodation who are either already resident in the District or have strong connections with it, such as locally employed key workers. Some examples of appropriately secure arrangements are given at para B7.89 below."</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B7/ 79	New Para B7.76G	<p>The Council will keep the need for affordable housing under review, together with the progress made towards achieving the level of provision expected under this policy. If justified by the evidence, an early review of the policy will be made with a view to introducing changes using the opportunities presented by the procedures for local development documents under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.”</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.33
M/B7/ 80	Policy HG.8	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG.8</p> <p>Based on the findings of the most recent Housing Needs Survey, a significant proportion of affordable homes will be sought within the scope of Policy GDS.1, where any residential development is proposed, and on all other sites falling within the site size thresholds set out in the Local Plan, taking account of the site's suitability in terms of:</p> <p>The Council will seek to secure the provision of 35% affordable housing before determining applications for planning permission in the following circumstances:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in Bath, Keynsham, Norton-Radstock, Saltford, Peasedown St John and Paulton where permission is sought for 15 dwellings or more or the site has an area of 0.5ha or more; and • in settlements where the population is 3000 or below, where permission is sought for 10 dwellings or more or the site has an area of 0.5ha or more. <p>Higher or lower percentages may be sought in individual cases, taking account of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) the proximity of local services and facilities and access to public transport; ii) whether there are abnormally high costs associated with development of the site; iii) whether it would prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives that need to be given priority in development of the site; and iv) distribution of need <p>Where provision of an element of affordable housing is justified residential development</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.34</p> <p>Consult Housing Services</p>

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>will only be permitted where:</p> <p>Before planning permission is granted under this policy secure arrangements will need to be in place to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) occupancy of the affordable housing is restricted to people who are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) in need of such accommodation due to their inability to compete successfully in the local housing market; and b) in need of separate accommodation and are either currently living in or have strong local connections with the District such as local employment; ii) the benefits of the affordable housing will be enjoyed by successive as well as initial occupiers; and iii) the affordable housing is integrated with general needs housing in such a way that it secures a mix of dwelling size, type and affordability on the site. <p>The Council will keep under review the need for affordable housing and the provision achieved under this policy and, if appropriate, will bring forward an early review of the matter.</p>	
<p>M/B7/ 81</p>	<p>Para B7.83</p>	<p>Where there are genuine difficulties in securing an adequate supply of affordable housing to meet local needs in rural areas, PPG3 foresees Local Plan policies being drawn up to allow the release of small sites where housing will not normally be permitted. Policy 35 of the JRSP carries forward this advice.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36</p>
<p>M/B7/ 82</p>	<p>Para B7.84</p>	<p>It is envisaged that some local needs housing will be met within the terms of policies GDS.1 and HG.4, 5, and 6. However, the 2000 Housing Survey shows a need for around 380 affordable homes in rural areas by 2005. Completions of affordable homes in rural areas on non-exceptions sites since 1999, together with that being sought on sites allocated in policy GDS.1 and expected contribution from large windfall sites, amounts to a total of around 110 80 dwellings. Therefore particular needs which cannot be met under these policies may justify the release of other land in special circumstances and this eventuality is allowed in policy HG.9.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36</p>

CHAPTER B7 – HOUSING

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B7/ 83	Para B7.85	Such releases are limited to villages classed in policy SC.1 as R1, R2 & R3 settlements. In sensitive Green Belt locations only very limited provision will be considered provided it is consistent with the function of the Green Belt.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36
M/B7/ 84	Para B7.86	Other small settlements, hamlets or small groups of dwellings are unsuitable for such provision because of the impact on the character of the countryside, and/or openness of the Green Belt and it would be contrary to sustainability objectives.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36
M/B7/ 85	Para B7.87	In villages, particularly around Bath, the ability of those on the Common Housing Register and concealed households to purchase property is very limited because of the high cost of such properties. This applies even to small flats or terraced houses. There is also a relative scarcity of flats. In addition low cost market housing is inappropriate on rural exceptions sites due to the difficulty of safeguarding such housing as low cost in perpetuity through the planning system. In these circumstances housing for rent or purchase will need to be subsidised and the definition of affordable housing for rural exceptions sites is as follows: <i>(italicised quote relocated and incorporated in new text below)</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36
M/B7/ 86	Para B7.88	Under the special arrangements set out in HG.9 the Council will wish to be satisfied that there is a demonstrable local need for affordable housing. Evidence of this will be expected to be forthcoming from the Local Authority's own Common Housing Register and from detailed surveys to be carried out by Parish Councils or other recognised bodies in co-operation with Bath & North East Somerset Housing Services.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36
M/B7/ 87	New Para B7.76H	Recent amended advice in PPG3 is that all local authorities that include rural areas should include a 'rural exception site policy' in the relevant development plan document. This is to enable the allocation or release of small sites which would not otherwise be released for housing to provide affordable housing to meet local needs in perpetuity on sites within and adjoining existing small rural communities.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36
M/B7/ 88	New Para B7.76I	The Council recognises that there is only limited scope to satisfy rural-based needs	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		for affordable housing through the operation of policy HG.8, yet WEHNAME identifies a need for 847 affordable homes in rural areas between 2002 and 2009. It will therefore give sympathetic consideration under policy HG.9 to schemes designed to meet local needs generated within rural communities under the terms of PPG3 and demonstrated to be required through specific needs data compiled in cooperation with the Council's Housing Services.	
M/B7/ 89	New Para B7.76J	The definition of affordable housing for rural exceptions sites will be taken to be <i>"... that provided, with subsidy, for people who are unable to resolve their housing needs in the private sector market because of the local relationship between housing costs and incomes."</i> (italicised quote relocated from para B7.87)	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36
M/B7/ 90	Para B7.90	<i>Para B7.90 relocated after New Para B7.76J</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36 (no change to text)
M/B7/ 91	New Para B7.76K	However, such schemes will be limited to villages classed R1, R2 and R3 under policy SC.1. Smaller settlements will be considered unsuitable on sustainability grounds. In considering any schemes within the green belt the Council will require sites to be selected that have the minimum possible impact on the purposes of the Green Belt.	
M/B7/ 92	Para B7.89	<i>Para B7.89 relocated after New Para B7.76K</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36 (no change to text)
M/B7/ 93	New Para B7.91A	As the potential for positive 'allocation' of such sites was introduced into PPG3 at a very late stage in the evolution of the local plan this possible avenue of provision will not be considered until the affordable housing policies are reviewed through a local development document.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.36
M/B7/ 94	Policy HG.9	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG.9</p> <p>As an exception, residential development will be permitted on land outside the scope of policies GDS.1, HG.4, HG.5, HG.6 and HG.10 to meet a demonstrable and particular need for affordable housing that cannot be met in any other way, provided that:</p> <p>i) the local need is genuine, and arises and is capable of being met</p> <p>(a) within an individual parish; or</p> <p>(b) within a group of parishes well</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.35

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>related to the proposed scheme;</p> <p>ii) the occupancy of such housing shall be restricted to:</p> <p>(a) as a first priority, people who are currently living in, and who are long-standing residents of, the parish or group of parishes and who are in need of separate accommodation, or</p> <p>(b) as a second priority, people who are not resident in, but who have strong local connections with, the parish or group of parishes;</p> <p>iii) its benefits in meeting local needs are retained in perpetuity by restricting occupancy</p> <p>(a) in line with (ii); and</p> <p>(b) to people in need of such accommodation due to their inability to compete successfully in the local housing market.</p> <p>As an exception to the other housing policies of the plan, residential development of 100% affordable housing will be permitted on land outside the scope of those other policies if it will meet a particular demonstrable need for local affordable housing arising in an individual rural parish or group of parishes which cannot be met in any other way, provided that:</p> <p>occupancy of the housing is restricted in perpetuity as being for the benefit of people in need of the accommodation because of their inability to complete successfully in the local housing market who are either:</p> <p>as a first priority, currently living in the parish or group of parishes as long-standing residents and are in need of separate accommodation, or</p> <p>as a second priority, not resident in the parish or group of parishes but have strong local connections with it/them; and</p> <p>iv) the development is limited to villages defined in policy SC.1 as R1, R2 & R3 settlements;</p> <p>v) the development comprises a small group of dwellings within or adjoining the built up area of the village well related to existing developments and surrounding uses and</p>	

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>which would not adversely affect the character of the village; and</p> <p>vi) it is consistent with the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>in the case of a proposed development at a Green Belt village, the site has been selected to cause the minimum possible harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt</p>	
M/B7/ 95	Policy HG.10	<p>POLICY HG.10</p> <p>Outside the scope of policies HG.4, 5, and 6 HG 4, 6 and 9 new dwellings will not be permitted unless they are essential for agricultural or forestry workers.....</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.37
M/B7/ 96	Para B7.112	<p>Parking provision will be considered in the context of policy T.27 T.26 having regard to accessibility to local facilities and availability of public transport and other transport modes. Schemes involving retail premises will also be assessed against policies S.5, S.8 and S.9.</p>	A non-material change arising since the Inquiry.
M/B7/ 97	Para B7.118	<p>Within the urban area and villages defined in policy SC.1, proposals for the replacement of dwellings, because of dereliction or some other reason, would be considered within the context of policies HG.4, 5 or and 6. Policy HG.14 lays down criteria for considering proposals for replacing or rebuilding existing dwellings outside such settlements where there is normally a presumption against new dwellings (see HG.10).</p>	This is not a modification recommended by the inspector
M/B7/ 98	Policy HG.14	<p>POLICY HG.14</p> <p>Outside the scope of policies HG.4, 5 and 6 permission will only be given for:</p> <p>i) the rebuilding or replacement of an existing but substandard dwelling where the size of the replacement or reconstructed dwelling would not have a materially greater impact on the countryside or openness of the Green Belt than the dwelling to be replaced; or</p> <p>ii) the rebuilding or replacement of other existing dwellings, where the replacement or reconstructed dwelling and ancillary buildings would not be materially larger than, and would not have a materially greater impact on the countryside or openness of the Green Belt, than that to be replaced; and</p> <p>iii) ii) the creation or extension of any residential curtilage would not detract from rural character nor conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.38.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B7/ 99	Para B7.119	The 1991–2001 Census recorded about 240 270 households living in caravans, mobile homes or other non-permanent accommodation, representing approximately 0.4% of the District's total households. Most are living on sites at Claverton Down-Bath, Batheaston, Corston, Dunkerton, Keynsham and Whitchurch. JRSP policy 36 recognises that this form of accommodation can contribute to housing needs and intends that development proposals should be treated neither more nor less favourably than other kinds of schemes. This follows the advice of PPG3. Proposals will therefore be considered in the context of HG.4-6 and other relevant policies.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3
M/B7/ 100	Para B7.122	Therefore in considering proposals for permanent residential moorings a range of Local Plan policies will apply. Proposals for permanent residential moorings will be subject to Policy HG 14A, and other relevant policies of the Local Plan.	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.39
M/B7/ 101	New Policy	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG. 14A</p> <p>Residential moorings in Bath, Keynsham, Norton Radstock and those villages defined in policy SC.1 as R.1, R.2 and R.3 settlements will be permitted if the site is:</p> <p>i) within the built up area of Bath or within a defined housing development boundary; or</p> <p>ii) within an established boatyard or marina; and in all cases</p> <p>provided the location has good access to services and facilities including employment opportunities and accessibility to public transport.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.40
M/B7/ 102	Policy HG.16	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY HG.16</p> <p>Proposals to provide sites, including mixed-use sites, for use by gypsies who reside in or resort to Bath & North East Somerset will be permitted on land outside the scope of policies GDS.1 and HG.4,-5 & 6 provided that:</p> <p>i) the proposal is for permanent residential use or mixed use and has reasonable access to local community facilities and services;</p> <p>ii) there is no conflict with agricultural interests;</p> <p>iii) adequate services are provided;</p> <p>iv) effective provision is made for preventing pollution of adjacent land and</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.41

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>watercourses and storing and collecting waste;</p> <p>v) adequate access is provided and no serious highway problems would result; and</p> <p>vi) vehicle movements, noise, fumes and business activities would not cause any substantiated effect on the amenity of adjacent uses or the character of the area.</p> <p>i) the site has good access to local services, facilities and public transport;</p> <p>ii) it has safe and convenient access to the road network;</p> <p>iii) it is capable of being landscaped to ensure that it blends in with its surroundings;</p> <p>iv) adequate services including foul and surface water drainage and waste disposal can be provided;</p> <p>v) there would be no harmful impact on the amenities of local residents by reason of noise or fumes from business activities.</p>	
M/B7/ 103	Policy HG.17	<p>POLICY HG.17</p> <p>Development of student accommodation will be permitted where:</p> <p>(i) it is on previously-developed land or other land allocated for the purpose;</p> <p>(ii) there is good accessibility to the campus and to other services and facilities by modes of transport other than the private car; and</p> <p>(iii) it lies either:</p> <p>(a) within the built up area of Bath or within the defined housing development boundary for the urban areas of Keynsham and Norton-Radstock; or</p> <p>(b) within the Bath Spa University College Newton Park Major Existing Developed Site as defined in policy GB.3; or</p> <p>(c) within the Eastern part of University of Bath campus, Claverton Down, as defined in Policy GDS.1. within the areas identified for development for student accommodation in the university of Bath master plan (see Policy GDS.1/B11).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.42 and R9.6
M/B7/ 104	Para B7.134	Current proposals set out in the University's Masterplan increase academic, sporting and student accommodation on campus providing	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.5

CHAPTER B7 – HOUSING

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>an additional 950 student bedrooms. This together with other accommodation within the City recently given planning permission should meet current needs.</p>	
M/B7/ 105	Para B7.134A	<p>However, the University needs to further expand in order to meet government priorities and objectives for higher education, including widening participation, increasing the recruitment of overseas students and taking a greater role in regional economic development. In addition there is an opportunity to build on the University's status as a major centre for sporting excellence, including developing an allied academic School of Sport. Therefore, there will be a need for further student accommodation beyond that outlined in the Masterplan and policy GDS.1 allocates land to help meet both student and academic needs on campus.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.5.
M/B7/ 106	B7.138	<p>In this context any proposals will be assessed against a range of policies in the Local Plan which seek, for example, to protect existing employment uses (ET.1A-D) (ET.1 ET.2 and ET.3) or residential accommodation (HG.13).</p>	Consequence of according with R2.4
M/B7/ 107	New Para	<p>The university has identified a need for a further 2000 bedspaces of student accommodation to be provided on campus during the plan period. Policy GDS.1 makes an allocation to meet that need, together with the academic needs of the university.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.5

ANNEX 2 TO CHAPTER B7

Table 2: Current Housing Stock by Number of Bedrooms (2000)

Area	Percentage of 1, 2, 3 or 4+ bedroom accommodation			
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Bath	11	28	42	19
Keynsham	10	18	52	20
Norton-Radstock	5	26	50	19
Rural Areas	5	19	46	30
All of B&NES Bath & North East Somerset	9	24	45	22

Table 3: Future Housing Requirements of Existing Households and Concealed Households* seeking to move now or in next five years (2000-2005)

Area	Percentage number of households seeking 1, 2, 3 or 4+ bedrooms			
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Bath	19	32	33	16
Keynsham	9	31	44	16
Norton-Radstock	9	39	37	15
Rural Areas	8	27	40	25
All of B&NES Bath & North East Somerset	14	31	36	19

* Households living within an existing household e.g. young people wishing to set up their own homes.

ANNEX 3 TO CHAPTER B7

TABLE 3A SETTING OUT DWELLING CAPACITIES OF ALLOCATED SITES IN THE PLAN PERIOD

Policy	Site Name	Capacity to 2011	Previously Developed Land / Greenfield
B1	Bath Western Riverside	450-600	PDL
B7	R/O 89-123 Englishcombe Lane	45	Greenfield
B12	Lower Bristol Road	50	PDL
B13	St Martin's Hospital	128	PDL
B14	Former St Mary's School	16	PDL
K1	Somerdale	50	PDL
K2	South West Keynsham	500	Greenfield
K5	Cannocks Garage	25	PDL
NR2	Radstock Railway Land	50+	PDL
NR4	St Peter's Factory/Jewsons	100	PDL
NR5	Mount Pleasant Hostel	10	PDL
NR9	Folly Hill	50	Greenfield
NR13	Land in the Coomb End area	30	PDL
NR14	Welton Packaging Factory	100	PDL
NR15	Land at Cautletts Close	110	Greenfield
V3	Paulton Printing Factory	250*	PDL
V5	Bannerdown Road, Batheastern	6	Greenfield
V7	Goosard Lane	16	Greenfield
V8	Radford Retail	30	PDL
V10	Wellow Lane	100	Greenfield
	TOTAL CAPACITY OF ALLOCATED SITES IN THE RDDLP	2,116-2,266	

* In addition to 100 granted planning permission at 01/04/2004

ANNEX 4 TO CHAPTER B7

TABLE 3B SETTING OUT SIZE MIX OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEED (SOCIAL RENTED AND INTERMEDIATE COMBINED)

Location	Size of Affordable Housing Required in 2006 (%)			
	1bed	2bed	3+bed	Total
Bath City	130 (42)	90(29)	90(29)	310(100)
Keynsham ¹	21(20)	49(47)	34(33)	104 (100)
Norton-Radstock ²	71(38)	72(39)	43(23)	186 (100)
NE Somerset Rural ³	33(27)	55(45)	33(27)	121 (100)
B&NES Total	252 (35)	267 (37)	202 (28)	721(100)

¹ Keynsham & Saltford

² Norton Radstock and wards of Paulton, Peasedown St. John, Timsbury and High Littleton

³ All other wards

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B8/1	Para B8.4	<p>Data for Council-collected wastes are reliable and readily available. In respect of other major waste "streams" – industrial and commercial wastes and construction and demolition waste – the position is less reliable. The most recent comprehensive study of arisings of these wastes is the Environment Agency's Strategic Waste Management Assessment 2000 (SWMA). Other available data is old and its reliability is questionable. Data in the SWMA is presented largely at county level or above. Figures for Bath & North East Somerset are therefore subsumed within an aggregate figure for former Avon. Whilst data has been extrapolated from the SWMA figures to arrive at an estimate for Bath & North East Somerset, there is potentially a wide margin for error and the estimates cannot be taken as being more than indicative. Details of the movement of Council collected wastes are given in paragraph B8.5. Information relating to the movement of other waste streams out of Bath & North East Somerset or into the District from other areas is not readily available, but may be forthcoming from the investigations of the Regional Technical Advisory Body on Waste and those to be undertaken as part of the sub-regional study on waste management in the 'Avon' area. In view of the limited waste management facilities that are available within the District, it is likely that currently only small amounts of waste are imported into the District from other areas for either treatment or disposal.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
M/B8/2	Para B8.5	<p>Council-collected wastes</p> <p>Arisings in this category are presented at Table 4 below. The Council recycles approximately 22% of the waste it collects. The remainder – some 70,000 tonnes per annum – is transported by rail to Buckinghamshire or by road to Dimmer in Somerset for disposal to landfill. The rail contract was renewed in April 2001 for 7 years with an option to extend this arrangement for another 3 years. The Council is at present reviewing its Waste Management and Recycling Strategy. Options for future management of unrecoverable wastes will be considered as part of the review.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
M/B8/3	Para B8.6	<p>Industrial and Commercial wastes 4.</p> <p>It is estimated that arisings of industrial and commercial waste in B&NES Bath & North East Somerset broadly are in the order of</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION		
		<p>180,000 tonnes per annum. About 52% of arisings are industrial waste (92,000 tonnes) and 48% (86,000 tonnes) are commercial waste. The trend for the South West is 55%:45%, whilst nationally the split is 70%:30%.</p> <p>1. Waste from premises used wholly or mainly for the purposes of a trade or business or for sport, recreation or entertainment, and wastes from any factory or such other specified premises.</p>			
M/B8/4	Para B8.7	<p>Construction and Demolition wastes 4</p> <p>Approximately 54,000 tonnes of construction and demolition wastes were deposited at the two active landfills in the district (at Wellow and Camerton) in 1998/99. The average over a 3 year period is about 45,000 tonnes. On the basis of recent research and having regard to the absence in Bath & North East Somerset of exempt sites or non inert landfills requiring daily cover, it is estimated that this figure represents about 65% of the total arisings of waste in this category. The remaining 35% comprises wastes which are recycled or re-used. On this basis it is estimated for B&NES that arisings of wastes in this category typically are in the order of 70,000 tonnes each year.</p> <p>4. Waste arising from the construction and maintenance of buildings or other civil engineering works.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1		
M/B8/5	Para B8.8	<p>Major new development or infrastructure projects occurring during the Plan period will render this figure obsolete. Anticipated projects may generate over 500,000 tonnes of C&D wastes during the Plan period.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1		
M/B8/6	Para B8.9	<p>Clinical and Special Wastes 2-</p> <p>The SWMA indicates that 1,000 tonnes of special wastes were transferred from the District in 1998-99. There are no waste management facilities licensed to accept special wastes in Bath & North East Somerset. It is considered therefore that this figure broadly represents arisings in this waste stream.</p> <p>2. Waste arising from medical, pharmaceutical or related practices which may present risks of infection, and wastes as defined in the Control of Pollution (Special Wastes) Regulations 1980.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1		
M/B8/7	Table 4	<p>Table 4: Current wastes arising</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Wastes arising</td> <td>Tonnes (rounded)</td> </tr> </table>	Wastes arising	Tonnes (rounded)	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
Wastes arising	Tonnes (rounded)				

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION																																
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Council-collected</td> <td>90,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private-sector collected industrial and commercial (including 2,000 tonnes scrap metals)</td> <td>180,000*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Private-sector collected inert construction and demolition</td> <td>70,000*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clinical and Special</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total waste arising</td> <td>350,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">*estimate</td> </tr> </table>	Council-collected	90,000	Private-sector collected industrial and commercial (including 2,000 tonnes scrap metals)	180,000*	Private-sector collected inert construction and demolition	70,000*	Clinical and Special	1,000	Total waste arising	350,000	*estimate																						
Council-collected	90,000																																		
Private-sector collected industrial and commercial (including 2,000 tonnes scrap metals)	180,000*																																		
Private-sector collected inert construction and demolition	70,000*																																		
Clinical and Special	1,000																																		
Total waste arising	350,000																																		
*estimate																																			
M/B8/8	Para B8.10	Table 5 sets out in broad terms how wastes arising in Bath & North East Somerset currently are managed.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1																																
M/B8/9		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Table 5: Management of Waste Arisings</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">Tonnes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Waste re-used and recovered</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Council-collected</td> <td>20,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial & industrial (including scrap metals)</td> <td>52,000*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction & demolition</td> <td>25,000*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total waste re-used and recovered</td> <td>97,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">*estimate</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> </td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">Tonnes</th> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><i>Waste disposed (landfill or other treatment)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Council-collected</td> <td>70,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial & industrial</td> <td>128,000*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction & demolition</td> <td>45,000*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clinical and Special</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total waste disposed to landfill</td> <td>243,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">*estimate</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Tonnes		<i>Waste re-used and recovered</i>		Council-collected	20,000	Commercial & industrial (including scrap metals)	52,000*	Construction & demolition	25,000*	Total waste re-used and recovered	97,000	*estimate		 		Tonnes		<i>Waste disposed (landfill or other treatment)</i>		Council-collected	70,000	Commercial & industrial	128,000*	Construction & demolition	45,000*	Clinical and Special	1,000	Total waste disposed to landfill	243,000	*estimate		To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
Tonnes																																			
<i>Waste re-used and recovered</i>																																			
Council-collected	20,000																																		
Commercial & industrial (including scrap metals)	52,000*																																		
Construction & demolition	25,000*																																		
Total waste re-used and recovered	97,000																																		
*estimate																																			
Tonnes																																			
<i>Waste disposed (landfill or other treatment)</i>																																			
Council-collected	70,000																																		
Commercial & industrial	128,000*																																		
Construction & demolition	45,000*																																		
Clinical and Special	1,000																																		
Total waste disposed to landfill	243,000																																		
*estimate																																			
M/B8/10	Para B8.11	Considerations discussed at paragraph B8.4 apply similarly to prediction of future arisings. In addition there is a wide range of factors – for example, change in the nature of employment, population growth, legislative change – that will influence the quantity of waste needing to be managed in the future. The principal issues are discussed in paragraphs B8.16 – B8.30. The overall trend indicates an increase in waste arisings, particularly in arisings of household waste.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1																																
M/B8/11	Para B8.12	<p>Council-collected wastes</p> <p>At present the trend in Bath & North East Somerset is an increase in arisings of about</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1																																

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION														
		3% per annum. This estimate accords with the National Waste Strategy estimate for increases in arisings in this category.															
M/B8/ 12	Table 6	<p><i>Table 6: Estimated Council-collected Waste Arisings 1997 – 2012 (including home composting)</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Total (tonnes) including 3% annual increase</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1997/98</td> <td>82,995 (actual)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1998/99</td> <td>83,170 (actual)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999/00</td> <td>88,765 (actual)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000/01</td> <td>91,427</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005/06</td> <td>109,167</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011/12</td> <td>130,350</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Total (tonnes) including 3% annual increase	1997/98	82,995 (actual)	1998/99	83,170 (actual)	1999/00	88,765 (actual)	2000/01	91,427	2005/06	109,167	2011/12	130,350	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
Year	Total (tonnes) including 3% annual increase																
1997/98	82,995 (actual)																
1998/99	83,170 (actual)																
1999/00	88,765 (actual)																
2000/01	91,427																
2005/06	109,167																
2011/12	130,350																
M/B8 13/	Para B8.13	<p>The number of dwellings in Bath & North East Somerset is predicted to rise from 71,200 in 2001 to 73,700 by 2006 and 75,600 by 2011. The Bath & North East Somerset Waste Strategy suggests that the average household produces about 1.24 tonnes of waste annually. Based on this figure and taking account of annual increases in waste arisings of 3%, it is considered that the figures set out in Table 6 should be added to as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2006 (tonnes)</th> <th>2011 (tonnes)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>+2,375</td> <td>+6,958</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2006 (tonnes)	2011 (tonnes)			+2,375	+6,958	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1								
2006 (tonnes)	2011 (tonnes)																
+2,375	+6,958																
M/B8/ 14	Para B8.14	<p>Industrial & Commercial Wastes</p> <p>Preliminary forecasts of employment growth have been used in an attempt to predict future change in waste arisings. The majority of employment growth for Bath & North East Somerset is likely to be within the commercial sector. The largest growth area (computing) is not likely to be the major generator of waste materials. Other likely growth areas such as general services and retailing are more significant. Whilst overall employment growth may be in the order of 15%, it is considered that the major waste-generating employment sectors may account for some 10% of growth. On this basis it is provisionally estimated that commercial waste arisings may increase over the Plan period by some 10% from about 86,000 tonnes in 1998 to about 95,000 tonnes</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1														

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>in 2011. Industrial employment may continue to decline, and a 23% decrease in arisings in this sector is possible. Industrial waste arisings could therefore decrease from about 92,000 tonnes in 1998 to about 74,000 tonnes in 2011. Overall there may be a reduction in industrial and commercial waste arisings of around 6,000 tonnes (approximately 4%) over the Plan period.</p> <p>1. Based on 1996 data contained within the Local Economy Forecasting Model designed principally for application at regional level 2. The 1996 Avon Waste Management Plan predicts for that annual industrial & commercial waste arisings will in total decrease by about 11% in the period 1993/94 – 2004. Within this waste stream the WMP predicts that between 1994 and 2004 there will be a marked difference in rates of waste arisings. Industrial waste arisings are predicted to decrease by about 23%, while commercial waste arisings are predicted to increase by approximately 6%.</p>	
M/B8/ 15	Para B8.15	<p>Construction & Demolition wastes</p> <p>Arisings of wastes in this stream are predicted to rise by about 5% over the Plan period. Arisings in 2011/12 may consequently be in the order of 75,000 tonnes.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
M/B8/ 16	Para B8.16	<p>The JRSP requires that provision be made for 6,200 dwellings between 1996 and 2011 of which 2,330 had been completed by April 2001. Together with increased household waste arisings, in waste management terms a significant impact of housing growth will be the generation of about 300,000 tonnes of construction industry waste over the Plan period. This figure is arrived at on the basis of 75 tonnes of waste arising per unit. It should be borne in mind that this figure may be revised upward having regard to the outcome of the Secretary of State's Direction on JRSP housing figures.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
M/B8/ 17	Para B8.17	<p>Transportation development proposed for 2001/2006 is set out in the Bath and North East Somerset Local Transport Plan. Over £49m of development is proposed including traffic management, highway improvements/maintenance and a major scheme at Western Riverside.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
M/B8/ 18	Para B8.18	<p>Several major developments are scheduled to begin during the Plan period. These include storm water drainage infrastructure proposed by Wessex Water, the Combe Down Stone Mines Remediation Project, employment and commercial redevelopment at Western Riverside in Bath, M.O.D. Foxhill and expansion of the Bath University campus. Taken together, these developments are likely</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		to generate significant quantities of excavation spoil and demolition/ construction wastes. It is not possible to predict the amount of waste likely to arise but it is likely to be in the order of several hundred thousand tonnes.	
M/B8/ 19	Para B8.19	Clinical and Special Wastes The Avon Waste Management Plan 1996 indicates that for the Plan period there is sufficient existing capacity in the sub-region to cater for wastes arising in these categories. This is confirmed in the relevant draft Waste Local Plans of neighbouring WPAs.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
M/B8/ 20	Para B8.20	Conclusions On the basis of these provisional data, by 2011/12 arisings of industrial/commercial and construction/demolition wastes could result in about 240,000 tonnes requiring management of one kind or another. By 2011/12 total annual waste arisings in Bath & North East Somerset could be in the order of 375,000 tonnes – an overall increase in total waste arisings of about 10% on 1999/2000 figures. The biggest growth area is in Council-collected household and trade wastes.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.1
M/B8/ 21	New Table 4	<i>Insert new table with a summary of the relevant information from paras B8.4 – B8.20 (see new table at the end of this section)</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.2
M/B8/ 22	Para B8.50	This document is currently under review. In October 2001, the Council adopted the concept of zero waste as a long term goal. The concept, which envisages maximum recycling and re-use of waste with no disposal of residual waste , will underpin the review of the Waste Management Strategy. The waste policies of the Plan assist towards realisation of this goal as far as it relates to the use of land.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.3 (incorporating PIC/B/47 as endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report).
M/B8/ 23	Para B8.53	South Gloucestershire Council has produced a Minerals and Waste Local Plan and North Somerset Council has produced a Waste Local Plan. The plans were adopted in April 2002 and January 2002 respectively. Both plans are at Deposit Draft stage. Public Local Inquiries into both Plans have been completed.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/48) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B8/ 24	Para B8.57	In accordance with the proximity principle, the movement of waste into or out of the District for processing and/or disposal is unsustainable. Development of all facilities must however, represent the BPEO for the waste streams to be managed. That is the	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/49) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Council's first position. However, in anticipating the development of a joint approach to implementation of strategic policy, which would justify elevation of the proximity principle to the level of the former Avon area, an exception to this stance is warranted in the case of development of facilities to deal with wastes arising in the sub-region, particularly for example in respect of provision of reprocessing / manufacturing facilities and infrastructure for recycled materials. PPG10 requires Waste Planning Authorities to establish the amounts of waste which will need to be managed over a period of at least 10 years. It is expected that the sub-regional investigations to be undertaken for the 'Avon' area will provide such data and form the basis of an approach to the proximity principle at this level. In all cases however, development of waste management facilities must however represent the BPEO for the waste streams to be managed.</p>	
M/B8/ 25	Para B8.55	<p>In the interim the Council must discharge its statutory obligation to prepare development plan policies and proposals for waste management development. The Council believes that until an agreed sub-regional strategy is in place it is important that major waste management development which potentially could prejudice implementation or compromise formulation of a sub-regional policy framework is resisted.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.6
M/B8/ 26	Para B8.58	<p>The keystone of the Council's policies for waste management is the BPEO. BPEO is defined as the outcome of a systematic and consultative decision-making procedure which emphasises the protection and conservation of the environment across land, air and water. The procedure establishes, for a given set of objectives, the option that provides the most benefits or the least damage to the environment as a whole, at acceptable cost, in the long term as well as in the short term BPEO provides an overarching framework within which both the economic and environmental elements of proposals for waste management development can be assessed. The Waste Planning Authority will expect prospective developers to address the BPEO in planning applications.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.5

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B8/27	Policy WM.1	<p>POLICY WM.1</p> <p>Development of waste management facilities will only be permitted where the proposal represents the Best Practicable Environmental Option for the waste stream(s) to be managed, having regard to the precautionary principle, the waste hierarchy, the proximity principle, regional self sufficiency and the development not having an unacceptable adverse impact on the environment or local amenities.</p> <p>Development of waste management facilities will only be permitted where they:</p> <p>(i) have regard for regional self-sufficiency, the proximity principle and the precautionary principle, and do not prejudice the management of waste via more sustainable methods;</p> <p>(ii) and do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the environment or local amenities.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.4
M/B8/28	ERRATUM Para B8.61policies and setting of targets in its Waste Management Strategy (see Policy WM.7).	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/50) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B8/29	ERRATUM Para B8.66for new or expanded Household Waste Recycling Centre facilities (see Policy WM 40 7).	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/51) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B8/30	Para B8.62	<p>The planning system can have most impact on reduction and re-use in terms of waste generated during the development of land. Policy WM.3 places a requirement on prospective developers of schemes involving a land area of more than 0.5ha or 10 houses (0.4ha or 1000m² floorspace in the case of industrial and/or commercial development) to submit a "waste audit" with their planning applications. Where a development is expected to generate significant volumes of waste through the development process by reason of demolition, site clearance or ground works applicants for planning permission will be required to submit a waste audit with their planning applications.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.7
M/B8/31	Policy WM.3	<p>POLICY WM.3</p> <p>Development of:</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.8

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>a) housing sites of 0.5 ha in area or more or 10 or more houses; or</p> <p>b) industrial and/or commercial sites of 0.4 ha or 1000m² floorspace or more; or</p> <p>c) major infrastructure proposals will only be permitted where opportunities for waste reduction and re-use of waste materials arising in the development process have been thoroughly assessed as appropriate and having regard to other material planning considerations, measures for waste reduction and re-use of waste are included in the development proposals.</p> <p>Development proposals which are expected to generate significant volumes of waste through the development process itself will be required to submit, as part of the application detail, a waste audit to include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the type and volume of waste that the development will generate; and 2. the steps to be taken to ensure the maximum amount of waste arising from the development process is incorporated within the new development; and 3. the steps to be taken to manage the waste that cannot be incorporated within the new development and, if disposed of elsewhere, the distance the waste will be transported. <p>The way in which the waste arisings identified in the waste audit are to be dealt with will be considered in the context of regional self-sufficiency, the proximity principle and the precautionary principle, and any prejudice to the management of waste via more sustainable methods.</p>	
M/B8/32	Para B8.72	<p>The recovery of materials brought to landfill sites is a paradox. Whilst the benefits may seem obvious, it may be that the site has been permitted for a temporary period in order, for example, to improve derelict land or restore a quarry. Landfill sites are normally located in comparatively remote, rural areas. If recovery of materials would have the effect of reducing the rate of fill at such a site the result may be that the environmental impact of the landfill would be unacceptably prolonged. A balance must therefore be struck between</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.9

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the desire to recover materials which otherwise would be lost and the desire to see restoration of a site take place quickly and effectively. If permission is granted for materials recovery, linked to the life of the landfill, and subsequently an application is received to significantly extend the life of the landfill this is likely to be unacceptable unless the proposal represents the BPEO for the waste streams involved.</p>	
M/B8/33	Policy WM.6	<p>POLICY WM.6</p> <p>Development involving the recovery of materials from wastes brought to landfill sites will only be permitted for the consented duration of the landfill development provided the recovery of materials will not conflict with completion of the site within its scheduled timescale and the site is close to the markets to be supplied with the recovered materials.</p> <p>where:</p> <p>i) the development will not conflict with or unreasonably delay reclamation and restoration of the site;</p> <p>ii) the site is close to the markets to be supplied with the recovered material.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.10
M/B8/34	Para B8.82	<p>Energy can be recovered from waste either by direct treatment or as a by-product of other forms of waste management. The most common form of direct treatment is mass burn incineration, but other methods of thermal processing such as gasification, pyrolysis and plasma arc heating are emerging. By-products are combustible gases (principally methane) recovered from landfills and anaerobic digestion – a form of accelerated composting. The gases can be collected and burned to generate electricity. Anaerobic digestion is unusual in that the Government now accepts that it can be treated as a contributor to Best Value targets for recycling and composting (which previously excluded anaerobic processes) and energy recovery. However for planning purposes, in terms of their final outputs and environmental impacts, anaerobic digestion and composting will be treated as analogous processes and therefore planning applications for anaerobic digesters will be considered under policies WM.8 and WM.9.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/52) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B8/35	Policy WM.10	<p>POLICY WM.10</p> <p>Facilities for thermal treatment with energy recovery will only be permitted where:</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R6.11

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>i) provision is made for energy recovery; and</p> <p>ii) the feedstock comprises residues remaining after re-use, composting or recycling and/or comprises waste materials which are unsuitable for such treatment; and</p> <p>iii) thermal treatment is the BPEO for the wastes to be managed; and</p> <p>iv) the site is located within an area designated for waste management development or within an appropriate existing or allocated employment site or area; and</p> <p>v) proven technology is used; and</p> <p>vi) the plant is of appropriate scale and design having regard to the site location and setting.</p>	
M/B8/36	Policy WM.11	<p>POLICY WM.11 Facilities for thermal treatment of wastes without pre-treatment recovery of re-useable, recyclable or compostable materials and without energy recovery will not be permitted.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R6.12
M/B8/37	Para B8.96	<p>In the vast majority of cases the grant of planning permission is conditional. Conditions are imposed to control elements of the development which, without regulation, would make it unacceptable. Planning obligations under s.106 of the Act may be sought for the same reason but in respect of off-site matters such as road improvements. Conditions must be necessary, relevant to planning, relevant to the development, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. A high-quality planning application, made in the light of pre-application discussion with the WPA, may reduce the number of issues needing to be controlled by condition. It is important therefore that planning applications address the full range of issues likely to be raised by the proposed development, including the transport matters covered by Policy M.9 in the Minerals Chapter.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.13
M/B8/38	Para B8.106	<p>The site is considered suitable for use as an integrated waste management facility. Detailed proposals for the site will come forward through the Council's Waste Management Strategy. However, the key features of the proposed development are</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.14 (incorporating PIC/B/53) as endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report).

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A maximum capacity of 70,000 tonnes per annum of domestic waste. Limited amounts of organic industrial wastes may also be processed. • Waste will be delivered by road. The majority of waste will be delivered in refuse collection vehicles and the "green box" collection vehicles. • The Materials Recycling Facility processes will include the pulverisation and separation of black bag domestic refuse. Reception and segregation of the waste will be undertaken within enclosed buildings to ensure that it will not give rise to odour. • Green waste and the putrescible fraction of the mixed domestic refuse will be composted in vertical, closed vessel units. • Energy recovery will be by gasification/pyrolysis, or anaerobic digestion of the residual organic fractions of the wastes and possibly sewage sludges and some commercial waste. 	

New Table 4 to accord with Inspector's Recommendation R6.2

Situation at 2000 (tonnes pa)				Predicted situation (to 2011*)	
Waste Type	Waste arising	Re-used and recovered	Landfilled	Waste Arising	Percentage increase
Council collected	90,000	20,000	70,000	130,350	+45%
Commercial and industrial	180,000	52,000	128,000	169,000	-6%
Construction and demolition	70,000	25,000	45,000	75,000	+7%
Clinical and special	1,000	-	1,000	1,000	0%
TOTAL	341,000	97,000	244,000	375,350	+10%

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B9/1	Para B9.2	The requirements to enable development to go ahead are included as part of the policy. These make explicit some of the individual site requirements which are needed in order to meet the policies of the Plan. These requirements set out below are not exhaustive. Various other Local Plan policies will also be relevant. As with all development proposals, planning applications for the development of the allocated sites will be assessed against all the Local Plan policies which are relevant to the scheme.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.1
M/B9/2	Para B9.3	Some site requirements are applicable to all the general development sites, and others to all those involving housing. To avoid repetition these are listed at the beginning of Policy GDS.1.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.2
M/B9/3	Para B9.4	In addition to these, more site specific requirements are set out below the general site requirements.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.2
M/B9/4	Policy GDS.1	The following sites are allocated for development during the Plan period and are shown on the Proposals Map. The Policy also sets out the requirements to enable development and phasing of development. A. General Site Requirements for All Sites: 1. Public transport services and infrastructure provision where current levels are insufficient to meet needs of site (Policy T.24). 2. Satisfactory safe access (Policy T.24). 3. To facilitate ease of movement, and to improve access to surrounding facilities and services, developments should be integrated and well connected to their surroundings. A choice of pedestrian, cycle and vehicular routes should be provided which create safe, secure and attractive environments (Policy D.2). 4. Building design to maximise energy conservation (Policy ES.2). 5. Sensitive building design and layout with appropriate landscape design and planting that responds to the physical context of the development (Policy D.4). 6. Taking account of archaeological and nature conservation interests on or near the site (Policies BH.11-13, NE.4 and NE.6-12). B. General site requirements for all sites involving residential development: 1. (deleted) 2. Provision of new and/or contribution toward proposed or existing	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.3

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>educational, community and recreational facilities including outdoor sportsfield and children's playing space (Policies CF.2, SR.3 & SR.6) at a level directly related in scale and kind to the need generated by the site.</p> <p>3. Provision of affordable homes in line with Policy HG.8 and site thresholds set in the Reasoned Justification. Provision should be integrated with general needs housing in such a way that it secures a mix of dwelling size, type and affordability avoiding concentration of only affordable housing.</p>	
M/B9/5	New Heading & Para A4.26A relocated	<p>BATH</p> <p>Bath Western Riverside</p> <p>The complex nature of redeveloping this site, partly arising from the scale of development and the multiplicity of land ownerships, makes it particularly important that a comprehensive approach to delivering regeneration is followed. Such an approach is required in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver the optimum mix of land uses for the benefit of the community; • secure high quality employment generating development of sufficient critical mass to support Bath's regional economic role; • deliver the requisite supporting infrastructure and facilities; • achieve for the area as a whole high quality urban design which is sympathetic to and respectful of the City's World Heritage status; • secure the necessary accessibility, linkages, permeability and transport infrastructure for Western Riverside, which enable it to integrate with the City as a whole; • achieve development and financial viability over the whole regeneration period; and • ensure that appropriate phasing and sequencing of development is secured to enable the regeneration of the area as a whole and not on a piecemeal basis. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.4 (no change to text)
M/B9/6	Policy GDS.1/ B1 Western Riverside	<p>B1 - WESTERN RIVERSIDE - site area 35.2 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements: Comprehensive mixed used scheme including:</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.5. Remaining development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Significant provision for business development (Use Class B1). 2. About 800 450 - 600 dwellings during the Plan period. 3. High density urban form. 4. Relocation of other uses including civic amenity site/refuse transfer station, sewage pumping and storage facility, gas storage facilities. 5. Flood mitigation measures. 6. On and off site transport infrastructure including an integrated transport system linking the site to a transport interchange at Newbridge in accordance with site GDS.1/B1A and the city centre. 7. Public access to and along the riverside 8. Remediation of existing land contamination. 9. Small scale local needs shopping food and drink uses and local offices (Use Classes A1, A2 & A3). 10. No adverse impact on Bath's hot springs and their sources. <p>Existing businesses wishing to remain within the site and which are compatible with the SPD will either remain in their current locations or be relocated within or adjacent to the redeveloped area or elsewhere if appropriate.</p> <p>Any planning application will need to demonstrate that it accords with and can deliver the comprehensive development of the whole site by reference to a masterplan which accords with this policy.</p> <p>Any planning application will need to demonstrate that it is consistent with and contributes to the delivery of comprehensive development of the whole site by reference to the BWR Supplementary Planning Document which accords with this policy.</p>	
M/B9/7	Policy GDS.1/ B1 Proposals Map Western Riverside	<i>Amend the Proposals Map by deleting the Bath Press area from GDS.1/B1</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.6.
M/B9/8	Policy GDS.1/B1A Land at Newbridge	<p>B1A – LAND AT NEWBRIDGE – site area 10.5ha Development Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provision of a transport interchange comprising Park & Ride facility, Rapid Transit System terminus and ancillary 	Proposed modification to delete Site GDS.1/B1A proposals have been superseded by proposal to expand existing Newbridge Park & Ride on A4 (see response to Inspector's

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>facilities.</p> <p>2. Provision of civic amenity facility.</p> <p>3. Satisfactory highway access.</p> <p>4. Provision of sustainable transport route (as identified under policy T.9).</p> <p>5. Public access to and along the riverside including creation of riverside amenity area.</p> <p>6. No adverse impact on floodplain.</p> <p>7. Ameliorate impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>8. No adverse impact on the River Avon Site of Nature Conservation Interest and adjoining SSSI to the west of the Recreation Ground.</p> <p>9. Mitigation of adverse impact on nature conservation interests of disused railway.</p> <p>10. Major landscaping to mitigate visual impact.</p> <p>11. Retention of existing trees wherever possible.</p> <p>12. Ameliorate impact on Newton Brook.</p> <p>13. Adequate and suitable replacement of playing fields, bowling green and tennis courts.</p>	<p>Recommendation R7.9)</p>
<p>M/B9/9</p>	<p>Policy GDS.1/B1A Proposals Map Land at Newbridge</p>	<p><i>Amend the Proposals Map by deleting Site GDS.1/B1A: Land at Newbridge and reinstating playing field protection under Policy SR.1A.</i></p>	<p>Proposed modification to delete Site GDS.1/B1A proposals have been superseded by proposal to expand existing Newbridge Park & Ride on A3 (see response to Inspector's Recommendation R7.9)</p>
<p>M/B9/10</p>	<p>Policy GDS.1/B2</p>	<p>B2. MOD FOXHILL - site area : 18.7 ha Development Requirements (see also Development Guide for this site approved 1998): Comprehensive mixed-use scheme including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 7.5 ha of land for residential and business development (Use Classes B1, B2 & B8). 2. About 200 dwellings. 3. No detriment to underlying water source protection area. 4. Stabilisation of previously mined/unstable land. 5. Retention & enhancement of existing vegetation, boundary planting & reinforcement & maintenance of northern boundary planting. 6. Main vehicular access onto Bradford Road, with at least one secondary access onto Foxhill incorporating traffic calming measures. 7. Local centre, including a small food 	<p>Whilst this site will not be contributing to the housing needs for the Plan period for the Plan period, the site is retained in the Local Plan as an allocation to guide development proposals that may come forward before 2011 (see response to R7.10) Therefore development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.</p>

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>store with residential development above, that does not harm the vitality and viability of other local centres.</p> <p>8. Minimum of 2.0 ha of public open space & equipped children's playing space</p> <p>9. Protect and enhance the Bath skyline.</p>	
M/B9/11	Policy GDS.1/B3 Rush Hill	<p>B3. RUSH HILL (Clarks/CIC Ralphs sites) – site area 5.2 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <p>Comprehensive mixed-use scheme including</p> <p>1. Around 100 130 dwellings.</p> <p>2. At least 2 ha of land for business development (Use Classes B1 and/or B2 and/or B8).</p> <p>3. Provision of community facilities.</p> <p>4. Improved access from Rush Hill.</p> <p>5. Pedestrian access onto Old Fosse Road to enhance accessibility to existing shops, local facilities and surrounding areas and to provide for a more permeable environment.</p> <p>6. Pedestrian access towards the western part of Rush Hill.</p> <p>7. Ameliorate impact of development on Green Belt & adjoining countryside on the site.</p> <p>8. Protection of hedgerows and trees on the site subject of tree preservation orders</p> <p>9. Protection of geological outcrop (site of nature conservation importance) on Rush Hill frontage</p> <p>10. Remediation of potential land contamination and instability.</p> <p>11. Ensure the development of this prominent site does not harm wider City views.</p>	Proposed modification arises from Inspector's recommendation R7.12. Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. Therefore site requirements to be deleted.
M/B9/12	Policy GDS.1/B3 Proposals Map Rush Hill	Delete the GDS.1 notation and show site GDS.1/B3 Rush Hill as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map	Proposed Modification arising from the Inspector's Recommendation R7.12
M/B/13	Policy GDS.1/B4 Southgate	<p>B4. SOUTHGATE – site area : 4.5 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements: —</p> <p>Comprehensive mixed-use scheme including:</p> <p>1. Provision of comparison retail floorspace.</p> <p>2. Convenience goods, retail floorspace to replace existing store up to 1,500 sq. metres net in size.</p> <p>3. About 90 dwellings.</p> <p>4. A proportion of retail units at any time to be provided for retailers 'meeting</p>	Proposed modification arises from Inspector's recommendation R7.14. Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. Therefore site requirements to be deleted.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>day to day needs'.</p> <p>5. Car parking provision appropriate to the nature and scale of development, public transport provision, and transport infrastructure.</p> <p>6. Fully integrated public transport facilities.</p> <p>7. Satisfactory relationship with and utilisation of listed structures.</p> <p>8. No adverse impact on Bath's hot springs and their sources.</p> <p>9. Protection of archaeological interests.</p> <p>10. Provision for national cycle route network.</p> <p>11. Permeable built form appropriate to urban design and grain of Bath.</p> <p>12. Visitor facility to include public toilets.</p>	
M/B9/14	Policy GDS.1/B4 Proposals Map Southgate	Delete the GDS.1 notation and show site GDS.1/B4 Southgate as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map	Proposed Modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R7.14.
M/B9/15	Policy GDS.1/B5 West of Swainswick Bypass	<p>B5. LAND WEST OF SWAINSWICK BYPASS, site area : 2.75 ha Development Requirements:</p> <p>1. Up to 20 new dwellings.</p> <p>2. Not more than 12 dwellings being constructed on land to the west of the bypass due to highway safety on Bailbrook Lane and no more than 8 dwellings being constructed on the Elms to maintain the landscape character of the site.</p> <p>3. Buffer zone with tree planting and acoustic barrier along A46 Swainswick bypass to safeguard residential amenity in terms of air quality and noise.</p> <p>4. </p> <p>5. </p> <p>6. Vehicular access of The Elms should only be from Woodland Park and vehicular access of the land to the west of the bypass should only be from Bailbrook Lane.</p> <p>7. </p> <p>8. </p> <p>9. </p> <p>10. A traffic calming scheme is required for land to the west of the bypass on Bailbrook Lane between site access and Gloucester Road, and for the Elms on Woodlands Park.</p> <p>11. Existing trees shall be safeguarded and any trees lost to be replaced.</p> <p>12. Provision of a landscape</p>	Proposed modification arises from Inspector's recommendation R7.15. Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. Therefore site requirements to be deleted.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		management scheme for The Elms.	
M/B9/16	Policy GDS.1/B5 Proposals Map West of Swainswick Bypass	<i>Delete the GDS.1 notation and show site GDS.1/B5 Land West of Swainswick Bypass as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.15
M/B9/17	Policy GDS.1/B7 R/O 123 Englishcombe Lane	B7. R/O 89-123 ENGLISHCOMBE LANE – Site area : 1.4 ha Development Requirements: 1. About 45 dwellings. 2. Retention of existing hedgerows along site boundaries. 3. Access from between Nos 87-89 Englishcombe Lane retaining existing trees where possible. 4. Stabilisation of ground conditions both on and adjoining site to ensure safe development. 5. Measures to minimise ecological impacts and compensatory measures. 6. No adverse impacts on hydrology of site and adjoining land. 7. Space within site for planting of large trees. 8. Pedestrian access from Stirtingale Road.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.16. Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/18	Policy GDS.1/B7 Proposals Map R/O 89-123 Englishcombe Lane	<i>Reinstate site GDS.1/B7 R/O 89-123 Englishcombe Lane from the DDLP on the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.16
M/B9/19	Policy GDS.1/B9 Windsor Castle Site	B9. WINDSOR CASTLE SITE, UPPER BRISTOL ROAD – Site area : 0.2 ha Development Requirements: 1. About 24 dwellings. 2. No adverse impact on floodplain. 3. Access from Windsor Court. 4. Retention and re-use of public house and associated buildings. 5. Residential properties along River Avon frontage. 6. Design to take account of existing trees located between site and Upper Bristol Road/ Windsor Bridge Road junction. 7. Enhancement of riverside path and its footpath link to Upper Bristol Road.	Proposed modification arises from review of the base date of the Plan. Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. Therefore development requirements to be deleted.
M/B9/20	Policy GDS.1/B9	<i>Delete the GDS.1 notation and show site GDS.1/B9 Windsor Castle Site as Site with</i>	

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
	Proposals Map Windsor Castle Site	<i>Planning Permission on the Proposals Map</i>	
M/B9/21	Policy GDS.1/B11 University of Bath	<p>B11. EASTERN PART OF UNIVERSITY OF BATH CAMPUS, CLAVERTON DOWN – site area 22.2 ha.</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <p>Comprehensive scheme including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. University related uses only, comprising student accommodation, learning and research centres, allied business incubation units, sports facilities and necessary supporting social and recreational infrastructure. 2. Adequate and suitable replacement of existing sports pitches. 3. On and off site transport infrastructure necessary to deliver an integrated transport solution. 4. High quality design that responds sensitively to the landscape context, which includes the Gotswolds AONB. 5. Designs must demonstrate regard for trees protected by the University of Bath Tree Preservation Order, particularly trees on The Avenue, in accordance with current best practice. <p>University of Bath Campus, Claverton Down – site area : 60 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements</p> <p>1. A comprehensive scheme expressed within a university-wide master plan providing for:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) approx 43,250 sq.m. of additional university-related non-residential development for uses including learning, research and allied business incubation & knowledge transfer; conferences; university administration and IT; and sports, health, creative arts, social, recreational and catering purposes and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) approx 40,000sq.m (2000 bedrooms) of additional student residential accommodation.</p> <p>2. Precise identification of a protected green heart to the campus (also to include St John's Field which is covered</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.9

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>by Green Belt designation) and other visually and ecologically important planted areas and landscape screens</p> <p>3. Adequate and suitable replacement on or off-site of any displaced existing sports pitches.</p> <p>4. On and off-site transport infrastructure necessary to deliver an integrated transport solution.</p> <p>5. High quality design and landscaping that responds positively and sensitively to the Cotswolds AONB designation and ensures that development on the campus has an appropriate and much-improved visual and landscape relationship with neighbouring land, particularly Bushey Norwood.</p>	
M/B9/22	Policy GDS.1/B11 Proposals Map University of Bath	<i>Amend the Proposals Map by showing new boundary for Site GDS.1/B11: University of Bath.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.9
M/B9/23	Policy GDS.1/B12 Lower Bristol Road	<p>B12 – LAND AT LOWER BRISTOL ROAD – site area 7.2 7.05 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <p>Comprehensive mixed use scheme including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least 3 ha of land for business uses within Use classes B1, B2 or B8 or, if less, suitable, alternative provision made 2. About 75 50 dwellings during plan period. 2A. About 2,100m² net of 'bulky goods' retail floorspace subject to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — (i) it not harming the vitality and viability of any of the shopping centres defined under policy S.1; and — (ii) the range and types of goods sold being limited to those that require a large format store; and — (iii) the transport implications of retail development being adequately addressed. 3. Enhancement of the Riverside area including public access and river transport links 4. Enhancement of the Lower Bristol Road frontage to provide appropriate 'gateway' to the City. 5. On and off site transport infrastructure 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.18 and R7.19. Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>integrating with the transport system proposed for Western Riverside under policy GDS.1 site B1.</p> <p>6. Small scale local needs shopping</p> <p>7. Flood mitigation measures</p> <p>8. Remediation of any land contamination</p>	
M/B9/24	Policy GDS.1/B13 St Martin's Hospital	<p>LAND AT ST MARTIN'S HOSPITAL , ODD DOWN (site area 5.3ha)</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <p>A comprehensive mixed-use scheme including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Around 130 dwellings 2. Business & community uses 3. Re-use of existing listed buildings (in accordance with Policies BH.2 – BH.5) 4. Safeguard protected species which use the site (Bats & badgers) 5. Retention of significant trees 6. Contribution to Wellsway improvement work to assist better access to public transport 7. A signalised pedestrian crossing on Frome Road 8. Replacement car parking for the hospital 9. A Travel Plan relating to residential, business and community uses 10. Adequate and suitable replacement cricket pitch and changing facilities 	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/57) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report. As planning permission was granted in June 2005 and the scheme now under construction development requirements were not reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/25	Policy GDS.1/B13 St Martin's Hospital Proposals Map	Amend boundary of GDS.1/B13: St Martin's Hospital, Bath	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/B/57) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/B9/26	Policy GDS.1/B15 237 Englishcombe Lane	<p>B15 – 237 ENGLISHCOMBE LANE (site area 0.35 ha)</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A maximum of 10 dwellings 2. Safe access to the site 	Proposed modification arises from Inspector's recommendation R7.20. Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. Therefore development requirements to be deleted.
M/B9/27	Policy GDS.1/B15 Proposals Map 237 Englishcombe Lane	<i>Delete the GDS.1 notation and show Site GDS.1/B15: 237 Englishcombe Lane, Bath as Site with Planning Permission</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.20
M/B9/28	Policy GDS.1/B16 The Podium/ Cattle-market	<p>B16 – THE PODIUM/CATTLEMARKET – site area 1.36 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <p>Comprehensive mixed use scheme</p>	Further Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/26) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High street comparison and convenience goods retail floorspace of at least the existing quantity; and 2. Other compatible city centre uses to include a hotel and provision for a replacement library; and 3. Enhancement of the Riverside area, including public access achieved through improvements to the Bath Riverside Walk; and 4. Replacement car parking of an equivalent amount to replace existing car parking; and 5. Transport infrastructure to provide an adequate transport solution, including vehicular access arrangements that minimise the likelihood of 'on-street' waiting. 	<p>Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.</p>
M/B9/29	<p>Policy GDS.1/B16 Proposals Map The Podium/ Cattle-market</p>	<p><i>Amend the Proposals Map by showing Site GDS.1/B16: The Podium/Cattlemarket.</i></p>	<p>Further Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/26) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.</p>
M/B9/30	<p>Policy GDS.1/B18 Hayesfield School Playing Field/ St Martin's Garden Primary School</p>	<p>B18 - HAYESFIELD SCHOOL PLAYING FIELD/ST. MARTIN'S GARDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL, ODD DOWN Site area – 6.3 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements Comprehensive mixed use scheme, expressed within a development brief, including –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primary school with grass playing field; autistic unit and Sure Start children's centre 2. Housing 3. Community facility 4. Public access open space 5. Business Workspace (B1) 6. Convenience floorspace to meet local needs provided by small retail outlets in accordance with the emerging retail strategy 7. Replacement of the existing Hayesfield School playing fields with a suitable synthetic turf facility (off-site) which is available for community use 8. On and off-site transport and highways infrastructure necessary to deliver an integrated transport solution that addresses the impacts of 	<p>Proposed modification responds to the Inspector's Recommendation R4.2 & R5.18</p> <p>Development requirements are needed in order to ensure that the impacts of development are adequately addressed and to set out the range of uses that should be provided on the site. The site requirement relating to convenience floorspace will give flexibility in meeting the need for additional convenience shopping in south Bath. Phased development is required so that disruption to the primary school and other existing facilities is minimised.</p> <p>A development brief is needed 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</p>

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the development identified by a Transportation Assessment and Independent Road Safety Audit.</p> <p>9. Pedestrian and cycle links to Wellsway and Frome Road</p> <p>10. Retention of existing high walls and mature trees bounding the north western part of the site</p> <p>11. Phased development to ensure continuous provision of a primary school, autistic unit and Sure Start Children's centre</p>	<p>production of environmental and transport assessments.</p>
M/B9/31	<p>Policy GDS.1/B.18 Proposals Map Hayesfield School Playing Field/St Martin's Garden Primary School-</p>	<p>Amend the Proposals Map by showing site: Hayesfield School Playing Field/St Martin's Garden Primary School</p>	<p>To accord with the inspector's recommendation R4.2 & R5.18</p>
M/B9/32	<p>Policy GDS.1/K1 Somerdale</p>	<p>K1. SOMERDALE - Site area : 25.3 ha Development Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retention of existing business uses and development of at least 10ha of land for business development (Use Classes B1, B2 and/or B8) 2. About 50 dwellings on southern part of site during the Plan period. 3. Safeguarding of residential amenities of proposed residential development from existing and/or proposed business uses including incorporation of a buffer zone, landscaping and other visual and noise mitigation measures. 4. Provision of equipped children's playing space. 5. Replacement playing fields. 6. Preserve setting of existing main factory frontage. 7. Public access along River Avon. 8. Retention of avenue of trees in Somerdale Road. 9. No development in the floodplain. 10. Ameliorate impact on the Green Belt. 11. Provision of major landscaping on northern, western and eastern site boundaries to satisfactorily accommodate development into Avon Valley landscape and contribute to Bristol/Avon Community Forest. 12. Protection of the River Avon Site of 	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.21. Proposed Modifications to clause 2 arise from paras 5.86 and 7.95 of the Inspector's Report. Further Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/59) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report. Remaining development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.</p>

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p align="center">Nature Conservation Importance.</p> <p>13. No adverse impact on nearby agricultural use.</p> <p>14. Remediation of potential ground instability.</p> <p>15. Loss of recreational and social facilities to be offset by satisfactory alternative provision.</p> <p>16. Provision of satisfactory highway access to A4175, realignment of Station Road and closure to traffic of Somerdale Road site entrance; off-site traffic management measures in Station Road and Avon Mill Lane.</p> <p>17. Traffic management measures to restrict vehicular use of Chandos Road.</p> <p>18. Provision of appropriate access to public transport, including enhanced rail infrastructure at Keynsham Station and enhanced bus services.</p> <p>19. Protection of minor aquifer below the site, during and after development.</p>	
M/B9/33	Policy GDS.1/K2 South West Keynsham	<p>K2. SOUTH WEST KEYNSHAM - Site area : 20.2 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <p>Site in two sections: Part A 8.5 ha east of Charlton Road and Part B 11.7 ha west of St. Clement's Road</p> <p>Site requirements are for A and B combined and development of either site will only be allowed to proceed on the basis of a co-ordinated strategy for a mixed use development in accordance with the following principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About 700 dwellings (about 500 delivered in the Plan period). 2. At least 1.5 ha of land for business uses (Use Class B1), including the replacement of existing workshops. 3. Vehicular access from Charlton Road (Site A) and Park Road (Site B). A new pedestrian and cycle route to be provided along Parkhouse Lane. This will also serve as an emergency access. 4. Pedestrian links to the adjoining Woodland Trust woodland and countryside and between sites A & B. 5. General traffic management measures to mitigate impact on surrounding road network. 6. Enhancement of pedestrian and cycle routes to Keynsham town centre and railway station. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.22 and R7.22.1. Remaining development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3 and Inspector's reasoning in para 4 of the addendum report on South West Keynsham.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>7. A contribution towards improvements to Keynsham railway station of an appropriate scale and kind.</p> <p>8. A contribution towards improvements to bus services between the two parts of the site, Keynsham Town Centre, Bristol and Bath of an appropriate scale and kind.</p> <p>9. Improvements to Castle Primary School to meet the demand arising from the K2 development.</p> <p>10. Provision of a community meeting place located adjacent to school together forming a community focal point.</p> <p>11. Provision of at least two small scale local convenience shops provided with residential accommodation above; and to form part of the community focal point.</p> <p>12. Provision of direct pedestrian/cycle access from Site A to shops at Holmoak Road.</p> <p>13. Retention of existing hedgerows where possible, especially along Parkhouse Lane.</p> <p>14. Provision of children's playing space on both A and B.</p> <p>15. Provision of a playing field.</p> <p>16. Protection of the Woodland Trust woodland.</p> <p>17. Incorporation into the layout of a scheme to accord with the Forest of Avon guidelines, to include the provision of on and off site planting.</p>	
M/B9/34	Policy GDS.1/K2 Proposals Map South West Keynsham	<i>Reinstate Site GDS.1/K2: land at South West Keynsham as shown on the DDLP Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.17, R7.22 and R7.22.1.
M/B9/35	Policy GDS.1/K3 Broadmead Lane	<p>K3. BROADMEAD LANE - Site area : 4.5 ha Development requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development for waste management purposes. 2. Traffic management and highway improvement measures at railway bridge(s) to facilitate access including for pedestrians and cyclists. 3. No adverse impact on flood plain. 4. Topographical survey together with hydraulic and hydrological studies of bridge improvement area having regard to flood flow and flood storage capacity 	Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>in order to ensure safe access to the site..</p> <p>5. Remediation of potential ground instability as site is former refuse tip.</p> <p>6. Remediation of potential land contamination including adjoining land as site is former refuse tip.</p> <p>7. Landscaping and planting to ameliorate impact on Green Belt and surrounding countryside.</p>	
M/B9/36	Policy GDS.1/K4 St. John's Court/ Charlton Road	<p>K4. ST. JOHN'S COURT/CHARLTON ROAD, KEYNSHAM - Site area : 1.4 ha</p> <p>Development requirements:</p> <p>Comprehensive mixed-use scheme for development/redevelopment for town centre/ community uses including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Food store of 1,500 – 2,000 sq. metres net floorspace. 2. Community meeting place. 3. Measures to safeguard the amenities of adjacent residential properties both during and after development including noise attenuation, landscaping, and restriction of opening and servicing hours. 4. Satisfactory access improvements. 5. Improvements to existing parking and servicing of properties fronting Bristol Road, High Street and Charlton Road. 6. Protection/enhancement of the character and setting of adjoining listed buildings. 7. Preservation of any potential features of archaeological interest. 8. Provision of off-site foul and surface water improvements. 9. CCTV linking with existing provision in town centre. 10. Relocation of notable plant species. 11. Remediation of potential site contamination. 12. Measures to mitigate any adverse impacts on air quality. 13. Public transport provision serving site. 14. Pedestrian and cycle links to High Street. 15. An element of residential development 16. Development on the site should take full account of the impact on the public realm 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.23. Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/37	Policy GDS.1/K5 Former Cannocks Garage	<p>K5 – FORMER CANNOCKS GARAGE, STATION ROAD (site area 0.28 ha)</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About 45 25 dwellings. 2. Provision of satisfactory access on to Bristol Road with improved junction. 	Pre-Inquiry Change (FPIC/B/60) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report. As planning permission was

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		3. Flood mitigation measures.	granted in August 2004 and the scheme now complete development requirements were not reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/38	Policy GDS.1/ NR2 Radstock Railway Land	<p>NR2. RADSTOCK RAILWAY LAND, NORTON-RADSTOCK – Site area 4.8 ha Development Requirements:</p> <p>Comprehensive mixed-use scheme including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leisure, residential, employment and community uses with retail uses within the Town Centre Shopping area. Residential development with retail and office uses within or adjacent to the Town Centre, with community facility and local nature reserve. 2. About 100 dwellings About 50 dwellings in the period to 2011 or more if the other site requirements are met. 3. Provision of amenity and public open space. 4. Safe access to the site for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. 5. Provision for safe movement of public transport service vehicles within the site and provision for a public transport interchange. 6. Safeguarding the former railway corridor as a sustainable transport corridor under Policy T.9 incorporating the National Cycle Network where this is compatible with the safeguarding of trackbed which is of significant nature conservation value. 7. Preparation and implementation of programme of ecological compensation and a management plan. Identification of areas of significant nature conservation interest to be retained, with a scheme for their management and the mitigation of any effects of development; together with a programme for compensation where the loss of areas of ecological importance cannot be avoided. 8. Remediation of potential land contamination. 9. Relocation or retention of Victoria Square public toilets. 10. Relocation of the War Memorial. 10a Retention (with relocation if necessary) within the site of engine shed and nearby turntable. 	To accord with the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R7.24. Remaining development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3. Relocation of the War Memorial (10) has already been carried out and therefore deleted.
M/B9/39	Policy	NR3. FORMER SEWAGE WORKS,	Development requirements

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
	GDS.1/ NR3 Former Sewage Works,	WELTON HOLLOW, MIDSOMER NORTON - Site area : 1.4 ha Development Requirements: 1. Development for business uses within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8. 2. Remediation of potential land contamination including adjoining land. 3. Remediation of potential ground instability. 4. Safeguard wildlife value of adjoining streams. 5. Protection of floodplain. 6. Satisfactory access from Midsomer Enterprise Park access road or Radstock Road. 7. Pedestrian and cycle links to Norton-Radstock Greenway and to Midsomer Enterprise Park access road and/or Radstock Road	reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/40	Policy GDS.1/ NR4 St. Peter's Factory and Jewson's site, Westfield	NR4. ST. PETER'S FACTORY AND JEWSON'S SITE, WESTFIELD – Site area: 8.0 ha 10.1ha Development Requirements: 1. Mixed use development for residential and business uses within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8. 1a. about 100 houses can be accommodated by 2011 2. Provision of recreational route along southern boundary alongside Waterside tributary stream to link with existing rights of way. 3. Compensatory provision of equivalent community benefit for any loss of existing sports facilities. 4. Retention of existing trees and hedgerows along eastern and southern boundaries of the site and management of open areas for landscape and ecology purposes. 5. Safeguarding of residential amenities of nearby residential development including incorporation of a buffer zone, landscaping, and other visual and noise-mitigation measures. 6. Diversion of public right of way CL24/107 and making it up to an adopted standard including lighting. 7. Protection of Waterside tributary stream and minor aquifer underlying the site. 8. Provision of a surface water regulation system, including pollution control measures to overcome flooding risk and pollution of nearby watercourses.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.18 & R7.25. As planning permission was granted in April 2006 development requirements were not reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/41	Policy	<i>Include land to the rear of Lincombe Road</i>	To accord with the Inspector's

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
	GDS.1/ NR4 Proposals Map St. Peter's Factory and Jewson's site, Westfield	<i>Jewsons site within the boundary. Site GDS.1/NR4: St Peter's Factory, Westfield on the Proposals Map</i>	Recommendation R5.18 & R7.24
M/B9/42	Policy GDS.1/ NR5 Mount Pleasant Hostel	NR5. Mount Pleasant Hostel, Writhlington, Radstock - Site area 0.3 ha Development Requirements: 1. About At least 10 dwellings. 2. No loss of existing off-street parking provision. 3. Additional pedestrian and cycle link onto the Frome Road. 4. Retention of existing trees in south west corner of site. 5. Protected species survey prior to demolition of existing buildings and compensatory habitat provision if appropriate.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.26.
M/B9/43	Policy GDS.1/ NR7 R/O 63-101 Kilmersdon Road	NR7. R/O 63-101 Kilmersdon Road, Haydon — Site area : 1.1 ha Development Requirements: 1. Up to 34 dwellings. 2. Enhancement of existing equipped children's play space and compensatory provision for loss of informal play area.	Proposed modification arises from Inspector's recommendation R7.27. Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. Therefore site requirements to be deleted.
M/B9/44	Policy GDS.1/ NR7 Proposals Map R/O 63-101 Kilmersdon Road	<i>Show site GDS.1/NR7 R/O 63-101 Kilmersdon Road, Haydon as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.27
M/B9/45	Policy GDS.1/ NR9 Proposals Map Folly Hill, Chilcompton Lane	<i>Show part of site GDS.1/NR9 Folly Hill, Chilcompton Lane as allocated and part as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.28. (As planning permission was granted in August 2004 development requirements were not reviewed in accordance R7.3.)
M/B9/46	Policy GDS.1/ NR11 Land at Hazel Terrace/ Old	NR11 — LAND AT HAZEL TERRACE/OLD PIT ROAD — Site area: 0.67 ha Development requirements: 1. About 20 dwellings. 2. Provision of noise mitigation measures and buffer zone between existing	Proposed modification arises from Inspector's recommendation R7. 29. Planning permission granted prior to new base date of April 2004 and to be shown as Site

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
	Pit Road	employment uses and new residential uses. 3. Remediation of potential land contamination. 4. Provision of a footway across the site frontage (Hazel Terrace).	with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map. Therefore site requirements to be deleted.
M/B9/47	Policy GDS.1/ NR11 Proposals Map Land at Hazel Terrace/ Old Pit Road	<i>Show site GDS.1/NR11 Land at Hazel Terrace/ Old Pit Road as Site with Planning Permission on the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.29
M/B9/48	Policy GDS.1/ NR12 Land West of Midsomer Norton enterprise Park	NR12 – LAND WEST OF MIDSOMER NORTON ENTERPRISE PARK - (Site area 0.84 ha) Development requirements: 1. Development for employment uses 2. Safeguard the nature conservation interests of the Wellow Brook 3. Measures to safeguard against flooding 4. Safeguard the routes of existing public rights of way 5. Mitigate the effect on the amenity of nearby residential areas.	Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/49	Policy GDS.1/ NR13 Land at Coomb End, Radstock	NR13 – Coomb End Radstock - (Site area 0.59 ha) Development requirements: 1. Mixed use scheme for residential use to accommodate about 30 dwellings 2. Provision of footway along Coomb End Road 3. No net increase in traffic congestion or any prejudice to safety at the junction of Coomb End with A367 in Radstock	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.18 & R8.4
M/B9/50	Policy GDS.1 Proposals Map Land at Coomb End, Radstock	<i>Allocate land at Coomb End, Radstock for mixed use scheme under Policy GDS.1 on the Proposals Map and include the site in the HDB</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.18 & R8.4
M/B9/51	Policy GDS.1/ NR14 Proposals Map Welton Bag Factory, Norton Radstock	NR 14 - WELTON BAG FACTORY, MIDSOMER NORTON – Site area: 5.72 ha Development Requirements: 1. Mixed use scheme for residential and business uses within Use Classes B1, B2 or B8 2. About 100 dwellings 3. Provision for the public rights of way within the site	To accord with the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R8.7

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/B9/52	Policy GDS.1/ NR14 Proposals Map Welton Bag Factory, Norton Radstock	<i>Allocate Welton Bag Factory, Station Road: mixed use scheme under Policy GDS.1 on the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R8.7
M/B9/53	Policy GDS.1/ NR15 Cautletts Close Norton Radstock	NR15 - LAND AT CAUTLETTS CLOSE, MIDSOMER NORTON - Site area: 3.4 ha Development Requirements 1. About 110 dwellings 2. Improved junction between Cautletts Close and Steam Mills and associated traffic calming measures 3. Secondary link from Cautletts Close to Withies Park required to include a bridge for emergency services, cyclists and pedestrians 4. Improved public access to and along the River Somer	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.18
M/B9/54	Policy GDS.1/ NR15 Proposals Map Cautletts Close Norton Radstock	<i>Allocate land at Cautletts Close for residential use under Policy GDS.1 on the Proposals Map and include the site in the HDB</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R5.18
M/B9/55	Policy GDS.1/V3 Paulton Printing Factory	V3. PAULTON PRINTING FACTORY - Site area : 17.8 ha Development Requirements: 1. Development primarily for business use within B1, B2 & B8 of the Use Classes Order and with residential use on south eastern part of the site. Requirement for business and residential uses are: Development for residential and business use. Residential development beyond the south eastern part of the site to take place only as part of a mixed use scheme which includes employment development 2. Traffic management/calming measures to improve traffic, safety and environmental conditions through the village. 3. The provision of physical infrastructure to allow or improve access to public transport services.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.30. Remaining development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>4. Provision for pedestrians and cyclists as an integral part of the development, including links to the village centre and improvement to public footpath CL16/2 between the High Street and site.</p> <p>5. Enhancement of public footpath access from Paulton village to Cam Brook Valley.</p> <p>6. Provision of major landscaping along the northern, eastern and western boundaries of the site in order to reduce the impact on the Cam Valley.</p> <p>7. Retention of existing trees.</p> <p>— Requirements for business uses are:</p> <p>8. Provision of satisfactory highway access onto B3355 Hallatrow Road from the most western existing access.</p> <p>9. Safeguarding of residential amenity of nearby existing and proposed residential areas and amenity of adjoining recreation ground through measures including visual and noise mitigation.</p> <p>10. Measures to restrict vehicular access from existing access points along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site onto Church Street and High Street and if possible Hallatrow Road.</p> <p>Requirements for residential development are:</p> <p>11. About 100 dwellings located on the older factory building east of the existing Print Hall & Bindery building and south of the site given planning permission for a replacement book factory (application number 98/02269/RES) About 350 dwellings to be accommodated within the factory site, with no more than 150 to be constructed unless linked to a scheme for the development of employment floorspace</p> <p>12. No adverse impact on operation of existing and proposed business uses on the site.</p> <p>13. Vehicular access from Church Street/Farrington Road/Hallatrow Road junction with improved junction arrangements.</p> <p>14. Extensive landscaping of the site to allow for varying depths of vision in and out of site and to soften visual impact of existing and proposed business development.</p> <p>15. Retention of views across the site to the Cam Brook valley and countryside to the</p>	

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>north and to the Holy Trinity Church to the south.</p> <p>16. Development designed to integrate site into existing village and relate well to the open countryside to the north.</p> <p>17. Measures to safeguard the amenity of new residents of the site including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — 1) provision of a buffer zone between the existing and proposed factories and new dwellings; — 2) Landscaping; — 3) Noise and light mitigation from the existing factory(ies) and the proposed factory site to the north in perpetuity. 	
M/B9/56	Policy GDS.1/V4 Old Mills, Paulton	<p>V4. OLD MILLS, PAULTON - Site area : 13.5 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development for business use within uses B1, B2 & B8 of the Use Classes Order 2. Major landscaping to mitigate the impact on the surrounding countryside and nearby residential properties. 3. Protection, diversion or undergrounding of overhead electricity lines. 4. Improvements to A362 including its realignment & associated traffic management measures to A362 & Langley's Lane to ensure safe access to the site. 5. Retain existing hedgerows where possible. 6. Provision of community facility to meet needs of workers. 7. Mitigation works to avoid worsening the flood hazard downstream and on site. 8. Protection of water resources on the underlying aquifer. 	Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/57	Policy GDS.1/V5 Banner-down Road, Batheaston	<p>V5. BANNERDOWN ROAD, BATHEASTON</p> <p>— Site area : 0.3-0.85 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About 6 dwellings. 2. Improvements to Bannerdown Drive, Edon Park Drive and Bannerdown Road to provide suitable access, retaining the character of the area as far as possible. 3. - 4. - 5. Compensatory provision for loss of nature conservation interests. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.32
M/B9/58	Policy GDS.1/V5	<i>Delete Site GDS.1/V5: Bannerdown Road, Batheaston from the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.32

CHAPTER B9 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
	Proposals Map Banner-down Road, Batheaston		
M/B9/59	GDS.1/V8 Former Radford Retail System's Site, Chew Stoke	<p>V8. FORMER RADFORD RETAIL SYSTEM'S SITE, CHEW STOKE - Site area : 3.0 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements: Comprehensive mixed-use scheme including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About 30 dwellings. 2. Workshops for business use within B1, B2 & B8 of the Use Classes Order. 3. Protection of the floodplain and corridor of the Chew Stoke Stream. 4. Provision of public open space. 5. Protection of the Chew Stoke Stream Site of Nature Conservation Importance. 6. Landscaping to ameliorate impact on countryside and Green Belt. 7. Provision of community facilities. 	Development requirements reviewed in accordance R7.3.
M/B9/60	Policy GDS.1/V10 Land at Wellow Lane, Pease-down St John	<p>V10 LAND BETWEEN WELLOW LANE AND THE BYPASS, PEASEDOWN ST JOHN-Site area: 3.73 ha</p> <p>Development Requirements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. About 100 dwellings 2. Vehicular access to be gained from Wellow Lane with no direct link to the Bypass 3. Provision for the public right of way within the site 	To accord with the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R8.8
M/B9/61	Policy GDS.1 Proposals Map Land at Wellow Lane, Pease-down St John	<i>Allocate land between Wellow Lane and the bypass, Peasedown St John for residential use under Policy GDS.1 on the Proposals Map and include the site in the HDB</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R8.8

CHAPTER C1 – GREEN BELT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C1/1	Para C1.3	PPG2 details both the purposes of including land in Green Belts and objectives for the use of land within them. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection and should take precedence over the land use objectives.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.1
M/C1/2	Para C1.8	In addition to the need to address minor anomalies, changes to the Green Belt boundary are proposed in three locations. At Keynsham where JRSP policies 2(I), 9 and 16 provide for a change (see paragraphs C1.17 to C1.24). These proposed alterations relate to the inner boundary around Bath at Newbridge, and at Claverton Down and at Weston in Bath where an alteration is proposed (see paragraphs C1.9 – C1.12). The detailed Green Belt boundary is shown on the Proposals Map.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.2
M/C1/3	Para C1.10A	C1.10A Alterations to the Green Belt boundary are proposed in three locations. At Newbridge it is proposed to change the boundary in order to accommodate the provision of a transport interchange and civic amenity site associated with the redevelopment of Western Riverside.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.3
M/C1/4	Para C1.10B	The regeneration of Western Riverside will be of considerable benefit to the City and the District as a whole. In order to secure this regeneration it is necessary to relocate the existing civic amenity facility and to provide a transport interchange, incorporating a significant level of car parking which can not be accommodated within the development area. Western Riverside will be linked to this parking provision and the City centre by a Rapid Transit system (see paragraphs D6.1 – D6.3).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.3
M/C1/5	Para C1.10C	Most of the Western Riverside related vehicular traffic travelling from outside Bath will originate from areas to the west. The transport interchange needs to be able to serve a number of important transport corridors (principally the A4, A39 and A431). Sites of a sufficient size are not available within Bath and in order to minimise visual impact on the surrounding countryside it is preferable that the facility is situated in close proximity to the urban area. As such the Newbridge area represents the most appropriate location.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.3
M/C1/6	Para C1.10D	Whilst Annex E of PPG13 makes it clear that in certain circumstances park and ride	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.3

CHAPTER C1 – GREEN BELT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>development is not inappropriate in Green Belts (see paragraph C1.29A and policy GB.1A) it is likely that, given the required capacity, the scale of built infrastructure necessary would compromise the purposes of the Green Belt and would be inappropriate development within it. Therefore, it is necessary to change the boundary.</p>	
M/C1/7	Para C1.10E	<p>The proposed revised boundary follows the River Avon, A4 and the railway line and is defined on the Proposals Map. The area of land removed from the Green Belt is subject to a number of constraints, including flooding, nature conservation interests and visual impacts of development. The land is allocated under policy GDS.1 for the provision of a transport interchange and civic amenity facility and is of a sufficient size to accommodate these uses whilst ensuring that the identified constraints can be satisfactorily addressed.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.3
M/C1/8	Para C1.10F	<p>A change to the Green Belt boundary is also proposed on the eastern side of the University of Bath Campus at Claverton Down. The University is of considerable importance to the area, not only as an educational establishment but through its contribution to the local economy and as the site for the English Institute of Sport (SW). It is vital that its future development is facilitated</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances exist that warrant changing the Green Belt boundary in terms of the need for expansion in order to meet the Government's national priorities and objectives, the likely spatial requirement of this expansion and the lack of suitable alternative sites within Bath.</p> <p>Changes to the Green Belt boundary are proposed at the campus of the University of Bath at Claverton Down. The Green Belt boundary here will be redefined to exclude two areas of land. The larger area is to the east of Convocation Avenue, consisting of the buildings and enclosed outdoor facilities of the English Institute of Sport and some grass pitches to the east of them. The grass pitches make some contribution towards Green Belt purposes 1 and 3 (contributing to checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment) but are not considered to serve any meaningful role in meeting purposes 2, 4 and 5. The smaller area mainly comprises enclosed tennis courts to the west of Norwood</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.7

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Avenue which also make a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes 1 and 3.</p>	
M/C1/9	Para C1.10G	<p>The Government's key national priorities in relation to Higher Education can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Widening participation, thereby increasing the number of young people experiencing Higher Education (ii) Recruitment of overseas students to U.K. Universities to increase revenue to the U.K. economy (i) Greater role in regional economic development and competitiveness (iv) Continuation and enhancement of sporting excellence <p>Given the strong reputation of the University of Bath for academic excellence in both teaching and research and the presence of the English Institute of Sport it has and will continue to be able to make a significant contribution towards meeting these national priorities.</p> <p>However, the Council considers that there are exceptional circumstances which warrant excluding these areas from the Green Belt. Briefly, these result from Government priorities for the development of higher education and the opportunity for Bath, as a leading research-intensive university with particular strengths in the fields of science and technology, to contribute towards the aims of increasing participation, supporting growth in science, innovation and knowledge transfer.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.7
M/C1/10	Para C1.10H	<p>As a result of Government policy and demographic growth in demand, funding is expected to be available to increase student numbers. Assumptions relating to growth and the infrastructure needed to accommodate it have been validated against national indicators of supply and demand. Whilst it is not possible to precisely detail future student numbers and accommodation requirements it is anticipated that significant expansion will be needed which cannot be accommodated on the existing built up part of the campus.</p> <p>The University has identified a substantial requirement for additional accommodation to meet a wide range of needs as summarised in policy GDS.1/B11. This amounts to approximately 43,250 sq.m. of non residential floorspace and</p>	To reflect the Inspector's Recommendation R9.7 with qualification of figures by the word 'approximately' for the reasons set out in the Statement of Decisions.

CHAPTER C1 – GREEN BELT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>approximately 40,000 sq.m. of student accommodation. It is expected that this new development will need to be provided over a 10 year timescale to 2015, extending beyond the plan period. It is also considered highly desirable and more sustainable to concentrate and consolidate this growth at the existing campus rather than seeking to disperse it across a variety of sites in the city. In any case, the main development sites in the city outside the campus are more suited to meeting other important local needs and have been allocated accordingly.</p>	
M/C1/ 11	Para C1.10I	<p>Alternative suitable sites within Bath of a sufficient size are not available. In addition, there are organisational and sustainability benefits in providing for expansion 'on-campus'.</p> <p>While a substantial amount of this development can be accommodated within the present non-Green Belt areas of the campus, not all can be met in this way without unacceptable encroachment on the important green heart of the campus or skyline views.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.7
M/C1/ 12	Para C1.10J	<p>The University is also planning to develop a campus in Swindon. This will largely focus on complementary activities and will not help meet the existing and future requirements of the disciplines accommodated at Claverton Down.</p> <p>Weighing the limited harm that would be caused to Green Belt purposes against the above exceptional circumstances, the Council has concluded that the Green Belt boundary should be redrawn in two places: (a) to exclude land to the north side of The Avenue as far as the edge of the campus and then along the boundary between the campus and the adjoining land at Bushey Norwood and (b) to exclude land west of Norwood Avenue between Claverton Down Road and The Avenue.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.7
M/C1/ 13	Para C1.10K	<p>The amended Green Belt boundary follows the campus boundary and is defined on the Proposals Map. The land removed from the Green Belt is allocated for University related uses under policy GDS.1. This land also lies within the Cotswolds AONB and therefore, proposals for major development need to be assessed against the requirements set out in</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.7. Additional paragraph (C1.10K) proposed to refer to the need for a campus-wide Masterplan as required by modified policy GDS.1/B11 (see also Statement of Decisions for full

CHAPTER C1 – GREEN BELT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>paragraph 22 of PPS7. The exceptional circumstances that warrant changing the Green Belt boundary also address these requirements in relation to the importance of development in terms of national considerations and the cost of and scope for development elsewhere. Given the location of the site development proposals will be expected to display a high quality of design and respond sensitively to this landscape context.</p> <p>Development to provide the additional accommodation required by the University will need to come forward through the preparation of a Masterplan for the whole campus as required by policy GDS.1/B11. As part of the preparation of the Masterplan a full and detailed assessment of the appropriate development capacity of the campus, including the land to be excluded from the Green Belt, will be necessary in order to determine whether and how the required additional residential and non-residential floorspace can be acceptably accommodated.</p>	<p>reasons).</p>
<p>M/C1/ 14</p>	<p>Para C1.19</p>	<p>The JRSP through policies 2(l), 9 and 16 states that a change to the Green Belt boundary should be made at Keynsham to provide primarily for new residential development and associated local employment and social infrastructure. However, a change to the Green Belt boundary is not proposed at Keynsham these purposes as the dwelling requirement can be accommodated in other ways (see chapter B7 Housing). Keynsham has both good rail and bus links to Bath and Bristol and also has a good range of local facilities and services.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.10</p>
<p>M/C1/ 15</p>	<p>Para C1.20</p>	<p>In line with the need to ensure that the separate identity of the town is maintained it is proposed that the Inset boundary be altered to exclude land on the south western side of the town. See policy GDS.1.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.10</p>
<p>M/C1/ 16</p>	<p>Para C1.21</p>	<p>It is proposed that the locally important employment site at Lays Farm be excluded from the Green Belt. This site was formerly in agricultural use and was therefore, closely associated with the countryside. It is now occupied by two established industrial estates, is densely developed and effectively forms part of the adjoining urban area. As such it no longer serves Green Belt purposes.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.11</p>

CHAPTER C1 – GREEN BELT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C1/ 17	Policy GB.1 Proposals Map Land at Newbridge	<i>Reinstate the established Green Belt boundary at Newbridge as shown on the Proposals Map of the DDLP.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R7.8
M/C1/ 18	Policy GB.1 Proposals Map University of Bath	<i>Modify the Proposals Map by excluding St John's Field from the GDS.1/B11: University of Bath allocation and reinstate it within the Green Belt</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.8 (see Chapter B9 for site requirements)
M/C1/ 19	Policy GB.1 Proposals Map South Lodge, Sion Hill, Bath	<i>Amend the Green Belt boundary as shown on revision GB.1/1 so that it follows the low railings rather than the driveway at South Lodge on Proposals Map Inset 31</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.13 (reflecting PIC/C/2 as endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report).
M/C1/ 20	Policy GB.1 Proposals Map South West Keynsham	<i>Modify Green Belt boundary on the Proposals Map to reinstate GDS.1/K2 South West Keynsham as shown on the Proposals Map in the DDLP</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R9.12
M/C1/ 21	Policy GB.1 Keynsham Proposals Map Lays Farm, Keynsham	<i>Modify the Proposals Map to include Lays Farm, Keynsham within the Green Belt (the boundary to follow the HDB).</i>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R5.26
M/C1/ 22	Para C1.34	(vii) Chew Valley School, Chew Magna Stoke	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/3) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C2/1	Diagram 10	<i>Amend Diagram 10 to show the correct demarcation between landscape character areas 12 and 6 south of Bath</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/4) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/2	Para C2.5	Local Plan Policy 1 (Overall Strategy section) provides the overall context for seeking to ensure that new development is more sustainable than in the past. More d Detailed policies on the conservation of the many elements of the natural environment are set out in this chapter.	Proposed modification to the first sentence arising from the deletion of Policy 1 (R1.10).
M/C2/3	Para C2.9	The landscape setting of Bath is one of the City's most important assets and makes an important contribution to its status as a World Heritage site. It embodies the spring, from which the city first developed, and the river. It includes its hillside setting, the many designed and open spaces that lie within the built-up areas and the countryside, much of which lies within the Cotswolds AONB, which surrounds and penetrates deep within the City. A number of prominent, green hillsides within the built-up area, namely Stirtingale Farm, Twerton Farm, The Tumps, Twerton Round Hill, Beechen Cliff, Lyncombe and Mount Beacon, are also vital to the City's landscape setting and character as well as being important for wildlife. For Bath, Policy NE.1 is supplemented by the landscape strategy, entitled 'Cherishing Outdoor Places'.	Proposed modification arising from R10.3.
M/C2/4	Para C2.10	The character of Keynsham, Norton-Radstock and the villages are enriched and partly defined by the landscapes which surround and in some cases penetrate the built up areas. The Forest of Avon covers a large part of the north of the District. It completely surrounds Keynsham and is shown on Diagram 11. The aim of this initiative is to achieve major environmental improvements around towns and cities, with associated provision for access, leisure and education (See Policy NE.5). For Radstock the convergence of five valleys contributes to its unique character. It is surrounded and penetrated by prominent hillsides, including those around Midsomer Norton, which make a fundamental contribution to the town's character and adjoining areas.	Proposed modification arising from R10.3. Reference to the Forest of Avon deleted as it is no longer accurate in the context of this paragraph (since its extension) and is discussed in paras C2.27 – C2.32.
M/C2/5	Para C2.11	The aim of Policy NE.1 is to retain and where appropriate, enhance local landscape character in both urban and rural areas. Development will need to meet high standards of design, be sensitively related to existing	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.1

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		settlements and conserve historic, wildlife and landscape resources. The Landscape Character Assessment SPG will be used to assess the effect of proposals on landscape character and local distinctiveness when applying Policy NE.1 to particular proposals.	
M/C2/6	Policy NE.2	<p>POLICY NE.2</p> <p>Development which adversely affects the natural beauty of the landscape of the designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will not be permitted.</p> <p>Major development within an AONB, or which would affect it by virtue of proximity, will not be permitted unless</p> <p>i) an exception is justified by proven national need; and</p> <p>ii) there are no alternative options.</p> <p>Major development within an AONB or outside it which would harm the designated area will be determined on the basis of the advice in PPS7.</p> <p>Minerals development within an AONB will only be permitted where it is in the national interest or meets a local requirement for traditional building materials.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.2
M/C2/7	Para C2.18	<p>Important Hillside</p> <p>Within Bath, there are large tracts of open hillsides which are important in giving Bath its green and rural setting. Many are protected by Green Belt designation but others such as at Stirtingale Farm, Twerton Farm, The Tumps, Twerton Round Hill, Beechen Cliff, Lyncombe and Mount Beacon are not. These prominent, green hillsides like these within the built-up area are vital to the City's landscape setting and character. Many of the hillsides are also important for wildlife.</p>	To accord with the response to Inspector's Recommendation R10.3
M/C2/9	Para C2.20	<p>Where these hillsides make a contribution to local character, they are These areas are shown on the Proposals Map and protected under Policy NE.3.</p>	To accord with the response to Inspector's Recommendation R10.3
M/C2/10	Policy NE.3	<p>POLICY NE.3</p> <p>Development that would adversely affect the landscape qualities of the important hillsides shown on the proposals map, or their contribution that hillsides make to the character and landscape setting of Bath and</p>	To accord with the response to Inspector's Recommendation R10.3

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		Norton-Radstock, will not be permitted.	
M/C2/ 11	Policy NE.3 Proposals Map	<i>Delete the Important Hillside designation from the Proposals Map and amend the Notation Sheet accordingly</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.3
M/C2/ 12	Para C2.25	Bath & North East Somerset has a duty under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to ensure tree and woodland preservation wherever it is appropriate. The Council will continue to protect trees and woodlands through Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) as appropriate. There is also a level of protection afforded to trees in Conservation Areas (CAs) as outlined in para C3.48. Further advice can be found in the Council's guidance note 'A Guide to Trees in Conservation Areas' . However there are many trees of value outside these designations and careful consideration should be given to the removal of any tree.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.5
M/C2/ 13	Quick Guide 13A	<p align="center">Quick Guide 13A Trees in Conservation Areas</p> <p>In view of the contribution that trees can make to the character and appearance of a Conservation Area, the principal Act makes special provision for trees in Conservation Areas which are not the subject of Tree Preservation Orders. Under Section 211, subject to a few exceptions (including trees that are dead, dying or dangerous), anyone proposing to cut down, top or lop a tree in a Conservation Area is required to give six weeks notice to the Local Planning Authority. The purpose of this requirement is to give the Authority an opportunity to consider bringing the tree under their general control by making a Tree Preservation Order in respect of it. Penalties for contravention, which may include a requirement to replant, are similar to those for Tree Preservation Orders. For guidance on these matters, see Department of Transport, Local Government and the Region's leaflet 'Protected Trees, A Guide To Tree Preservation Orders' (item 20).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.4
M/C2/ 14	Para C2.26	The District's woodland cover is less than half of the national average. In line with the Government's England Forestry Strategy, Bath & North East Somerset seeks a significant increase in woodland cover and supports the extension of existing woodland and the creation of new woodlands. This may be through appropriate planting in new development, farm diversification or leisure provision. With new planting schemes, good	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/8) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		design is needed to ensure the appropriate species and layouts are used to allow trees to grow to maturity. Ancient woodlands are generally important for wildlife and the Council has sought to protect this interest under Policy NE.9.	
M/C2/ 15	Para C2.26A	Some mature trees are of great antiquity and make a particular contribution to landscape character, local distinctiveness, biodiversity and they are often valued cultural features with historical associations. Known as Veteran or Ancient trees they are in the ancient latter stage of their life, although this can be the longest period different species of trees tend to live for varying numbers of years; 100 years of age would be old for a birch or a willow tree. At 200 years a beech tree is middle aged, an oak would just be maturing and a yew tree a mere youngster. Veteran trees can be found anywhere; along old hedgerows, road junctions, river corridors and in parkland.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/9) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 16	Policy NE.4	<p align="center">POLICY NE.4</p> <p>Development will only be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it does not have an adverse impact on trees and woodlands of wildlife, landscape, historic, amenity, productive or cultural value; and ii. it includes the appropriate retention and new planting of trees and woodlands; and iii. it does not have an adverse impact on a veteran tree; <p>In the case of an unavoidably adverse impact on trees and woodlands of wildlife, landscape, amenity, productive or cultural</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/10) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 17	Para C2.31	Whilst designation of the Forest has no statutory implications, the Forest of Avon Plan is a material consideration in deciding a planning application in the Forest Area. Any development proposals must be in accordance with Green Belt and other policies in the Local Plan. SPG ' Planning and the Forest of Avon A Guide for Developers is being prepared was adopted in October 2005 to supplement policy NE.5.	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.6
M/C2/ 18	Policy NE.5	<p align="center">POLICY NE.5</p> <p>Development in the Forest of Avon, as shown on the Proposals Map, will only be permitted where it;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) respects the existing and developing woodland setting; and 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.6

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>ii) contributes to the implementation of the Forest Plan, particularly through tree planting.</p> <p>ii) does not conflict with the objectives of the Forest Plan and has regard to its aims in the layout of development, including landscaping.</p>	
M/C2/ 19	Policy NE.5 Proposals Map	<i>Extend the boundary of the Forest of Avon to include the entire District but excluding the AONBs on the Proposals Map</i>	The extension of the Forest of Avon Boundary to include the whole of the Bath & North East Somerset area except those parts designated as Mendip Hills and Cotswold AONBs was endorsed in June 2006 as a Single Member Decision.
M/C2/ 20	Diagram 8	<i>Extend the boundary of the Forest of Avon to include the entire District but excluding the AONBs</i>	See above
M/C2/ 21	Para C2.33	The natural environment can only support human life, health and well-being if its resources are healthy and in good order. The quality of our environment is therefore dependant on the quality of natural features present and the diversity of wild plants, animals, and habitats (the biodiversity) that they support — see Quick Guide 14. Biodiversity is discussed in more detail in the Bath and North East Somerset Biodiversity Action Plan 2000.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.8
M/C2/ 22	Quick Guide 14	<p>Quick Guide 14 What is Biodiversity?</p> <p>Biodiversity refers to the range of wildlife plants, animals, insects etc and Whilst in decline, there is still enormous biodiversity in Bath & North East Somerset from bumble bees to blackbirds, oak trees to otters.</p> <p>It is biodiversity that sustains us and the environment upon which we depend – it is essential for all our lives in all sorts of ways. It affects our health and well being, as well as the opportunities we have for work and play. Its continued degradation will result in the degradation of our economic, social and spiritual well being. Biodiversity therefore affects us all.</p> <p>Bath & North East Somerset Biodiversity Action Plan 2000</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.8

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C2/ 23	Para C2.40A	<p>The bats' feeding grounds extend roughly 4 km from the roosting and maternity sites. The interests of bats and their habitats are protected under Policy NE.10 and Bat Protection Zones are indicated in Diagram 11A. The Local Plan seeks to protect the Bats' interests by defining the Bat Protection Zones through Policy NE.7. Whilst the bat zones therefore cover large areas, the Policy seeks only to prevent development in those areas which would harm structures, feeding grounds or features used by the Bats. The Policy is therefore not overly negative in that it doesn't seek to constrain development per se but seeks to safeguard the interests of these rare and important bats.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.7
M/C2/ 24	Para C2.41	<p>All these sites are also Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) under UK legislation. The protection and management of internationally designated sites are achieved by a combination of the provisions in the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994 and section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. The legislative controls over development affecting these sites, primarily set out in the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994 are reflected in Policy NE.6. Permitted Development Rights affecting these sites are also curtailed. In accordance with PPS9 advise local planning authorities should show sites identified through international conventions and European Directives on the Proposals Map although policies in respect of these sites should not be included in the Local Plan as they are protected under separate legislation.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.7
M/C2/ 25	New Diagram 11A	<i>Insert a new Diagram 11A after Para C2.41 to indicate the extent of the Bat Protection Zones within the District</i>	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.10
M/C2/ 26	Policy NE.6	<p>POLICY NE.6 Development which would adversely affect the integrity* of potential or classified Special Protection Areas, and designated or candidate Special Areas of Conservation, whether directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless: i there is no alternative solution; and ii there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest; and iii compensatory provision of at least equal value is made to preserve the overall coherence of the Natura 2000 network.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.7

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Where such a site hosts a priority habitat or species, as listed in the EC Habitats Directive, the development is required for overriding reasons of human health, public safety or there are beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment.</p> <p>* integrity of a site is the coherence of its ecological structure and function, across its whole area, that enables it to sustain the habitat, complex of habitats and/or the levels of population of the species for which it was classified (PPG9).</p>	
M/C2/ 27	Policy NE.6 Proposals Map	<i>Change 'SI' notation to 'SAC at Compton Martin Ochre Mine, add 'SN' notation to remainder of 'SNCI' and delete 'RIG' notation on Proposals Map Inset 2.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/12) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 28	Policy NE.7	<p>POLICY NE.7</p> <p>Development within the Bat Protection Zones, as defined on the Proposals Map, that would adversely affect structures, feeding grounds or landscape features used by Horseshoe and Bechstein Bats, will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>(i) material factors are sufficient to override the nature conservation value of structures, feeding grounds or features; and</p> <p>(ii) any harm to their nature conservation value is minimised; and</p> <p>(iii) compensatory provision of at least equal nature conservation value is made.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.10
M/C2/ 29	Policy NE.7 Proposals Map	<i>Delete the Bat Protection Zones from the Proposals Map and amend the Notation Sheet accordingly</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.10.
M/C2/ 30	Policy NE.8	<p>POLICY NE.8</p> <p>Development which would adversely affect SSSIs, either directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>i. there are imperative reasons of national importance for the development; and</p> <p>ia. any harm to the nature conservation value of the site is minimised; and</p> <p>ii. compensatory provision of at least equal nature conservation value is made.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.13 (incorporating PIC/c/14 as endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report).
M/C2/ 31	Policy NE.8 Proposals Map	<i>Amend notation on land to north of Tynning Road, Bathampton from Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SN) to Site of Special Scientific Interest (SI) on Proposals Map Inset 31.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/15) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 32	Policy NE.8 Proposals Map	<i>Add Burlledge Sidelands and Meadows Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) to the Proposals Map, Insets West, Central and 8.</i>	Proposed modification arising from the notification of Burlledge Sidelands and Meadows SSSI in November 2005 under Countryside and

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
			Rights of Way Act 2000.
M/C2/ 33	Para C2.43	PPG9 on nature conservation stresses the importance of protecting locally as well as nationally designated sites of nature conservation importance. Semi-natural habitats in Bath & North East Somerset the District , whilst being limited in extent, are diverse and include unimproved grasslands, broad-leaved woodlands, batches , streams, rivers, lakes and ponds. JRSP Policy 18 requires the Local Plan to identify areas where the fragmentation of natural habitats should be halted and reversed. Much of the semi-natural habitat is identified in the Local Plan as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs).	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/16) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 34	Para C2.44	Also included as SNCIs are Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS). In addition to biological importance, local community value may contribute to the designation of a site. The criteria for site selection are summarised in Quick Guide 15. Natural Assets in Avon 1995 sets out the SNCI habitat selection criteria. All SNCIs, as currently identified, are shown on the Proposals Map but other sites which meet the criteria may come forward during the Plan period. The Council's Ecologist holds the description of each SNCI and a plan of their boundaries.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.14
M/C2/ 35	Quick Guide 15	Quick Guide 15 SNCI Habitat Selection Criteria 1. Scientific Characteristics – Naturalness, size, diversity, rarity, fragility, irreplaceability, representativeness, location, important and key species and habitats, age/continuity. 2. Community/Amenity Community value, physical access, visual access, education, landscape/aesthetic, situated in area lacking natural habitats, recorded history, species & Habitats Conservation Source : Natural Assets in Avon 1995	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.14
M/C2/ 36	Policy NE.9	POLICY NE.9 Development which would adversely affect, either directly or indirectly the nature conservation value of , Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, Local Nature Reserves or Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites, as shown on the Proposals Map, or any other sites of	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.15

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>equivalent nature conservation value, will not be permitted unless;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. material factors are sufficient to override the local biological geological / geomorphological and community/amenity value of the site; and ia any harm to the nature conservation value of the site is minimised; and i. compensatory provision of at least equal nature conservation value is made 	
M/C2/ 37	Policy NE.9 Proposals Map	<i>Amend the Proposals Map by adding SN annotation to Linear Park and add Newton Brook SNCI.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/19) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 38	Para C2.48	There are also species of plants and animals which are of particular importance within the District such as Bath Asparagus and Field Eryngo. They are important because they comprise significant local populations of nationally rare species or they are species unique or typical of the area. The Council proposes to prepare SPD on Priority Species and Habitats which will provide more detailed information.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.17
M/C2/ 39	Quick Guide 15A	<p>Quick Guide 15A Priority Species and habitats for Bath & North East Somerset</p> <p>Habitats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Habitats for which there is a national Biodiversity Action Plan 2. Habitats of local ecological and cultural significance 3. Habitats listed in Annex 1 of the Habitats Directive <p>Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UK BAP species with national Biodiversity Action Plans 2. Species listed in official UK Red Data Books 3. Nationally scarce/nationally notable species 4. European Protected Species as listed in the European Habitats Directive 5. Species which are known to be present in nationally or internationally important numbers (as defined by recognised national data bases e.g. WEBS). 6. Species which expert opinion suggests that Bath and North East Somerset is of particular importance in a national or regional context 7. Species that are rare in Avon according to the BRERC area status for that species 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.16

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>group</p> <p>8. Species which are present in 3 or fewer sites in Bath & North East Somerset.</p> <p>9. Species where there is evidence of significant population decline locally</p> <p>10. Species that if conserved will deliver significant conservation benefit for species or habitats that are on the list (so-called keystone or indicator species).</p> <p>Source: Wildthings Priority Species List.</p>	
M/C2/ 40	Policy NE.11	<p>POLICY NE.11</p> <p>Development which would adversely affect a species of importance to Bath & North East Somerset or the habitat of such species, directly or indirectly, will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>(i) the importance of the development and its need for that particular location is sufficient to override the local value of the species; or and</p> <p>(ii) any harm to the species and their habitats is minimised; and</p> <p>(iii) compensatory provision of at least equivalent nature conservation value is made.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/22) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 41	Para C2.49	<p>Many features of the landscape such as trees, copses, woodlands, batches, ponds, hedgerows, stone walls, orchards and watercourses are valuable for a range of reasons such as their wildlife, amenity, historic, recreational or visual benefit. Such heritage is not confined to protected areas or designated sites and are of importance throughout the countryside and within urban areas.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/21) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 42	Para C2.52	<p>Local Plan Policy 4 NE.12 sets out the overall detailed requirements for considering environmental interests in new development and Policy NE.12 takes this further. The careful siting and treatment of development can protect wildlife habitats and physical features. Furthermore, development often offers positive opportunities for enhancing the value of such features which may enhance the quality of the development itself. Such features should be considered at an early stage in the development process with a view to the creation of new habitats or the enhancement of existing ones. Further guidance on the type and nature of new features and habitats will be set out in the proposed SPD on Priority Species and Habitats.</p>	Proposed modification to the first sentence arising from the deletion of Policy 1 (R1.10). Proposed modification to the final sentence to accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.18
M/C2/ 43	Policy NE.12	<p>POLICY NE.12</p> <p>Development will only be permitted where it:</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/23) has been endorsed by the Inspector as

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>i. retains features of the landscape such as trees, copses, woodlands, grasslands, batches, ponds, roadside verges, veteran trees, hedgerows, walls, orchards, and watercourses and their corridors if they are of amenity, wildlife, or landscape value, or if they contribute to a wider network of habitats ;</p> <p>ii. provides, where appropriate, for the creation of new features and habitats; and</p> <p>iii. makes appropriate provision for the management of such features and habitats where they are of major importance for wild flora and fauna.</p> <p>Where the loss of such features is unavoidable because the reasons for the development outweigh the need to retain the features:</p> <p>a. any harm to the feature is minimised, and</p> <p>b. compensatory provision of at least equal value will be required</p>	<p>confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.</p>
M/C2/ 44	Para C2.56	<p>Within the District, the Environment Agency has identified a number of groundwater source protection areas and these are shown on the Proposals Map. These are concentrated in the Chew Valley and the northern edge of the Mendip Hills and in areas north and south of Bath. In order to protect public water supplies and prevent pollution which is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to clean up, it is important that development proposals affecting identified groundwater catchment areas and any others within the District, are strictly controlled.</p>	<p>Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/24) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.</p>
M/C2/ 45	Para C2.56A	<p>Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels. If it is anticipated that works may penetrate the natural winter water table then the impact of such works will need to be assessed and discussed with the Environment Agency. If detrimental consequences of the water environment are likely, agreed mitigation measures will be necessary.</p>	<p>Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/25) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.</p>
M/C2/ 46	Para C2.58A	<p>PPG25 (Development & Flood Risk) sets out a sequential test in the allocation of land for development and the consideration of development proposals. Table 1 of the PPG defines fluvial Flood Risk zones and advises on the nature of development appropriate in each zone. Flood Risk Assessments should be prepared and submitted with planning applications within indicative</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.19</p>

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		floodplains or where there is other evidence that there is a risk from flooding. Advice on their preparation can be found at Annex F of PPG25.	
M/C2/ 47	New Para C2.58B	There are a number of watercourses in Bath & North East Somerset which are highly modified, under normal conditions flow through storm water drains, sewers and culverts. Under extreme storm conditions, floodwaters can emerge above ground and follow established "Overland Flood Paths". Under Policy NE.14 these "Overland Flood Paths" are protected from inappropriate development which may impede floodwater flows and are on the Proposals Map and in Diagram 12.	Proposed modification arising from Council's responses to the Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 48	Para C2.59	In light of the inherent danger associated with flooding and the uncertainty exacerbated by climate change, a precautionary approach is required in relation to development and flood hazard. Development will not normally be allowed in floodplains or other locations which may give rise to flooding. Indicative floodplains defined by the Environment Agency are shown on the Proposals Map. Floodplains will be reviewed on a regular basis in future by the Environment Agency and it is important that development proposals take account of the most up to date information.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.20 (incorporating PIC/C/26) as endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report).
M/C2/ 49	Policy NE.14	<p align="center">POLICY NE.14</p> <p>Development will not be permitted where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) it is subject to flooding, causes flooding elsewhere or where it would impede the flow of floodwater unless the flood hazard can be mitigated; (ii) it is in an indicative floodplain, including those identified on the Proposals Map, unless the flood hazard can be mitigated, it is not subject to flooding or does not cause flooding elsewhere; (iii) it causes net loss in the flood storage capacity; (iv) the run-off from the development would result in, or increase the risk of, flooding of watercourses, ditches, land or property; (v) it would prevent the maintenance of the channels of watercourses; it would result in watercourse channel instability; or (vi) the existing drainage systems on the site are adversely affected, or if the land drainage of the site, when developed, is inadequate. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.21

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		All planning applications located within an indicative floodplain shown on the Proposals Map or where there is other evidence that it is at risk from flooding should be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.	
M/C2/ 50	Policy NE.14 Proposals Map	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31 and 31a to show amendments to the flood plain in the Bath area.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 51	Policy NE.14 Proposals Map	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 19 to show the Protected Overland Flood Path at Coomb End Culvert, Radstock</i>	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 52	Policy NE.14 Proposals Map	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31 to show the Protected Overland Flood Path at Charlcombe Brook, Larkhall</i>	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 53	Policy NE.14 Proposals Map	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31 to show the Protected Overland Flood Path at West Brook, Weston</i>	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 54	Diagram 12	<i>Amend Diagram 12 to show amendments to the flood plain in Bath and the Protected Overland Flood Paths</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 55	Policy NE.14 Notation Sheet	<i>Add "Overland Flood Paths (Policy NE.14)" to the Notation Sheet</i>	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 56	Proposals Map Notation Sheet	<i>Add "indicative" before "flood plain" on the Notation Sheet (Policy NE.14)</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.22
M/C2/ 57	Para C2.62to protect the watercourse character as set out in Policy NE.15.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/31) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C2/ 58	Para C2.66	These might include, for example, the comparative accessibility/sustainability of land if of different agricultural value , its importance for biodiversity; the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure; workforce and markets; the protection of natural resources, including soil quality; or where agricultural practices contribute to the quality of the environment or local economy. Some of these qualities may be recognised by a statutory wildlife, landscape, historic or archaeological designation.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.24
M/C2/ 59	Policy NE.16	POLICY NE.16 Development which would result in the loss of	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R10.23

CHAPTER C2 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a based upon the DEFRA land classification) will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>i)the need for the development at that location is sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land; or</p> <p>ii)other sustainability considerations on available lower grade land outweigh the need to protect the agricultural value of the land; or</p> <p>iii)available lower grade land contributes in a special way to the quality of the environment or local economy.</p> <p>Where there is a choice of sites on land in Grades 3b-5, development should be directed towards the lowest grade, except where sustainability considerations suggest otherwise.</p> <p>Development which would result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land will not be permitted unless sustainability considerations are sufficient to override the protection afforded to the agricultural value of the land. Development should be directed towards the lowest grade agricultural land except where sustainability considerations indicate otherwise.</p>	

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C3/1	Para C3.2	<p>The District's towns and villages are diverse in character reflecting their history, location and size. The character, layout and form of groups of buildings and streets and spaces make a significant contribution in engendering a sense of place and adding to the quality of life in town and country. The identity of settlements should be conserved and enhanced through regeneration, enhancement of the public realm and a high standard of new design. Equally important in conserving the distinctiveness of settlements is the maintenance of their physical separation especially in the south of the district where there are numerous small villages in close proximity to one another but which comprise separate communities.</p>	Proposed modification arising from R11.20.
M/C3/2	Quick Guide 16	<p align="center">Quick Guide 16 The Historic Environment</p> <p>The Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 imposes duties relating to the preservation of Listed Buildings and protection and enhancement of Conservation Areas. PPG15 'Planning and the Historic Environment' sets out measures for the conservation of the wider historic environment including non-listed buildings. Protection of Ancient Monuments and archaeology is afforded by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979 (as amended) and PPG16 'Archaeology and Planning' sets out measures for the preservation and management of archaeological sites. JRSP Policies 3 and 19 provide a framework for the Local Plan to take a comprehensive and integrated approach in setting out policies for conserving and enhancing the historic environment.</p>	Quick Guide 16 proposed to be deleted for the sake of consistency with the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in the Report to delete other Quick Guides (see para 1.11 of Report).
M/C3/3	Para 3.6	<p>Inclusion on the List of World Heritage Sites is recognition of the universal value of Sites, meaning that their conservation and continuity are of concern to all. Bath is considered to be of outstanding importance for the purposes of the World Heritage Convention because it fulfils three of the six criteria plus a further two criteria that all sites have to fulfil from the Guidelines prepared by the World Heritage Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it represents a masterpiece of human creative genius; • it exhibits an important interchange of 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.1

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is an outstanding example of a type of building or architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates a significant stage in human history; • meet the test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components; • have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties or cultural landscapes. <p>The City also meets the two further criteria required of World Heritage Sites, namely, authenticity and legislative protection.</p>	
M/C3/4	Para C3.8	<p>It is now acknowledged that providing statutory protection for World Heritage Sites is not sufficient to ensure their future survival. According to current best practice, the Local Planning Authority is working in partnership with landowners, managers and other agencies to ensure that a comprehensive World Heritage Site Management Plan is produced and implemented, complementing the provisions made in the Local Plan and Structure Plan. The Management Plan is currently being prepared and will from 2003-2009 forms a framework for the activities that take place within the Site, ensuring that the World Heritage values are protected, conserved and enhanced. It sets out a long-term vision for the Site, aims and objectives, and a programme of short and long term actions to improve the condition and management of the Site. Not only does this demonstrate that the obligation is being fulfilled but also that the Council is fully committed to the protection of the World Heritage Site.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/32) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C3/5	Para C3.10	<p>Government guidance places great emphasis on the need to protect World Heritage Sites for the benefit of both present and future generations. PPG15 states that development proposals should always be carefully scrutinised for their likely effect on the site or its setting in the longer term. Significant development proposals that may adversely affect the site or its setting are therefore likely to require an environmental assessment so that their immediate and long-term impact can be assessed in accordance with advice</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.2

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		contained within the Department of the Environment Circular 7/94 'Environmental Assessment – Amendment Regulations' Circular 02/99 Environmental Impact Assessment.	
M/C3/6	Para C3.12	The boundary of the World Heritage Site is defined by UNESCO. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport has confirmed in November 2005 that UNESCO agreed that the boundary of the City of Bath World Heritage Site is the former Bath City municipal boundary as it was in 1986 at the time of its nomination. The boundary of the World Heritage Site is defined shown on the Proposals Map and development proposals affecting the Site or its setting will be considered in the context of Policy BH.1.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.3
M/C3/7	Policy BH.1	POLICY BH.1 Development that will have an adverse impact on the World Heritage Site of Bath or its setting will not be permitted Development which would harm the qualities which justified the inscription of Bath as a World Heritage Site or which harm the setting of the World Heritage Site will not be permitted.	To reflect the Inspector's Recommendation R11.4 but with reference to the setting of the WHS retained.
M/C3/8	Para C3.17	It is recognised that alteration and extension are sometimes necessary to adapt a listed building. Where they are of architectural or historic interest, the presumption will be in favour of retaining all original and later internal and external features such as fireplaces, windows (including shopfronts), external and internal doors, panelling, sash boxes and shutters, staircase balustrades and other features of importance.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.5
M/C3/9	Policy BH.3	POLICY BH.3 Development involving the total or substantial demolition of a listed building will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and where: i) the building is not capable of being repaired or maintained and overriding environmental, economic or practical reasons exist in favour of demolition; ii) every possible effort has been made to continue the present use or to find a suitable alternative use for the building; iii) an acceptable scheme for redevelopment or reparation has been approved. the proposals bring substantial benefits for the community.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/33) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C3/ 10	Policy BH.4	<p align="center">POLICY BH.4</p> <p>Development proposals for the change of use of part or the whole of a listed building will be permitted provided:</p> <p>i) there is no realistic prospect or demonstrable need for continuation or reinstatement of the use for which the building was originally designed (except where Policy ET.2(2) also applies); and</p> <p>ii) there is no adverse impact resulting from the proposed use on the fabrie character and setting of the listed building, its architectural or historic interest, and on the character of the surrounding area.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.6 (incorporating PIC/C/34 as endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report).
M/C3/ 11	Para C3.30	<p>The Council will maintain a list of locally significant buildings selected on the basis of their contribution to the local environment and their intrinsic architectural or historic associations. The process of identification and selection is ongoing and will be encouraged through community participation in the form of village design statements, conservation area appraisals and thematic studies of buildings, structures and landscapes. The selection criteria are set out in Quick Guide 17 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Age and integrity of building or structure is representative of its period. The consideration of integrity assesses whether the style and form of a building or structure is substantially complete. 2. Architectural interest. Examples of the local vernacular. Built by a noted local/national architect/engineer/builder. Rare or pioneering example of a building type or structure. 3. Historical associations. Association with a notable person or event. Buildings of structures constructed as part of an historic event. 4. Context. Individual and/or group value. Landmark buildings. 5. Local interest. Buildings which are part of the cherished local scene. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.8
M/C3/ 12	Quick Guide 17	<p>Selection Criteria for Locally Important Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Age and integrity of building or structure is representative of its period. The consideration of integrity assesses whether the style and form of a building or structure is substantially complete. 7. Architectural interest. Examples of the local vernacular. Built by a noted 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.8

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>local/national — architect/engineer/builder. Rare or pioneering example of a building type or structure.</p> <p>8. Historical associations. Association with a notable person or event. Buildings of structures constructed as part of an historic event.</p> <p>9. Context. Individual and/or group value. Landmark buildings.</p> <p>10. Local interest. Buildings which are part of the cherished local scene.</p>	
M/C3/ 13	Policy BH.5	<p align="center">POLICY BH.5</p> <p>Development which adversely affects a building or structure on the list of Locally Important Buildings will only be permitted where:</p> <p>i) the architectural interests and integrity of the building is conserved or enhanced;</p> <p>ii) the contribution to its context, local interest or historical associations is not adversely affected.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.7
M/C3/ 14	Para C3.40	<p>Policy BH.6 sets out the criteria against which applications for planning permission within or affecting Conservation Areas will be assessed. Conservation area appraisals will assist in the application of the policy as they identify what makes an area special and what detracts from it (see paras C3.49 and C3.53). Design Policies D.2 and D.4 also sets out particular design requirements for new development.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.9
M/C3/ 15	Policy BH.6 Proposals Map	<i>Amend Conservation Area boundary at Mill Lane, Radstock on the Proposals Map</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/35) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C3/ 16	Policy BH.6 Proposals Map	<i>Add the Midsomer Norton and Welton Conservation Area to the Proposals Map, Insets 19 & 19a</i>	The Midsomer Norton and Welton Conservation Area was designated in April 2004 and effective from July 2004.
M/C3/ 17	Policy BH.7	<p align="center">POLICY BH.7</p> <p>Within Conservation Areas, development involving the total or substantial demolition of buildings and other structures which make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area will only be permitted where:</p> <p>i) the building or structure is not capable of retention or repair;</p> <p>ii) every possible effort has been made to continue the existing use or find a suitable alternative use; and</p> <p>iii) the proposed development, if any, would</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.10

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>make a similar or greater contribution to the special character or appearance of the area.-or</p> <p>iv) the proposed development would make a significantly greater contribution to the conservation area than the building to be lost.</p>	
M/C3/ 18	Quick Guide 18	<p align="center">Quick Guide 18</p> <p>Restrictions on Permitted Development Rights</p> <p>There are some forms of development, which do not require permission. For example planning permission is not normally required for internal alterations to buildings which do not alter their external appearance and limited changes of use. Within Conservation Areas, there are restrictions on the type of cladding; dormer windows in roof slopes; satellite dishes on walls, roofs or chimneys fronting a highway; and radio masts, antennae or specified radio equipment housing which can be erected or installed without planning permission. The size of house and industrial extensions may also be more restricted.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.11
M/C3/ 19	Para C3.45	<p>A consequence of Conservation Area designation is that some permitted development rights are restricted and planning permission is required for various types of development. Restrictions on permitted development rights in Conservation Areas are outlined in Quick Guide 18. The Council will review the need for further restrictions on permitted development rights during the Plan period.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.12
M/C3/ 20	Para C3.46	<p>The local planning authority may also issue a Direction under Article 4 (2) of the town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 to withdraw permitted development rights for developments which materially affect the external appearance of dwelling houses such as doors, roofs and frontages, if this is considered appropriate. For example, in the Bath Conservation Area the demolition of boundary walls of one metre or less in height will require planning permission.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.13
M/C3/ 21	Para C3.48	<p>Trees make a vital contribution to the character and appearance of a Conservation Area. Certain trees (including fruit trees not in commercial production) are protected by Tree Preservation Order and in Conservation Areas all trees are afforded specific protection under the legislation. Under Part 8 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 six weeks notice</p>	Proposed modification to delete reference to Quick Guide 13A arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.4

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		must be given to the local planning authority before trees are lopped, topped or felled (subject to certain exceptions including small trees and trees that are dead, dying or dangerous). This enables the Council to consider making the tree the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (see also Quick Guide 43A).	
M/C3/ 22	Para C3.54	English Heritage has compiled a Register of Historic Parks and Gardens which are of national importance by virtue of their historic layout, features and architectural ornaments. Twelve of these lie within, or partly within the District. In addition, the Parks and Gardens Gazetteer, prepared by the former Avon County Council and the Avon Gardens Trust, lists a number of other such sites within the District which are of more local historic importance and make a significant contribution to local distinctiveness.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.17
M/C3/ 23	Para C3.55	The number and range of sites illustrate the District's important parks and gardens heritage. The increased demand for land for development means that some of these parks and gardens are under threat. Many are particularly vulnerable to housing schemes, especially where the previous use has become redundant or historic designs have been overgrown. However, transport infrastructure, golf course and other recreational development can be just as damaging to the unique character of parkland.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.17
M/C3/ 24	Para C3.56	All of these sites on English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens are shown on the Proposals Map and Policies Policy BH.9 and BH.10 seeks their conservation. The local planning authority must is required to consult English Heritage where a planning application is likely to affect a Grade I and II* registered site or its setting, and the Garden History Society must be consulted on all applications affecting any site on the English Heritage register.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.13
M/C3/ 25	Policy BH.9	POLICY BH.9 Development which adversely affects Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest shown on the Proposals Map and their settings, will not be permitted. Development which adversely affects sites on English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens or their settings will not be permitted.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.16
M/C3/ 26	Policy BH.10	POLICY BH.10 Development which adversely affects the features which contribute to the character of	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.15

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		interest of Local Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest shown on the Proposals Map will not be permitted.	
M/C3/ 27	Proposals Map Policy BH.10	<i>Modify the Proposals Map by deleting all Parks and Gardens of Local Historic Interest and amend the Notation Sheet accordingly.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.14
M/C3/ 28	Para C3.71	Within many of the District's towns and villages, there are open spaces which make an important visual contribution to local character. The nature of these sites varies and they may include public open space, recreational areas, playing fields, open fields, the grounds of large properties or amenity areas. Some are open to public access and others are privately owned. This list is not exhaustive, but an open space should contribute to the character of the settlement in terms of its visual importance to benefit from protection under this policy.	Proposed Modification arising from the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R11.19
M/C3/ 29	Para C3.72	Many of these sites are identified on the Proposals Map and Policy BH.15 seeks to safeguard the contribution they these sites make to local character. The purpose of the designation is to protect visual amenity value.	Proposed Modification arising from the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R11.19
M/C3/ 30	Policy BH.15	<p align="center">POLICY BH.15</p> Development which harms the openness and character of Visually Important Open Spaces, including those shown on the Proposals Map, will not be permitted. Development which adversely affects open spaces that make a contribution to the character of the settlement or locality will not be permitted.	Proposed Modification arising from the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R11.19
M/C3/ 31	Policy BH.15 Proposals Map	<i>Delete the VIOS designation from the Proposals Map and amend the Notation Sheet accordingly.</i>	To accord with the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R11.19
M/C3/ 32	Para C3.74	In some places there are narrow gaps between settlements which are under considerable pressure from development, particularly in the south of the District. Policy BH.16 identifies and protects the particularly sensitive largely undeveloped gaps between settlements by designating village buffers. The primary objective of the policy is to maintain the separateness of settlements and not necessarily protect attractive landscapes.	To accord with the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R11.20
M/C3/ 33	Policy BH.16	<p align="center">POLICY BH.16</p> Development in the village buffers defined on the Proposals Map and listed below which would prejudice the separateness of	To accord with the Council's response to the Inspector's Recommendation R11.20

CHAPTER C3 – BUILT & HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>settlements will not be permitted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paulton – Midsomer Norton 2. Paulton – Hallatrow 3. High Littleton – Hallatrow. 4. Temple Cloud – Clutton <p>Outside the Green Belt, development which prejudices the separateness of settlements will not be permitted.</p>	
M/C3/34	Diagram 15	<i>Delete Diagram 15: Village Buffers</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.20
M/C3/35	Policy BH.16 Proposals Map	<i>Delete the Village Buffer designation from the Proposals Map and amend the Notation Sheet accordingly.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.20
M/C3/36	Para C3.80	<p>Advertisements requiring express consent may also be refused in the interests of public safety. This will be a significant factor where an advertisement is likely to cause confusion with traffic signs and signals, for instance, or where it will result in glare or dazzle, or interfere with a navigational light or aerial beacon. All directional signs are regulated under the Traffic Signs and Highways Regulations and General Directions 1994. As highway authority, the Council makes every attempt to reduce sign clutter and other adverse impacts that highway signage can have on the historic and other sensitive environments within the scope of the Regulations. As planning and highway authority special attention is given to the consideration of traffic signs for tourist attractions.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R11.21

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/1	Para C4.3	The principles of sustainable development form the basis of strategic minerals planning advice contained within draft Regional Planning Guidance for the South West RPG10 and strategic minerals policies contained within the draft Joint Replacement Structure Plan.....	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/36) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C4/2	Policy M.1	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY M.1</p> <p>The winning and working of minerals and other forms of minerals development will be permitted where:</p> <p>i) DELETED</p> <p>ia) the need for mineral in relation to the availability of alternative sources of primary, secondary and recycled materials to the expected market is demonstrated;</p> <p>ii) DELETED</p> <p>iii) the scale and output of the proposed development is compatible with the character of the area and the nature of existing mineral workings within the District;</p> <p>iv) the adverse environmental effects are either acceptable or mitigation measures can be employed;</p> <p>v) soils, overburden and mineral wastes will as far as is practicable be retained within the site to assist progressive reclamation and to minimise the need to import waste or other materials for this purpose; and</p> <p>vi) the site will be restored to a condition which maintains or enhances its environmental value and value to the community.</p> <p>The winning and working of minerals and ancillary and related minerals development will be permitted where:</p> <p>i) the need for the mineral in relation to the availability of alternative sources of primary, secondary and recycled materials to the expected market is demonstrated;</p> <p>ii) the scale and nature of the proposed development is compatible with the character of the area; and</p> <p>iii) the adverse environmental effects are either acceptable or mitigation measures can be employed;</p> <p>iv) soils, overburden and mineral wastes will as far as is practicable be retained within the site to assist progressive reclamation and to minimise the need to import waste or other materials for this purpose; and</p> <p>v) the site will be restored to a condition</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.1

CHAPTER C4 – MINERALS

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>which maintains or enhances its environmental value and value to the community.</p>	
M/C4/3	Para C4.5	<p>Geology The three main geological series present in the District are the Carboniferous, Triassic and Jurassic formations (Diagram 16).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/4	Para C4.6	<p>Carboniferous Carboniferous limestone is characteristic of the Mendip Hills to the south of the District, but there are outcrops near Compton Martin and West Harptree. The Pennant Sandstone and Shale series are part of the Upper Coal Measures which underlie much of the former Wansdyke area. They outcrop in a band between Farrington Gurney and Keynsham with an isolated outcrop near Newton St Lee. At Lower Writhlington part of the former coal tip is a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) because of its geological significance. It has produced Britain's largest collection of Carboniferous insect fossils.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/5	Para C4.7	<p>Triassic These rocks form an area of low relief between the Mendip Hills and Dundry Hill. To the east they form the valley floors of the Somer, Wellow and Cam Brooks before disappearing under more recent Jurassic formations. Dolomitic Conglomerate comprises rock debris accumulated at the foot of the Mendips and can be seen in the vernacular red stone building material in the villages of the area. Occasional beds of Butcombe Sandstone associated with the Keuper Marl form local topographical features such as Pagans Hill and Chilly Hill near Chew Stoke.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/6	Para C4.8	<p>Jurassic The Lias limestones form the plateau areas above the low-lying Keuper Marl valleys. Blue Lias has been quarried in the north of the District to provide building materials for Keynsham. Numerous fossils are associated with these rocks. In the south, White Lias has been worked to provide building stone for the Norton Radstock area. Some of the worked out quarries are now SSSIs. Lower Lias clay lies on top of the limestone plateau in places and is exposed in the narrow valleys of the Cam, Wellow and Newton Brooks.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/7	Para C4.9	<p>Rising above the Lias Limestone plateaux are the hills, ridges and high plateaux formed by the Inferior Oolite limestone which includes</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>the Fullers Earth and Midford Sands formations. They include the Cotswold Hills but also occur as isolated fragments such as The Sleight, Stantonbury Hill and Winsley Hill. The Great Oolite and Forest Marble limestones form the scarp slopes and wide plateaux which typify the Cotswolds. They provide high ground between valleys of the Wellow and Cam Brooks, the extensive plateau near Hinton Charterhouse and the Downs around Bath.</p>	
M/C4/8	Para C4.10	<p>Surface Deposits River gravels and glacial alluvium feature in the valley bottoms of the Avon and its tributaries. They form extensive areas in the upper parts of the Chew and Cam Valleys. They also occur at the foot of the Mendip Hills around Chew Valley Lake and at Hollow Marsh. At Bathampton, near Keynsham and at Newton St Loe the terrace gravels of the Avon are SSSIs.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/9	Para C4.11	<p>Mineral Resources Limestone Limestone is the principal commercial mineral worked in the plan area. Current reserves (2001) are in the order of 430,000 tonnes of Jurassic Oolitic and 170,000 tonnes of Jurassic Lower Lias and Triassic limestones. Limestone worked in the district is used predominantly for building and walling purposes.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/10	Para C4.12	<p>Extraction of stone has taken place in the district since Roman times. Bath Stone, the most familiar of the various types of building stone found in Bath & North East Somerset, is a generic name for limestones quarried and mined from the Middle Jurassic Great Oolite Limestone formation capping the hills in the Bath area. Underground extraction historically was found to yield the best quality Bath Stone, resulting in extensive mining at Combe Down. Bath Stone is still mined at Stoke Hill Mine near Limpley Stoke. An extensive resource of high quality Bath Stone is believed to exist in the Great Oolite limestone plateau forming a corridor between Limpley Stoke and the southern boundary of the District. A variety of Bath Stone known as Combe Down Stone is extracted at Upper Lawn Quarry. It is considered that a sufficient resource of Combe Down Stone exists on land surrounding the quarry to ensure a long term supply of materials for maintenance and refurbishment of buildings within Bath.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

CHAPTER C4 – MINERALS

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/ 11	Para C4.13	Jurassic Lower Lias ("blue lias") and Rhaetian Stage Triassic ("white lias") limestones are extracted for building and walling stone purposes at Stowey Quarry near Bishop Sutton. An identified workable resource of about 480,000 tonnes of limestone exists on land adjacent to the site.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 12	Para C4.14	Having regard particularly to the status of Bath as a World Heritage Site, this Plan must make provision to ensure that a sufficient supply of limestone is readily available to meet local demand for building and walling stone over the plan period.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 13	Para C4.15	Fuller's Earth Fuller's earth is a generic name for clays and fine silts which exhibit properties of absorption and adsorption. The name derives from its historic use in "fulling" - cleaning oil and grease from - woollen cloth. Fuller's earth is a nationally scarce and versatile mineral with many commercial and industrial applications. It was extracted by underground mining for many years at Combe Hay near Bath until closure of the pit in 1979. Whilst the planning permissions for extraction of the mineral over an area of about 126 ha are no longer extant, it is thought that there are unworked sub-economic deposits of the mineral in the order of 5 million tonnes on land between Twinhoe and Peasedown St John (referred to as the Wellow deposit).	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 14	Para C4.16	Fuller's earths vary considerably in their nature and applicability owing to different levels of impurity and/or constituent minerals. The comparatively high level of impurity (principally calcite) of the Bath deposits reduces the versatility of the mineral and consequently its commercial value. Whilst deposits in Oxfordshire, Bedfordshire and Sussex lend themselves to more advanced processing, given the present state of processing technology impurities in the Combe Hay fuller's earth make it unsuitable for "value added" treatment.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 15	Para C4.17	National production of fullers earth has reduced from 213,000 tonnes in 1989 to 94,000 tonnes in 1999. Levels of imports have risen. It is understood that ready-processed granules and powders currently are imported from the Mediterranean region at approximately half the cost of mining the mineral at Combe Hay.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/ 16	Para C4.18	<p>A revival of working at Combe Hay would entail the commissioning of new plant together with the sinking of a new mine adit to exploit the remaining mineral deposits. It is considered that the environmental impact and concomitant land-use planning issues raised by creation of a new mine adit together with the limited expected yield in the Combe Hay area (between 200,000 and 400,000 tonnes ex-drier) and poor quality of the deposit would make investment an unattractive proposition. Underground mining of the largely unproved Wellow deposit would not be commercially viable for reasons similar to those put forward in considering the Combe Hay position and for the additional reason that geological movement in this area is thought to have broken up the deposits into small economically unattractive pockets. A proposal for opencast extraction of fuller's earth in the Wellow area would be difficult to justify in terms of either environmental impact or overriding national need.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 17	Para C4.19	<p>Having regard to the issues outlined above it is considered that proposals for working the Combe Hay/Wellow fuller's earth deposits are unlikely to come forward during the Plan period. On this basis there is little justification for reconfirmation of the Area of Search for fuller's earth identified in the 1993 Mineral Working in Avon Local Plan. The known resource is wholly within the Bristol – Bath Green Belt and substantially within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is therefore unlikely that the resource will be sterilised by significant surface development should circumstances change and commercial interest in the mineral revives. Any proposals which do come forward during the Plan period will be considered on their merits and judged against relevant policies of the Plan.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 18	Para C4.20	<p>It is considered that the derelict plant site should either be demolished and the land restored to agriculture or the existing buildings refurbished and used for a purpose which does not conflict with policies relating to the Green Belt, development in rural areas, highways and other planning policy considerations.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 19	Para C4.21	<p>Coal A long history of coal mining in the district ended with the closure of Lower Writhlington colliery in 1973. On nationalisation in 1947 the Somerset coalfield was estimated to have</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		sufficient remaining accessible reserves to maintain an annual production level of 750,000 tonnes until 2047.	
M/C4/ 20	Para C4.22	It is unlikely that coal mining will resume in Bath and North East Somerset. The principal reasons are the nature and geology of the coal deposits together with the economics generally of the modern coal industry and the cost of investment in infrastructure needed to extract coal locally.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 21	Para C4.23	The restored or naturally regenerated colliery spoil tips of the Radstock and Pensford basins are the visible remnants of the Somerset coal mining industry and are now a valued part of the industrial archaeology of the District. The Mineral Working in Avon Local Plan (MWALP) contained policies and proposals relating to restoration of the tips. MWALP policies and proposals have been reviewed. No proposals for these sites are put forward at this time.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 22	Para C4.24	Mineral Reserves Active sites There are two surface mineral workings and one underground mine operating currently in Bath and North East Somerset.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 23	Para C4.25	Stowey Quarry near Bishop Sutton is a small surface mineral working now producing "white lias" and "blue lias" limestones for use as building and walling stone and also for aggregate purposes. Stone is extracted by mechanical means. Products from the quarry are used in construction and refurbishment of buildings within the district and as far afield as the Royal Opera House and Dover Town Hall. The quarry covers an area of about 9ha. It is located on the edge of the escarpment overlooking the Chew valley on land approximately 500m east of the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is accessed from an unclassified lane off the Stowey Clutton road. Areas of nature conservation and archaeological importance are located within 150m of the northern site boundary. The location of the site and the nature of the surrounding topography means that it is at present largely hidden from wider views.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 24	Para C4.26	Historically, actual output has been 5000 tonnes or less. A maximum output of 180,000 tonnes each year is permitted following review of the 1954 planning permission for stone extraction. The quarry is estimated to	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>have a remaining workable reserve of about 470,000 tonnes in 2001. A 3.75ha area of land adjacent to the eastern boundary of the current working was identified as a preferred area for extension in the MWALP. It is estimated that this area would yield in the order of 480,000 tonnes of stone. The void resulting from maximum extraction of stone both from the current site and preferred extension area is estimated to be around 1.7 million m³.</p> <p>² The Review of Old Minerals Planning Permissions procedures under the Planning and Compensation Act 1990 and the Environment Act 1995 require old minerals planning consents to be registered and fresh schedules of planning conditions submitted for approval. Dormant sites where permissions have been registered cannot be worked until new conditions have been approved.</p>	
M/C4/ 25	Para C4.27	<p>The MWALP proposals for Stowey Quarry are:</p> <p>i) phased mineral extraction eastwards through the preferred area followed by backfilling with excavated and imported wastes and the progressive reclamation of the site for an agricultural use. Possible retention of the clay pigeon shoot and house;</p> <p>ii) removal of the plant and buildings and the reclamation of the plant base as in (i).</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 26	Para C4.28	The MWALP proposals have been reviewed. Revised proposals are set out at C4.87 – C4.89 below.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 27	Para C4.29	Upper Lawn Quarry at Combe Down is a surface mineral working producing the Combe Down variety of Bath Stone for building, refurbishment, restoration and walling purposes. The quarry is effectively the last operational remnant of the complex of quarries and mines in the Combe Down area where stone was extracted for the construction of Bath. Stone is extracted by mechanical means. Products from the site are used in the construction and refurbishment of buildings within Bath and in other areas.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 28	Para C4.30	The 1.4 Ha site is just outside the Bristol Bath Green Belt and Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is overlooked by residential property on St Winifred's Drive. It is located on generally flat land. Access is via Shaft Road and St Winifred's Drive. Land adjacent to the south-western and south-eastern boundaries is used as allotments. Land to the north-east is in residential use, whilst land to the north west comprises a	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		recreational area for a nearby school. Given the topography of the area and vegetation surrounding the perimeter of the quarry, the site is largely hidden from wider views. Output is limited by planning condition to 5000 tonnes each year. Planning permissions relating to the site recently were reviewed under the Environment Act 1995 and a new schedule of operating and restoration conditions imposed. Planning permission was granted in 2001 for an extension to the site which is believed will secure reserves until at least 2011.	
M/C4/ 29	Para C4.31	The MWALP proposals for Upper Lawn Quarry are: i) perimeter landscaping around the boundaries of the preferred area; ii) development of a new access from Shaft Road to avoid future use of St Winifred's Drive by vehicles serving both the masonry works and the quarry; iii) phased extraction in the preferred area followed by backfilling with excavated wastes; iv) possible retention of the masonry works following the cessation of quarrying and the use of imported stone.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 30	Para C4.32	The MWALP proposals have been reviewed. Revised proposals are set out at C4.80 – C4.81 below.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 31	Para C4.33	Hayes Wood Mine at Limpley Stoke produces high quality Bath Stone known as Stoke Ground Base Bed and Stoke Ground Top Bed for building purposes. Stone from the mine has been used in construction of Seven Dials in Bath, in restoration of Northampton Town Hall and in refurbishment of Buckingham Palace. The permitted area of the mine extends to approximately 29 Ha underlying land within the Bristol Bath Green Belt and Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 32	Para C4.34	Stone is extracted by the pillar and stall method and cut into blocks underground before transportation to the surface. Mineral waste is deposited underground in worked-out areas. The stone blocks are transported to Yeovil for final cutting and processing. Apart from the mine administration buildings, car parking and stacking area off Midford Lane, there is little visual evidence of a working mineral extraction site.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

CHAPTER C4 – MINERALS

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/ 33	Para C4.35	Hayes Wood Mine produces 9-11,000 tonnes of stone each year. Planning permission for a 22.62 ha extension to the site was granted in June 1996. Reserves of saleable minerals were estimated at that time to be 395,850 tonnes. It is considered that there are workable reserves at the site for at least 18 years' production at current rates of output.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 34	Para C4.36	An extensive area of land between Hayes Wood to the north, Cleaves Wood to the west, the A36 to the east, and the District boundary to the south and encompassing the current mine was identified as an Area of Search for Bath Stone extraction in the MWALP.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 35	Para C4.37	The MWALP proposals for Hayes Wood Mine are: i) Phased underground extraction in the Hayes Wood – Hog Wood area by the development of Hayes Wood Mine; ii) Improvements to the existing surface stacking ground at Hayes Wood Mine followed by its relocation; iii) Installation of new landscaped adits or shafts and surface stacking grounds elsewhere in the preferred area with new highway access to the A36 or B3110; iv) Removal of all surface installations and reclamation of cleared areas for an agricultural/forestry use.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 36	Para C4.38	The MWALP proposals both for the Area of Search and the mine have been reviewed. Revised proposals are set out in paragraph C4.82 below.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 37	Para C4.39	Inactive sites with registered planning permissions There are currently 3 dormant mineral working sites in Bath and North East Somerset.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 38	Para C4.40	North Wick Quarry at East Dundry is a clay pit. Planning permission has been registered covering an area of approximately 6.6 ha. The pit currently is dormant. The site has in the past produced "puddling" clay used for lining porous waterways and sealing joints in concrete and earth banks. Optimum extractable remaining reserves of clay at the site are estimated to be in the order of 2.3 and 2.5 million tonnes. Environmental Impact Assessment is likely to be required prior to determination of any proposal to recommence working.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/ 39	Para C4.41	Proposals for North Wick Quarry in the MWALP were that the site should be restored to agriculture and/or forestry and that a reduction in the area to be worked would be desirable having regard to general environmental and landscape considerations. The MWALP proposals have been reviewed. No proposals for this site are made at this time.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 40	Para C4.42	Queen Charlton Quarry near Keynsham is an unreclaimed quarry which in the past has produced lias limestone for building and for use in the manufacture of pre-cast concrete products. It is understood that the quarry has not operated since the 1950s. Planning permission has been registered over an area of approximately 17 ha although mineral extraction rights have been surrendered by agreement on a 2 ha parcel of land restored in the 1990's. Having regard to nature conservation interests within the site, Environmental Impact Assessment is likely to be required prior to determination of any proposed new conditions. Details of remaining mineral reserves at the site are not available but are anticipated to be small. There were no proposals in the MWALP relating to this site.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 41	Para C4.43	Mount Pleasant Quarry at Combe Down is an unreclaimed quarry which produced Bath Stone for building and for use in the manufacture of pre-cast concrete products. Planning permission has been registered over an area of approximately 0.7ha. Having regard to nature conservation interests within the site, Environmental Impact Assessment is likely to be required prior to determination of any proposed new conditions. The quarry has not operated since the mid-late 1980s. The remaining resource at the site is small and may not be economically workable.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 42	Para C4.44	There were no proposals in the MWALP relating to this site. A planning application currently is being processed for development of the site for a recreational use.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 43	Para C4.45	CURRENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF MINERAL WORKING IN BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET The District has few active mineral workings. Those that exist are comparatively small scale in nature. At present, the principal minerals-related environmental impact issue in the District is ground stability issues resulting from	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>underground stone mining at Combe Down in the 18th and 19th centuries. It is considered that the implications of ground stability issues in this area encompass planning issues of a broader nature than those normally associated with mineral extraction and restoration of mineral working sites. The Council has set up a dedicated project team of officers to deal with this issue. Proposals for remediation works are likely to be only tangentially related to minerals policy planning and will have more in common with major civil engineering works.</p>	
M/C4/ 44	Para C4.46	<p>Setting aside the Combe Down stone mines project, the environmental impacts of mineral working in Bath and North East Somerset can be divided between active and inactive sites.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 45	Para C4.47	<p>Active sites</p> <p>Stowey Quarry: it is desirable, having regard to MPG7, that land used for mineral extraction is returned to a beneficial afteruse as quickly as possible. However, at this quarry, large heaps of waste (overburden and interburden) on the land surface together with an irregular quarry floor and little evidence of effective reclamation to agriculture by backfilling quarried waste has not been successful, even though planning permission was also granted to raise levels in part of the quarry by the use of imported inert waste.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 46	Para C4.48	<p>Views into the site are limited but its prominent location on the edge of the escarpment means that there is potential for waste heaps to become visually intrusive. Noise, dust, hours of working, output, traffic numbers and other material planning concerns are controlled by modern planning conditions.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 47	Para C4.49	<p>The changing context of waste management may result in a significant reduction in the availability of wastes suitable for reclamation of the site. Reclamation should therefore incorporate mineral wastes resulting from the extraction and processing of building and walling stone. For this reason, and to ensure that high quality building and walling stone is not put to low grade use, the processing on the site of minerals and mineral wastes for aggregate should be resisted. Having regard to the visually unobtrusive location of the site restoration to low level may be an appropriate option.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

CHAPTER C4 – MINERALS

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/ 48	Para C4.50	Upper Lawn Quarry: is largely hidden from view by the surrounding landform and vegetation. Operation of the quarry over many years has not given rise to complaints from residential property bordering the site. Noise, dust, hours of working, output, traffic numbers and other material planning concerns are controlled by modern planning conditions.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 49	Para C4.51	The proximity of this currently innocuous site to a candidate Special Area of Conservation (Greater and Lesser Horseshoe bats) and to residential property, the potential loss of allotment land and the possibility of extensions to the site opening up views into the workings set the planning context for consideration of future working, reclamation and afteruse of the quarry.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 50	Para C4.52	Hayes Wood Mine: although in a sensitive location in landscape terms, there is at present little visual intrusion from the pithead/stacking area. No complaints are on record relating to operation of the site. Noise, dust, hours of working, output, traffic numbers and other material planning concerns are controlled by modern planning conditions.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 51	Para C4.53	Any potential increase in output from the site may result in a more intrusive pithead/stacking area.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 52	Para C4.54	<p>Inactive sites</p> <p>Fuller's Earth Plant Site (Fuller's Earth Works)</p> <p>This site has long been regarded as an eyesore on the southern approach to Bath. The plant is set some way back from the A367. In summer it is partially screened by trees in leaf and is not readily visible. In winter the derelict industrial building is more visibly intrusive and clashes with the predominantly rural open surrounding landscape. Land to the north east of the plant site requires reclamation in order to bring it back into beneficial agricultural use. A planning application submitted in 2000 for redevelopment of the site for offices and residential uses was subject of a call in inquiry and is awaiting the decision of the Secretary of State was subsequently dismissed. However the inquiry did establish that the site has the benefit of a B2 (general industrial) fallback permission.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendations R12.2 and R12.3

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/ 53	Para C4.55	<p>North Wick Quarry</p> <p>North Wick Quarry is currently inactive. Vegetation within the working area has naturally regenerated and the site has a disturbed, hummocky appearance. Access to the site is via narrow single-track unclassified roads with few passing places. Restoration of the site involving importation of materials is unlikely to prove acceptable on highway impact grounds. Any proposal to resume working will be subject either to a fresh planning application or an application for fresh operating and restoration conditions. Having regard to the potential scale of the reserve, to the sensitive hillside location and to the nature of the highways serving the site, an Environmental Statement is likely to be required to accompany any future applications for resumption of mineral extraction and/or restoration of the site.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 54	Para C4.56	<p>Queen Charlton Quarry</p> <p>This site originally comprised four distinct areas. One area has been restored to agriculture and another – the former concrete works – is currently being reclaimed for an agricultural/nature conservation afteruse. The 6.0 ha area indicated on the proposals map is at present characteristic of an unreclaimed shallow mineral working – hummocky and uneven land overgrown with ruderal weeds. It is part of a larger area designated in the draft Wansdyke Local Plan as a Landscape Improvement Area. The site is a breeding habitat for skylark. Numbers of this species nationally have dramatically reduced in recent times. If the site is left untouched, it is anticipated that this valuable habitat will gradually disappear as the vegetation changes in accordance with natural progression. The site therefore requires sensitive reclamation in order to protect this habitat, to improve its appearance in landscape terms and to restore it to a beneficial afteruse.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 55	Para C4.57	<p>Colliery spoil tips</p> <p>The MWALP made proposals for reclamation of four colliery spoil tips in the District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marsh Lane (Farrington Gurney) – “remove/regrade for an agricultural use or industrial use in conformity with the Norton Radstock and Environs Local Plan. Not suitable as a processing plant location”; 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pensford (Wick Lane, Pensford) — “regrade top part of tip for agriculture or woodland use taking account of wildlife conservation importance of the site and the need to avoid exposure of industrial activities in the old pithead areas at Wick Lane”; • Springfield (Midsomer Norton) — “regrade/additional tree planting for site to act as an improved screen to adjoining commercial uses taking into account tree preservation order and the site’s archaeological importance”; and • Old Mills (Midsomer Norton) — “regrade/additional tree planting, taking account of the wildlife conservation importance of the site, for uses in conformity with the Norton Radstock and Environs Local Plan”. 	
M/C4/ 56	Para C4.58	<p>These tips have either been reclaimed or have now naturally regenerated to the extent that some now are a significant nature conservation resource. Tips such as Old Mills at Midsomer Norton are an important element in the industrial archaeology of the southern part of the District, and are distinctive landscape features. Proposals to remove the tips or to recover residual minerals within them should be resisted.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 57	New Para C4.58A	<p>Limestone is the principal commercial mineral worked in the plan area. Current reserves are in the order of 600,000 tonnes, according to 2001 estimates. Fuller’s Earth and coal were extracted from sites within the District up to 1979 and 1973 respectively. However, whilst reserves still exist in the area the extraction of these minerals is not considered to be economically attractive and is unlikely to resume in the District.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 58	New Para C4.58B	<p>There are currently three sites active in the District: two surface mineral workings and one underground mine. Stowey Quarry near Bishop Sutton, produces white lias and blue lias limestones for use as building and walling stone and also for aggregate purposes. Upper Lawn Quarry at Combe Down produces the Combe Down variety of Bath Stone for building, refurbishment, restoration and walling purposes; and Hayes Wood Mine at Limpley Stoke produces some 9-11,000 tonnes of stone each year.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/C4/ 59	New Para C4.58C	There are also a further three sites which are currently inactive but with extant planning permissions. Table 4.1 below provides a summary of the mineral reserves and registered planning permissions at the six sites."	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 60	New Table 4.1	<i>Insert new Table 4.1 with a summary of the mineral reserves and registered planning permissions at the six sites (see new table at Annex 1 appended to this section)</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.2
M/C4/ 61	Para C4.60	Efficient use of minerals Given the economic and environmental need to conserve resources, clearly it is essential to make best use of extracted minerals. The MPA has no influence on the end use of minerals and mineral products. However it can contribute to the efficient use of minerals by seeking to ensure, for example, that high grade minerals are not processed for low grade applications.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.4
M/C4/ 62	Policy M.3	POLICY M.3 Minerals development will only be permitted where minerals extracted at the site, including where appropriate overburden and mineral wastes, will be used to their maximum practicable efficiency in both economic and environmental contexts.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.4
M/C4/ 63	Para C4.62	Production of secondary and recycled materials is, on the face of it, to be encouraged. But it must be borne in mind that this may not always represent the best practicable environmental option for management of the wastes involved. Moreover, as more construction and demolition wastes are recycled there is likely to be a greater shortfall in availability of materials suitable for quarry reclamation and restoration purposes. The MPA considers that in principle it is desirable for some extracted materials to remain on site, even if they can be marketed, in order to assist with reclamation of the site. The amount to be retained will depend on the circumstances at the site.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.5
M/C4/ 64	Policy M.4	POLICY M.4 Development at mineral extraction sites involving the production of secondary and/or recycled aggregates will only be permitted where: i) it will not involve the redevelopment of a satisfactorily restored or satisfactorily	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.6

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>regenerated quarry or landfill site, or redevelopment of a colliery spoil tip where it would cause significant harm of value in respect of landscape or nature conservation and/or industrial archaeology; and</p> <p>ii) the site is either close to the source of waste and/or the market for the recycled material; and</p> <p>iii) the development will not conflict with or unreasonably delay reclamation and restoration of the site.</p>	
M/C4/ 65	Policy M.5	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY M.5</p> <p>Development involving exportation of processed or unprocessed mineral waste and/or overburden from surface and underground mineral workings will not be permitted unless the materials are demonstrated to be surplus to site reclamation and restoration requirements.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.7
M/C4/ 66	Para C4.64	<p>National target guideline levels for production of primary aggregates are apportioned by region and thence by county. In the former Avon County, the apportionment is between South Gloucestershire and North Somerset. Draft Joint Replacement Structure Plan policy 26 sets out levels of production for both Unitary Authority areas. Having regard to strategic planning policy, Bath and North East Somerset is not required to contribute to provision of aggregates to meet former Avon's regional apportionment. Bearing in mind the potential environmental impact of primary aggregate production and the strategic planning position, the MPA considers that it is appropriate to resist proposals for primary aggregate production in Bath and North East Somerset unless the material to be produced is not obtainable from quarries in South Gloucestershire or North Somerset.</p>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/C/39) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/C4/ 67	Para C4.74	<p>The current mineral operator intends significantly to increase output from the site in comparison with average annual outputs since operations began in 1945⁴. The site currently is producing aggregates as well as building and walling stone. It is considered that a material increase in output from the site will change the nature of the mineral operation from a small scale building stone quarry to a large scale intensive extraction operation possibly involving the production of aggregates. Whilst the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) is unable to amend the</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.8

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>current planning permission, the output limit imposed following the Environment Act review is accepted by the MPA only within the narrow and interrelated context provided by the practical limitations of the minerals review process and the fact that the existing 1953 permission did not regulate the level of output from the site at all.</p> <p>† 800 tonnes per annum between 1949 and 1972; 1200 tpa between 1973 and 1990 (Source: Mineral Valuer South)</p>	
M/C4/ 68	Para C4.75	<p>Extension of the site will require a new planning permission. Development of an intensive, higher-output operation will be unacceptable on policy grounds and could not be justified by local, regional or national need for either aggregates or building stone. Planning applications relating to extension of the quarry for production of materials other than building and walling stone at output levels compatible with historical output levels at the site will be evaluated against policies including M.1, M.3 and M.6.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.9
M/C4/ 69	Para C4.76	<p>There has been no material change in planning circumstances since the MWALP allocation relating to Stowey Quarry and no planning application has come forward for extension of the site. The Preferred Area for extension of the quarry has therefore been carried forward from the MWALP and is shown on the Proposals Map. Having regard to the ineffectual reclamation of the quarry it will be necessary for appropriate reclamation of the worked out areas to be clearly in hand before the MPA considers a planning application for extension of working into the preferred area. Winning and working of mineral within the preferred area should be phased to ensure that reclamation of the site keeps pace with extraction. Following reclamation the site should be put to an agricultural/nature conservation afteruse.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.10
M/C4/ 70	Para C4.78	<p>It is important that any future planning applications for extensions of the quarry are supported by reliable geological evidence in order to avoid unnecessary loss of allotment and recreational land and provide for reinstatement of allotments and recreational land on a <i>quid pro quo</i> basis as part of quarry restoration proposals.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.11
M/C4/ 71	Para C4.79	<p>The site is close to a candidate Special Area of Conservation incorporating Sites of Special Scientific Interest in respect of greater and lesser horseshoe bats. The quarry has</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.12

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>features of geological interest. Proposals for further working and restoration of the site must safeguard these interests. The amenities of residential properties near the south-eastern and north-eastern boundaries of the site must be safeguarded from noise, dust and general disturbance arising from activity at the quarry. Operations at present do not give rise to complaints. It is considered important that the quarry remains as a small building stone producer so that the present innocuous nature of activity is maintained.</p>	
<p>M/C4/ 72</p>	<p>Para C4.80</p>	<p>The MWALP proposals for the site refer to afteruse of the quarry as "possible retention of the masonry works following the cessation of quarrying and the use of imported stone". An afteruse of this nature would require planning permission. Having regard to the nature conservation interests within and near to the site, to the proximity of residential property, to the constraints on access to the site and to the potentially extensive floor area (in excess of 3.0 ha) that may remain after cessation of extraction, it is considered that use of the entire site as a masonry works will not be acceptable. A mixed afteruse incorporating reinstatement of recreational land and enhancement of the nature conservation/amenity potential of the site together with a small masonry works is preferred. Progressive restoration of the site should be compatible with the scale and nature of this afteruse.</p>	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.13</p>
<p>M/C4/ 73</p>	<p>Para C4.83</p>	<p>The site is shown on the proposal map and is about 6 Ha in area. A description of the site and discussion of the need for reclamation is set out at paragraphs C4.42 and C4.56 above. Phased reclamation of the site utilising inert soils and subsoils to a managed nature conservation and agricultural use is proposed. Having regard to the rural context of the site and the desirability of minimising local disturbance and achieving phased orderly reclamation of the quarry complex, reclamation proposals for the 6 ha site should be phased to accord with the completion of will be resisted until reclamation works on the Queen Charlton Concrete Works site have reached an advanced stage. Any planning application coming forward will need to demonstrate, amongst other things, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • satisfactory access to and egress from the site can be achieved; • nature conservation and amenity interests can be safeguarded; • noise, dust and general disturbance can 	<p>To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R12.14</p>

CHAPTER C4 – MINERALS

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>be contained within acceptable levels having particular regard to MPG11. <i>The Control of Noise at Surface Mineral Workings</i> and other relevant guidance;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sufficient inert soils and subsoils of acceptable quality can be obtained; • work can be completed within a reasonable period of time. 	

ANNEX 1 TO CHAPTER C4

**TABLE 4.1: Active and Inactive Quarries within Bath & North & East Somerset
Summary of the Mineral Reserves and Registered Planning Permissions
(Inspector's Recommendation R12.2)**

	Name	Description	Extent of mineral reserve and type	Planning Permissions
Active sites	Stowey Quarry	9 ha site located near Bishop Sutton on the edge of the escarpment overlooking the Chew valley.	White lias and blue lias limestones with workable reserve of 170,000 tonnes at 2001.	Maximum output of 180,00 tonnes per annum following review of 1954 planning permission
	Upper Lawn Quarry	1.4 ha site located at Combe Down on south east edge of Bath just outside Green Belt and Cotswold AONB	Surface mineral working producing Combe Down Bath Stone. Details of remaining reserves are not available.	Output limited by planning condition to 5,000 tonnes per annum by planning condition. Planning permission granted in 2001 for extension to secure reserves to 2011
	Hayes Wood Mine	29 ha site of underlying land located at Limpley Stoke to the south east of Bath within Green Belt and Cotswold AONB	Stoke Ground Base Bed and Stoke Ground Top Bed Bath Stone producing 9–11,000 tonnes per annum. Reserves of saleable minerals estimated to be 395,850 tonnes at 1996.	Output is limited by planning condition to 20,000 tonnes per annum. Planning permission for 22.62 ha extension granted June 1996
Inactive sites	North Wick Quarry	Dormant clay pit at East Dundry	Surface mineral working producing clay. Extractible remaining reserves estimated to be 2.3 – 2.5 million tonnes.	Planning permission registered over area of approximately 6.6 ha
	Queen Charlton Quarry	Dormant quarry near Keynsham which has not operated since the 1950s	Unreclaimed quarry formerly producing lias limestone. Details of remaining reserves are not available but anticipated to be small.	Planning permission registered over area of approximately 17 ha though mineral extraction surrendered by agreement on a 2 ha area restored in the 1990s
	Mount Pleasant Quarry	Dormant quarry at Combe Down, Bath which has not operated since themed-late 1980s	Unreclaimed quarry formerly producing Bath Stone. Remaining reserve is small and may not be economically workable.	Planning permission registered over area of approximately 0.7 ha

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/D/1	Para D1.1	<p>A prominent theme of this Local Plan is the need for "balance". The Regional Planning Guidance for the South West states that "the need for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods" should be balanced with "the need to protect and improve the environment" (RPG10 1994). The same Guidance calls for an "integrated and balanced transport system". Integration in this context is defined in the 1998 White Paper: "A New Deal for Transport – Better for Everyone" as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • integration within and between different types of transport so that people can move easily between them • integration with the environment so that our transport choices support a better environment • integration with land-use planning so that transport and planning work together to support more sustainable travel choices and reduce the need to travel • integration with policies for education, health and wealth creation so that transport policies help to create a more fair and inclusive society. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.1
M/D/2	Para D1.4	<p>More specifically the JRSP calls for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improvements in alternative modes to be harnessed to measures to reduce car traffic – the "carrot and stick" approach; • securing the provision of rail/bus infrastructure and passenger services, as required to implement the locational and transport strategy of the Plan and to meet identified social needs which do not satisfy the commercial criteria of the transport operators; • a comprehensive and integrated pattern of public transport services, incorporating better modal interchange; • 'park and ride' schemes to the town and City centres where reductions in car use would be realised and the viability of existing rail and bus services safeguarded; • a strategic approach to parking provision that encourages public transport use, avoids competitive provision of parking by neighbouring authorities and reduces congestion in urban areas; • traffic management measures that restrict undesirable car use, give priority to non-car modes of travel and protect communities from the adverse effects of private motorised traffic; • improved provision for cyclists and 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.1

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>pedestrians that offers safer conditions, including segregated routes and paths linking residential areas to shopping, leisure and employment centres;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support for fiscal measures to manage traffic. <p>All these measures are covered by the policies which follow.</p>	
M/D/3	Table 6B	<p>Table 6B</p> <p>Local Transport Plan Objectives</p> <p>National Criteria Bath & North East Somerset LTP 2000</p> <p>Environment The Council will continue to act as a good steward for the City of Bath and its unique status as a World Heritage Site and seek local environmental enhancements throughout the District.</p> <p>Safety To minimise the risk of personal injury to all road users and to ensure the area is safe.</p> <p>Economy To facilitate the prosperity of local businesses through policies which make travel more efficient.</p> <p>Accessibility To provide high levels of accessibility for all and promote public transport.</p> <p>Integration To gain maximum benefit from transport systems through the integration of their planning and operation.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's recommendation R13.2
M/D/4	Para D1.5	<p>The new Local Transport Plans play a major role in the integration of transport and land use planning. The proposals they contain have to be supported by policies in the Local Plan and it is intended that the two documents should be complementary. Transport Plans have a shorter time frame (5 years) and are reviewed annually. It is therefore appropriate that they should be consulted to find out about smaller road improvement or traffic management schemes which may previously have been found in the Local Plan. The Bath & North East Somerset Local Transport Plan</p>	Modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R13.2

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>(July 2000) sets out the Council's 20 year vision for transport, defines objectives and puts forward a strategy. It aims to implement the strategy with a programme of schemes and measures for the 5 years 2001/06. Progress will depend on the allocation by the DTLR of funding. An Annual Progress Report is submitted to the DTLR and a review of the Local Transport Plan is likely to begin in 2002/03. The Plan adopts the objectives in the box below to reflect the underlying elements of Government policy set out in the 1998 White Paper "A New Deal for Transport – Better for Everyone". This has now been replaced by the Joint Local Transport Plan 2006/7 – 2010/11 for the former Avon area. It includes two major schemes – The Greater Bristol Bus Network and the Bath Package which are referred to below. The Plan's objectives reflect the Government's current transport policy priorities – congestion, road safety, air quality, accessibility and quality of life.</p>	
M/D/5	Para D2.1	<p>In addition to the local transport corridors referred to in the JRSP Bath & North East Somerset is crossed by two strategic transport corridors of regional, national and European significance. The London to South Wales and the South-West corridor is identified in the Government's 10 year Transport Plan (2000) and the Regional Transport Strategy. It was the subject of a current Government multi-modal study, which recommended, inter alia, improvements to increase the capacity of the main London-Bristol railway and that a further study be undertaken of the Greater Bristol area. This has been agreed by the Government and it is proposed that it will examine the A4 and A37 corridors from Bath and North East Somerset to Bristol. Strategic Transport Study. This has now reported with recommendations which will guide both national and local expenditure on transport infrastructure between 2006 and 2026. These include the extension of road user charging to the Bath area following its introduction in Bristol, the construction of a South Bristol Ring Road and a road linking the A36 and A46 to the east of Bath, together with the radical improvement of public transport.</p>	Proposed Modification arisen from updated information.
M/D/6	Para D2.2	<p>The A36 and A46 which pass through Bath are major elements of the second corridor, that between South Wales/M5 to and Portsmouth, Southampton and Poole corridor which is identified in the Regional Transport</p>	Proposed Modification arisen from updated information.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>Strategy. with the result that the World Heritage site of Bath has therefore to contend with an unacceptable level of through traffic. This includes large numbers of H.G.V.'s en route to or from the Channel ports. Surveys have revealed that 67% of the H.G.V.'s recorded in the streets of Bath do not need to be in the City. The draft Regional Planning Guidance Spatial Strategy for the South West envisages infrastructure improvements for this corridor but since the abandonment of the 'A36 link' and 'East of Bath to Beckington' road schemes, which would have provided an eastern bypass for Bath, there has been no Government strategy which addresses this problem and other elements of corridor management which will reduce the impact of long distant traffic on the built and natural environment.</p>	
M/D/7	Diagram 17A	<i>Modify Diagram 17A by updating with 2001 census data.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.3
M/D/8	Diagram 17B	<i>Modify Diagram 17B by updating with 2001 census data.</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.3
M/D/9	Para D2.3	<p>The Council has therefore welcomed the current Government's recent Bristol/Bath to South Coast Transport Study and especially its focus on investigating the best way to reduce the amount of through traffic in Bath. This is essential if national air quality standards are to be met, the City's built heritage safeguarded and many of the Council's other aspirations for environmental improvement achieved. As the A36 and A46 will be de-trunked and will no longer be the responsibility of the Highways Agency, the Council will press for the resources to be made available to all the Local Authorities involved and the Strategic Rail Authority to implement any agreed recommendations. The Council also welcomes the forthcoming Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study (para D2.1) which will examine the impact of through traffic on other settlements in the District. In the meantime the Council will pursue ways of limiting the impact of heavy traffic on the World Heritage Site but its options are limited and any measures included elsewhere in this Plan such as the Lambridge Park and Ride scheme should not be regarded as a long term solution to the problem. A number of the measures recommended by the Study have been included in the Bath Package Major Scheme which is incorporated in the Joint Local Transport Plan 2006-2011. They</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.5

MOD. NO.	POLICY/PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		include the expansion of park & ride and restrictions on movement of HGVs in the City.	
M/D/10	Table 7	Update Table 7 with 2001 Census data (see Annex 1 to Chapter D)	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3
M/D/11	Table 8	Update Table 8 with 2001 Census data (see Annex 1 appended to this section)	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3
M/D/12	Table 9	Update Table 9 with 2001 Census data (see Annex 1 appended to this section)	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3
M/D/13	Para D3.1	In 1994 2001 some 22% of resident employees in Bath walked to work compared to 12% in the former Avon county and 10% in the country as a whole. The Council hopes to see an increase in this high proportion and a considerable increase in pedestrian movement in the remainder of the District where only 10% walked to work in 1991. the average figure for urban areas was only 7% in 2001. A Citizen Panel survey indicates that there may have been an increase in the proportion of journeys made on foot during the past decade.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3
M/D/14	Para D3.2	The Council also wishes to encourage cycle use. In 1991 the only part of the District where this mode of travel to work was at the national level was Keynsham, a reflection of The proportion of work journey by this mode increased in most of the urban parts of the District between 1991 and 2001 and in 10 wards this proportion is above the national average. Despite the hilly topography of much of the District, away from the Avon valley, The Citizens Panel survey indicates that increasing numbers are cycling to work but there is considerable scope to increase the choice of this mode especially for short "everyday" journeys to add to the increase in recreational cycling engendered by the establishment of the National Cycling Network and other initiatives. Despite the hilly topography of much of the District, away from the Avon valley, The Citizens Panel survey indicates that increasing numbers are cycling to work but there is considerable scope to increase the choice of this mode especially for short "everyday" journeys to add to the increase in recreational cycling engendered by the establishment of the National Cycling Network and other initiatives.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R1.3
M/D/15	Para D3.4	Mechanisms which will be employed to implement the Walking Strategy include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> identifying a network of safe and convenient pedestrian routes which link major attractions and residential areas (such routes would be provided with widened footways, improved pedestrian crossings, re-timing of traffic signals to make crossing on foot easier, traffic calming and restraint measures and projects such as Home Zones); 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.6

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring that footways are maintained to a high standard; • auditing highway and land use development schemes to ensure a positive environment for pedestrians; • ensuring that pedestrian facilities are integrated fully with public transport operations; • developing a road danger reduction strategy to reduce traffic danger through engineering, enforcement and education measures; • promoting walking as a means of children getting to school through the Safe Routes to Schools Scheme; and • providing training and advice to increase safety and enjoyment among children when they walk. 	
M/D/16	Policy T.3	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.3</p> <p>The Council will provide, seek the provision of or seek funding for safe convenient and pleasant facilities for pedestrians and the mobility impaired in association with traffic management, transport infrastructure and development proposals in ways which will promote walking and the use of public transport as means of travel.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.7
M/D/17	Policy T.4	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.4</p> <p>The Council will safeguard, enhance and, especially in conjunction with new development, seek the extension of a network of safe and convenient pedestrian routes.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.7
M/D/18	New Policy T.3	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.3</p> <p>To promote walking and the use of public transport, the Council will seek the provision of safe, convenient and pleasant facilities for pedestrians and the mobility impaired, including the extension of a network of pedestrian routes. These requirements should be incorporated in all new developments including traffic management and transport infrastructure schemes.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.7
M/D/19	Para D3.6	Development of the Council's Cycling Strategy was continued with the publication of a draft Strategic Cycling Network in August 2000. This includes both existing and proposed cycle routes in both urban and rural areas, some of which form part of the National Cycle Network. The main components of this network are shown in Diagram 18. Where use is made of former railway lines these routes are protected for sustainable transport under Policy T.9. Other	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.8

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		main links are also shown on the Proposals Map and safeguarded by Policy T.7. The national and local cycle network includes a range of routes, for example the Chew Valley Trail, which are actively promoted by the Council. It is an evolving network and one area where it is hoped to extend it is around the Chew Valley Lake where the Council and Bristol Water are co-operating in investigations to identify new or improved cycling (and walking) routes.	
M/D/20	Policy T.5	POLICY T.5 The Council will whenever possible provide, seek the provision of or seek funding for facilities which will encourage cycling as a means of travel in association with transport and development proposals.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.9
M/D/21	Policy T.7 Proposals Map	<i>Amend Proposals Map Central, Insets 13 & 16 by deleting the Cycle Route under Policy T.7 from the former railway line route east of Temple Cloud/Clutton.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/1) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/D/22	Policy T.7 Proposals Map	<i>Amend line of cycle route at A4 roundabout at the Globe, Newton St Loe on Proposals Map Central</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/2) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/D/23	Policy T.7 Proposals Map	<i>Delete part of cycle routes north west and south west of Chew Valley Lake on Proposals Map Inset West.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/3) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/D/24	Policy T.7 Proposals Map	<i>Delete part of cycle routes north west and south west of Chew Valley Lake on Diagram 18.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/4) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/D/26	Para D4.3	Implementation of the Bus Strategy will involve the Council developing its current co-operation with the bus companies into Bus Quality Partnerships with bus companies which require investment in infrastructure such as bus lanes and bus priority at traffic signals. On their part the companies undertake to improve the attractiveness of services through provision of better vehicles. The Council will also seek agreement on ways of achieving timetable reliability, higher frequencies, integration of ticketing and better information. The Council entered into its first Quality Bus Partnership with First in November 2002. Services which are considered appropriate for this investment are identified as Showcase Routes and these figure prominently in the two Major Scheme in the current Joint Local	Proposed Modification arisen from updated information.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION																
		<p>Transport Plan. The Greater Bristol Bus Network will include Showcase Routes linking Bath and Bristol with Norton – Radstock and Keynsham, whilst the Bath Package will help fund the upgrading of the main Bath City Services.</p>																	
M/D/27	Para D4.4	<p>In line with Structure Plan policy infrastructure investment is to be concentrated on specific areas and corridors (see para D1.3) and it It is hoped that these measures will make a major contribution towards meeting the traffic reduction targets for these corridors listed in Policy T.8. Developments which will generate a significant increase in movement in an area will be expected to contribute financially towards this investment by way of a Planning Obligation.</p>	Proposed Modification arisen from updated information.																
M/D/28	Policy T.8	<p>POLICY T.8 The Council will provide, seek the provision of or seek funding for facilities which will increase the proportion of journeys that are made by bus in association with traffic management, transport infrastructure and development proposals.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.11																
M/D/29	Quick Guide 19	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Quick Guide 19 Quality Bus Partnership Undertakings</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Councils</th> <th>Bus Operators</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus lanes and gates </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased service level where commercially viable </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UTC priority/SVD • Raised kerbs at bus stops • Information and publicity </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low floor buses • Information and publicity • Low emission and clean fuel vehicles </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic restraint measures • New bus shelters </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High standards of cleanliness • Bus services to new developments </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus compatible infrastructure in new developments </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved bus station </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved bus interchange facilities </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff training in customer care, disability awareness, etc. </td> </tr> <tr> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive policy and strategy framework </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concessionary fares for welfare to work claimants </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quick Guide 19 Quality Bus Partnership Undertakings		Councils	Bus Operators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus lanes and gates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased service level where commercially viable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UTC priority/SVD • Raised kerbs at bus stops • Information and publicity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low floor buses • Information and publicity • Low emission and clean fuel vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic restraint measures • New bus shelters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High standards of cleanliness • Bus services to new developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus compatible infrastructure in new developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved bus station 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved bus interchange facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff training in customer care, disability awareness, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive policy and strategy framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concessionary fares for welfare to work claimants 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.12
Quick Guide 19 Quality Bus Partnership Undertakings																			
Councils	Bus Operators																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus lanes and gates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased service level where commercially viable 																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UTC priority/SVD • Raised kerbs at bus stops • Information and publicity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low floor buses • Information and publicity • Low emission and clean fuel vehicles 																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic restraint measures • New bus shelters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High standards of cleanliness • Bus services to new developments 																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus compatible infrastructure in new developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved bus station 																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved bus interchange facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff training in customer care, disability awareness, etc. 																		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive policy and strategy framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concessionary fares for welfare to work claimants 																		

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/D/30	Para D5.3	<p>Other possible developments envisaged by the Strategy include the re-opening of the Radstock to Frome line and Saltford station. In addition the provision of a new station on the western edge of Bath may be feasible in the future depending on the precise size and configuration of the transport interchange proposed at Newbridge to serve the Western Riverside regeneration area and therefore no site for this station is shown on the Proposals Map. The provision of a new station on the eastern edge of Bath was rejected by the rail studies referred to above but the Council has supported the proposed re-opening of Corsham station in North Wiltshire and the possibility of providing a new station in the Bathampton/Bathford area will be re-examined in the context of the Bristol/Bath to South Coast and Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Studies. the provision of a new station either at Saltford or the western edge of Bath. As neither of these developments is now expected within the Plan period no sites are allocated.</p>	Para D5.3 to be retained but updated to ensure the Local Plan includes a more complete description of the Rail Strategy.
M/D/31	Para D5.4	<p>The Strategy is less specific about rail freight with no infrastructure proposals for Bath and North East Somerset apart from the retention of the railhead facility at Westmoreland Station Road, Bath, used for transportation of waste. There may be scope to make greater use of this facility and its use for rail freight is safeguarded in policy T.10. Opportunities for some form of rail freight facility may arise in association with the reopening of the Radstock to Frome railway.</p>	Proposed Modification arisen from updated information.
M/D/32	Para D5.5	<p>The Joint Rail Strategy has been submitted to the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) in the hope that its proposals will be included in future rail franchises. It has also informed the current Bristol/Bath to South Coast Transport Study and it will hopefully provide an important input for the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study. Implementation, which will be assisted by the establishment by the SRA of a Bristol and Bath Rail Management Unit could lead to a 5% per annum increase in rail use on local passenger services up to 2006 and a 4% modal share of the journey to work in B&NES Bath & North East Somerset (1.9% in 1991 and 2.4% in 2001). Both Local Authorities and, It is hoped that the measures that are implemented will maintain the increase in rail use that has occurred in recent years, raising the modal share of the journey to work in the District from 1.9% in 1991 and 2.4% in 2001 to at least 4% by 2011.</p>	Proposed Modification arisen from updated information.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		When appropriate, developers will be expected to contribute financially towards the implementation of the strategy.	
M/D/33	Para D5.7	In addition to the Radstock – Frome and Avon Valley Railway schemes, there are proposals to use part of (ii) above to provide some form of rapid transit a segregated busway to link a transport interchange at Newbridge with the Western Riverside area and the City Centre (see paras D6.1, D6.2 and D6.3 Policy T.11 below), but otherwise the only envisaged use of these safeguarded lines during the Plan period is as cyclepaths or footpaths.	Proposed modification arises from Inspector's Recommendation R13.15. Significant changes since the Inquiry in relation to rapid transport in Bath necessitates the reintroduction of Policy T.11 and the preceding text to be updated accordingly.
M/D/34	Policy T.9 Proposals Map	<i>Amend Proposals Map Central, Insets 13 & 16 by adding Sustainable Transport Route Notation under Policy T.9 to the former railway line route east of Temple Cloud/Clutton.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/7) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/D/35	Policy T.10	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.10</p> <p>Land shown on the Proposals Map will be safeguarded for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the provision of a new railway station at Salford; and 2) the retention of the rail freight facility at Westmoreland Station Road, Bath. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.14
M/D/36	Policy T.10 Proposals Map	<i>Delete the Railway Station Proposed at Salford from the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.14
M/D/37	Para D6.1	Consideration has been given for a number of years to the possibility of using the former Midland railway on the Western side of Bath to provide some form of rapid transit. Initially, when it was believed that the capacity of the main railway line could not be increased the proposal was to provide an additional rail link between Bath and Bristol. Although this is now again being considered may be needed in the future , attention has more recently concentrated on the possibility of using the former line to provide an enhanced park and ride service from the Newbridge area.	Proposed modification arises from response to Inspector's Recommendation R13.15. Significant changes since the Inquiry in relation to rapid transport in Bath necessitates the reintroduction of Policy T.11 and the preceding text to be updated accordingly.
M/D/38	Para D6.2	The concept has now acquired greater impetus with the realisation that the regeneration of the Western Riverside area is dependent on the provision of park and ride and improved public transport. The Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for the area requires the development of an integrated transportation system making use of the disused railway line or a suitable alternative route. Detailed proposals will be	Proposed modification arises from response to Inspector's Recommendation R13.15. Significant changes since the Inquiry in relation to rapid transport in Bath necessitates the reintroduction of Policy T.11 and the preceding text to be updated accordingly.

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<p>drawn up but in the meantime it is necessary to safeguard the line of the former railway for this use. This is being done under Policy T.9. The Bath Transportation Package 2006 formally proposes the provision of a segregated busway along the line of former railway land. Now that detailed proposals for the area are being submitted to the Council it is necessary to safeguard this route.</p>	
M/D/39	Para D6.3	<p>In 2000 another study investigated the potential for a tram network for the City and concluded that priority should be given to the development of a segregated corridor from Newbridge to the City centre. It may be possible to extend this to the proposed Lambridge park and ride site and other destinations in the City but these proposals are not sufficiently advanced for lines to be safeguarded at the present time. Further segregation may be possible in the future but the Bath Package proposes on-street measures to provide showcase bus routes and enhanced park and ride.</p>	Proposed modification arises from response to Inspector's Recommendation R13.15. Significant changes since the Inquiry in relation to rapid transport in Bath necessitates the reintroduction of Policy T.11 and the preceding text to be updated accordingly.
M/D/40	Policy T.11	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.11</p> <p>Land shown on the Proposals Map will be safeguarded for the provision of a segregated busway linking the Newbridge area with Bath City centre serving the Western Riverside Regeneration Area.</p>	Proposed modification arises from response to Inspector's Recommendation R13.15. Significant changes since the Inquiry in relation to rapid transport in Bath necessitates the reintroduction of Policy T.11 and the preceding text to be updated accordingly.
M/D/41	Proposals Map Policy T.11	<i>Reinstate the rapid transport (segregated busway) in Bath on the Proposals Map</i>	Proposed modification arises from response to Inspector's Recommendation R13.15. Significant changes since the Inquiry in relation to rapid transport in Bath necessitates the reintroduction of Policy T.11 and the preceding text to be updated accordingly.
M/D/42	Proposals Map Policy T.17	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31 by adding highway improvement scheme, London Road West / Gloucester Road, Bath</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/9) retained as a Proposed Modification (see response to R13.17).
M/D/43	Proposals Map Policy T.17	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31 by adding highway improvement scheme, Entry Hill, Bath</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/10) retained as a Proposed Modification (see response to R13.17).

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/D/44	Proposals Map Policy T.17	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31 by adding highway improvement scheme, Lansdown Road, Bath</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/11) retained as a Proposed Modification (see response to R13.17).
M/D/45	Proposals Map Policy T.17	<i>Amend Proposals Map Inset 31 by adding highway improvement scheme, Rossiter Road, Bath</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/12) retained as a Proposed Modification (see response to R13.17).
M/D/46	Proposals Map Policy T.17	<i>Amend Proposals Map Central, Insets 13 & 16 by deleting the A37 Temple Cloud/Clutton Eastern Bypass Route</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/8) retained as a Proposed Modification (see response to R13.17).
M/D/47	Para D10.4	Other proposals which may be implemented during the Plan period are an extension to the Odd Down site, the provision of an all-week site to serve the A36 and a much needed additional site in the Newbridge area. The latter will serve the Western Riverside regeneration area as well as the City centre, the link being hopefully provided by some form of rapid transit (see paras D6.1-D6.3, D7.1, Policy T.12 and the development requirements for site B1A under Policy GDS.1). Outside Bath there is the prospect of an additional site for Bristol adjacent to the A37, which has been the subject to the outcome of a joint study with Bristol City Council to determine need, capacity and location and smaller car parks to support existing inter-urban bus services. All these proposals will be evaluated using the criteria set out in Policy T22. Any proposals for development within the Green Belt will have to comply with Policy GB.1A and the guidance about assessment of alternative sites in para C1.29A. Whilst the prime function of the existing Park and Ride sites is to serve Bath City centre, the Council may agree to other links being provided if spare capacity is available. Wessex Water provides a link between Odd Down Park and Ride and their HQ at Claverton Down and a park and ride service from Odd Down to the Royal United Hospital via Twerton has also commenced.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/13) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report and other Proposed Modification arisen from updated information.
M/D/48	Policy T.21	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.21</p> <p>The Council will safeguard land shown on the Proposals Map for park and ride purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. at Lambridge, Bath adjacent to the A4 subject to the provision of suitable replacement recreational facilities; and ii. at Odd Down, Bath to extend the existing site. iii. At Newbridge, Bath adjacent to the A36 subject to the provisions of Policy GDS.1 B1A. 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.19

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/D/49	Policy T.22	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.22</p> <p>The Council will safeguard land shown on the Proposals Map for park and ride purposes at Lambridge, Bath, adjacent the A4. The expansion of existing Park and Ride schemes or the development of additional sites will be permitted if there would be no unacceptable impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the environment with particular reference to the policies relating to the Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the open countryside, the World Heritage Site; and the need to minimise light pollution; ii) agricultural, nature conservation, water environment and archaeological interests; iii) the amenities of local residents; iv) other public transport provision; v) the surrounding road network and its capacity to safely accommodate potential traffic generation and, in addition; vi) provision is made for the needs of those with impaired mobility and for the safety and security of all users 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.20
M/D/50	Policies T.21 & T.22	<i>Replace 'Park & Ride Site (Policy T.21)' with 'Park & Ride Site (Policy T.22) on the Notation Sheet</i>	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R13.19
M/D/51	Para D11.1	<p>Bristol International Airport at Lulsgate lies close to the western boundary of the District and parts of the Plan area are covered by the Safeguarding Areas for this airport, Filton aerodrome to the north of Bristol, and Colerne, a military aerodrome in North Wiltshire. Air installations that are protected in this way are selected on the basis of their importance to the national air transport system or national defence. Land uses or tall structures which would prejudice air safety or the ability of the installation to maintain either its existing or acceptable increased level of activity will not be permitted within these areas. This includes uses which might increase the risk of collision between aircraft and birds. Applicants should consult the Council about the current extent of the safeguarded areas because they are reviewed and amended from time to time by the CAA.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.21

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
M/D/52	Policy T.23	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.23</p> <p>Within the airport/aerodrome safeguarding areas shown on the Proposals Map as defined by the CAA development will not be permitted which would prejudice air safety or the optimum use of the facility.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.22
M/D/53	Policy T.23 Proposals Map	<i>Delete Airport Safeguarding Areas from the Proposals Map</i>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.22
M/D/54	Schedule to Policy T.26	<i>The Pre-Inquiry Change to the car parking standards are set out in Annex 2 appended to this section.</i>	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/D/15) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/D/55	Para D12.5	<p>The Council proposes to provide clearer guidance to developers by defining accessibility zones within which different parking standards will apply. This will be possible when a methodology can be devised which is sufficiently sensitive to the differing circumstances and characteristics of individual sites and locations and yet is not too complex to preclude its practical application in development control. Such refinement of the Council's parking standards will be introduced by way of Supplementary Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document or future revisions of this Plan.</p>	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation 13.27
M/D/56	Policy T.26	<p style="text-align: center;">POLICY T.26</p> <p>Development will only be permitted if an appropriate level of on-site servicing and parking is provided having regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the maximum parking standards and the suggested provision for drivers with disabilities and cycle parking set out in the schedules attached to this policy and any additional standards which may be adopted by the Council as Supplementary Planning Guidance; ii. the proposed use, any need for on-site provision to ensure its efficient operation, and the likely extent of movement to and from the site; iii. the environmental capacity of both the site and its surroundings to accept parking; iv. the capacity of the local highway network and the need to control any increase in traffic levels; v. the need to ensure highway safety; vi. the accessibility of the site by public transport, including Park and Ride; 	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.26

CHAPTER D – ACCESS

MOD. NO.	POLICY/ PARA	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vii. the ease of access by cycle or on foot; viii. the availability of public car parking in the vicinity of the site; ix. the provisions of any travel plan which may be submitted by or on behalf of the proposed occupier of the premises; 	

**ANNEX 1 TO CHAPTER D
TABLES 7, 8 & 9**

Table 7 - 1994 2001 Mode of Travel to Work for Selected Towns and Cities-Urban Areas									
Location	Pop'n 1994 2001 (000)	Main Mode to Work for Resident Working in Area Employees (percentage)							
		Walk	Cycle	Bus	Rail	Car	Home	Other	Total
Bath	80 90	28 22	3	12 9	0 4	48 50	6 10	3 2	100
Cambridge	92 131	15 12	34 23	5	0 3	39 45	7 9	3	100
Oxford	110 143	18 14	19 14	15 16	0 2	40 43	6 9	2	100
York	175 138	24 18	20 14	8 7	0 2	40 49	5 7	3	100
Edinburgh	448	16	2	33	0	43	4	2	100
Lincoln	104	15	8	7	0	61	7	2	100
Exeter	98 107	20 19	4 5	13 10	0 1	56	4 8	3 1	100
Gloucester	102 136	14 10	9 6	9 7	0	62 68	4 7	2	100
Cheltenham	103 110	18 17	4 7	6 5	0 1	58 60	6 9	2 1	100
Ipswich	117	17	9	13	0	55	3	3	100
Chester	91	13	4	8	1	64	8	2	100
Norwich	124	24	10	9	0	50	4	3	100
Maidstone	90	13	2	5	5	65	9	1	100
Warwick/ Leamington	85	14	4	4	2	66	8	2	100
Worcester	94	15	5	5	1	65	8	1	100
Torbay	110	15	2	5	1	64	11	2	100

Note the above statistics relate to residents of that town/city travelling to work in the same town/city.
Source: 1994 2001 Census

Table 8 - 1994 2001 Mode of Travel to Work for Bath (percentage)								
	Walk	Cycle	Bus	Rail	Car	Home	Other	Total
Resident in Bath: work in Bath	28 30	3	12 11	0	48 39	6 14	3	100
Resident in Bath: work elsewhere	4 3	0 2	5	11 12	80 75	0 -	2 3	100
Resident elsewhere: work in Bath	2	1	7 8	4 5	86 81	0 1	4 3	100

Source: 1994 2001 Census

Table 9 - Mode of Travel to Work of Resident Employees (percentage)						
	Walk	Cycle	Bus/rail	Car	Work at home or mode not stated	Households with no car (percentage)
Bath & North East Somerset	16 15	2	11 10	62 60	9 10	27 22
Bath	22	2 3	13	53 50	10	36 28
Keynsham	14 12	3 2	11 12	64 62	8 9	24 21
Norton-Radstock	13 10	2 3	6 5	72 73	7	20 16
Rural Parishes	7 6	1	3 6	73 68	16 17	44 7
Great Britain England & Wales	12 10	3	16 11	61	8 9	33 27

Source: 1994 2001 Census

**ANNEX 2 TO CHAPTER D
SCHEDULE TO POLICY T.26 – PARKING STANDARDS**

MAXIMUM PARKING STANDARDS (Incorporating National Maximum Standards from PPG13)			
Use Class	Description of Use	Parking Provision Maximum Standards (unless otherwise stated)	Notes
A1	Retail (includes cash and carry)	Below 200m ² No specific standard Between 200m ² and 1000m ² 1 space per 35m ²	Each case assessed on merit.
		Above 1000m ² Non food: 1 space per 20m ² Food: 1 space per 14m ²	Large non food retail stores will be required to accept a planning condition precluding food sales within Class A1 unless an area of land sufficient to satisfy the higher parking standard can be accommodated on site without compromising landscape setting or other amenities.
	Open Air Markets and Car Boot Sales		Each case assessed on merit.
A2	Financial and Professional Services	4 space per 35m² 1 space per 30m²	
A3	Restaurants, Cafes and Public Houses	4 space per 5m² 1 space per 10m² of drinking and dining area <i>(Source of change – representation 721/C73)</i>	Standard applies to eating and drinking areas only. Any residential accommodation to be assessed separately.
	Hot food takeaway	5 spaces	Each case assessed on merit.
	Transport Cafes	1 lorry space of 50m ² per 5m ² of dining area.	Provision for appropriate manoeuvring.
B1	Offices and light industrial, R & D, Laboratories Studios	1 space per 30m ²	
B1 & B2	Light industrial R & D, Laboratories Studios, General Industry (Manufacturing)	4 space per 40m² Up to 235m² 1 space per 30m² Above 235m² 1 space per 50m²	Where office content is in excess of 10% the office floorspace will be assessed as B1 above. For units in excess of 5000m² parking requirements will be assessed on individual merits. <i>(Source of change – representation 721/C73)</i>

CHAPTER D – ACCESS

B8	Storage, distribution and Warehousing	1 space per 200m² Up to 235m² 1 space per 30m² Above 235m² 1 space per 200m²	<p>Where office content is in excess of 10% the office floorspace will be assessed as B1.</p> <p>Restricted by condition or agreement to “Wholesale distribution” only. For any element of Cash and Carry retail standards will apply. For units in excess of 5000m² parking requirements will be assessed on individual merits.</p>
C1	Hotels and Guest Houses	1 space per bedroom	Public drinking/dining areas and Conference/function areas assessed as A3. Adequate setting down provision for coaches and taxis is also required.
C1	Hostels (including Youth hostels) and Halls of Residence for Students (detached from education premises)	1 space per 2 bedrooms	Each case assessed on merit. Conference/function and public drinking/dining areas, as for A3.
C2	Hospitals and Nursing Homes	1 space per 3 staff plus 1 space per 3 beds plus 5 spaces per consulting room 1 space per 4 staff plus 1 space per 3 visitors <i>(Source of change – representation 2987/C8)</i>	<p>When allocating parking spaces preference should be given to the needs of patients and the operational needs of staff.</p> <p>Each case assessed on merit. <u>New/expanded</u> health facilities will be required to improve access by public transport, walking and cycling and provision of Travel Plans will be sought. Adequate disabled parking provision and dropping off facilities must be provided.</p>
	Residential/Boarding Schools	1 space per each duty staff 1 space per 2 members of staff which shall include sufficient space for each member of duty staff.	Duty staff are those required to be present “on duty” over night. Operational requirements will be considered in addition. Adequate disabled parking provision and dropping off facilities must be provided.
	Residential Colleges, training Centres, Polytechnic/University	1 space per each duty staff.	Standard permit allowance for visitors. Dropping off area and temporary parking area for open days to be defined.
C2/ Continued	Convalescent, and Residential Care and Nursing Homes	1 space per 2 staff plus 1 space per 6 bed spaces	<p>Educational establishments are expected to discourage use of cars by students and staff. This standard does not apply to the University of Bath where there is an approved Travel/Transport Plan. <u>New/expanded</u> facilities will be required to improve access by public transport, walking and cycling. Provision of Travel Plans</p>

CHAPTER D – ACCESS

			will be sought.
C3	Houses / Flats / Maisonettes	(i) One bedspace/bedroom 1 space per dwelling plus 1 space per 4 dwellings for communal visitor parking	Residential car parking can be in the form of:- -a garage -a space off the carriageway -a car port -a drive within the curtilage of the property.
		(ii) Two bedrooms 1.5 2 spaces per dwelling plus 1 space per 4 dwellings for communal visitor parking.	-Dependent on the location and circumstances of the development, car parking provision can be either within the curtilage of individual properties, as
		(iii) Three bedrooms 2 spaces per dwelling	-overall parking area(s) to serve the development or as part of the highway. The standards will be applied flexibly and considered
		(iv) Four bedrooms and over 3 spaces per dwelling	against accessibility criteria. in the interests of attaining optimum site/layout and this may result, in certain circumstances in the
		(v) Elderly Persons Dwellings Sheltered Houses 1 space per 3 dwellings plus 1 space per warden (if applicable) plus 1 space per 5 dwellings Others 1 space per dwellings plus 1 space per warden (if applicable) plus 1 space per 5 dwellings * Owner occupied 1 space per dwelling 1 space per warden (if applicable) * Sheltered housing Category 1 (active elderly) 1 space per dwelling 1 space per warden (if applicable) -category 2 (elderly or Frail elderly assisted by Warden or emergency call system) - 1 space per 3 dwellings plus 1 space per warden (if applicable)	provision of driveway space which effectively exceeds the standard. Site design should provide access for emergency and servicing vehicles)
		(vi) Conversions *— In urban areas, development will not be permitted if the proposed average number of spaces per dwelling is in excess of 1.5. Outside	Parking space allocation must be related to the number of bedrooms provided in the development, as for C3.

CHAPTER D – ACCESS

		urban areas, an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling is encouraged but development proposing in excess of 2.5 spaces per dwelling will not be permitted.	
D1	Non Residential Institutions Places of Worship, Church Halls	1 space per 22 sq.m. 10 seats	
	Medical/Health Centres, Dentists Veterinary Surgeries	5 spaces per consulting room 1 space per medical staff plus 1 space per 2 admin. staff plus 3 spaces per consulting room.	In applying these standards, account will be taken of the particular services provided
	Crèches, Day Centres, Day Nurseries	4 space per 35 sq.m.	Each case assessed on merit dependent on accessibility and ages catered for. Adequate and safe space for picking up/setting down must be provided.
	Primary and Secondary Schools and Sixth Form Colleges	4 space per 2 staff	Each case assessed on merit dependent on accessibility of location and ages catered for. Adequate and safe space for picking up / setting down (including coaches) must be provided. Hard play areas should be accessible for visitor parking use on open days. Standards may be relaxed where facilities are used for community or adult education purposes.
	Colleges of Further Education, Polytechnic/University/Other Training Centres	1 space per 2 staff plus 1 space per 15 students	Hard play areas should be accessible for visitor parking use on open days. Standards may be relaxed where facilities are used for community or adult education purposes.
	Art Galleries/ Museums/ Exhibition Halls/ Citizens Advice Bureaux, Tourist Information Centres/ Libraries	4 space per 35m² (Visitors) plus 1 space per 150m² (staff) Each case assessed on merit	<i>(Source of change – representation 721/C73)</i> Standard for students relates to total number of students attending, not full time equivalent. The provision of Travel Plans will be sought for all developments in accordance with PPG13 Transport. and the parking standard will be more stringent where appropriate, depending on the location of the development and the degree of accessibility by non-car modes The parking standard may be relaxed where facilities are to be used for community or adult education purposes. Residential accommodation to be

CHAPTER D – ACCESS

			<p>assessed as C2/ C3.</p> <p><i>(Source of change – representation 721/C73)</i></p> <p>The allocation of staff and public spaces to be decided on merits (including need to accommodate coaches).</p>
D2	Theatres/ Cinemas/ Conference Halls Facilities	1 space per 22m ² 5 seats 1 space per 22m²	Adequate and safe space for picking up/setting down must be provided including, where applicable, space for coaches.
	Music and Concert Halls	Up to 1,000 m² 1 space per 22m² Above 1,000 m² 1 space per 5 seats	Drinking/dining areas assessed as A3.
	Bingo/ Hall/ Casino/ Dance Halls/ Discos	1 space per 22m ²	Adequate and safe space for picking up/setting down must be provided including that for buses. Conference/function and drinking/dining areas assessed as A3.
	Sports Hall/ Swimming Baths/ Gymnasia/ Leisure Centres	Above 1,000 m² 1 space per 22m ² Up to 1,000 m² 1 space per 2 players plus 1 space per 5m² spectator area.	Conference/function and drinking/dining areas assessed as A3.
	Dance Halls/ Discos		
	<u>Other</u> Stadia	1 space per 15 seats	<p>In accordance with PPG13 Transport, sufficient coach parking should be provided to the satisfaction of the local authority and treated separately from car parking. Coach parking should be designed and managed so it will not be used for car parking.</p> <p>In addition, satisfactory emergency access is required, in accordance with PPG13.</p>
	Petrol Filling Station	1 space per 35m ² floor space of sales kiosk	Each case assessed on merit. Workshop and other uses, asses as below.
	Vehicle Repair Garages, Tyre and Exhaust Centres	2 spaces per repair/service bay 3 spaces per MOT bay	
	Motor vehicle sales	1 space per 50m ² of sales display area.	

PROVISION FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES			
	<p>Disabled parking will be provided at all developments to an appropriate minimum standard that will be determined from the relevant maximum standard prior to any discounting, and will be additional to the final discounted level of parking. <i>(Source of change – representation 721/C70)</i></p>		
Use Class	Description of Use	Parking Provision Minimum Standards (unless otherwise stated)	Notes
	Employment*	<p>Up to 200 spaces 5% of capacity or 2 spaces, whichever is greater.</p> <p>Above 200 spaces 2% of capacity plus 6 spaces</p>	<p>In accordance with DETR Traffic Advisory Leaflet 05/95 “Reducing Mobility Handicaps”</p> <p>*Spaces for disabled employees will be in addition to these requirements.</p> <p>(1)</p>
	Shopping, leisure, recreation and other uses requiring public access	<p>Up to 200 spaces 6% of capacity or 3 spaces, whichever is greater.</p> <p>Above 200 spaces 4% of capacity plus 4 spaces <i>(Source of change – representation 2962/C7)</i></p>	<p>Car parking spaces should be clearly identified for blue badge holders only and should be located so as to allow easy access to the building they serve.</p> <p>(2) A minimum of 1 space should be provided where calculations produce a figure of less than one whole space.</p> <p>(3) Where development is to take place without on-site parking the availability of parking for disabled people in public/shared car parking needs to be reassessed and additional provision funded by the development if appropriate. The availability of on-street parking for disabled people may also be taken into consideration.</p>

NOTES: Operational requirement, such as deliveries, coaches etc, will need to be considered in all cases in addition to the parking standards set out in the schedule to policies T.6 and T.26.

This section was not in bold in the Revised Deposit Draft Local Plan.

MINIMUM CYCLE PARKING STANDARDS
<p>General Provisions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'One Sheffield' type parking stand (or one of similar or better design and quality) is required for every 20 car spaces provided. Where a reduced standard of car parking provision is applied, no reduction shall be made in the number of cycle stands to be provided, which shall be based on the maximum non-operational car parking standard. 2. At educational establishments and youth clubs the minimum provision is one stand per 7 students. 3. A minimum of two parking stands shall be provided at any one site unless there are overriding local circumstances for not providing them, such as lack of space in front of a building where change of use is proposed. In such circumstances, consideration should be given to the provision of wall hoops or a similar device. 4. In the case of B1 developments such as business parks, a minimum of two stands shall be provided within 20m of each unit. A higher standard of provision may be required depending on the scale of the development. <p>Additional Requirements</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At sites frequented by touring cyclists and at all sites where non-staff long stay (over 8 hours) parking can be anticipated, some of the provision should consist of cycle lockers or a supervised cycle store in place of 'Sheffield' stands. The proportion of superior provision will be decided by the Council. 2. Where 5 or more stands are provided as a group, they should be located under cover, lit at night, and adequately signed. The detailed design and lighting of such facilities should pay due regard to their location and surroundings. Superior provision will be required where 10 or more stands are necessary. 3. Provision of facilities for cyclists, such as lockers, showers and changing areas, will be sought by the Council where appropriate. <p>Location of Parking Spaces</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Visitors' parking should be located in close proximity to, and no more than 20m from, access points to buildings. Staff, students and long stay parking may be located at up to 50m from the access served, except as in General provision 4, above. In the case of offices and similar buildings separate parking may be provided for visitors and staff. 2. In general, cycle parking should be provided in locations where it is regularly observed by passers-by or an official, such as a car park attendant, in order to deter thieves. It should not be hidden away at the sides or rear of a building.

<p>MOTORCYCLE PARKING</p>
<p>Provision for motorcycle parking, including provision of security bars to which machines can be attached, should also be made for all developments other than private dwelling houses. Whilst no specific standards are given for motorcycle parking, the aim generally will be to achieve one motorcycle space for every 20 cars spaces provided, depending on the location and type of development proposed.</p>
<p>DEFINITIONS</p>
<p>Operational Parking: The space required for vehicles regularly and necessarily involved in the function of particular premises. By way of example, operational parking includes space for delivery or collection of goods, space for picking up or setting down passengers and space for storing or servicing vehicles, only where these operations are a necessary on-site requirement of the business being carried on.</p> <p>Non-Operational Parking: The space required for vehicles used by customers or those employed at an establishment.</p> <p>Car Space: An area normally measuring not less than approximately 4.88m x 2.44m (16 ft x 8 ft).</p> <p>GFA: Gross floor area; the entire area of the building measured externally and including all partitions and corridors etc. All areas are given in gross floor area unless stated otherwise.</p> <p>Disabled Parking Space: Normally will measure 4.8m x 3.6m (16 ft x 12 ft); or 4.8m x 3.0m (16 ft x 10 ft) where two adjacent bays may share and unloading area. When bays are in line they should be 6.6m long to permit rear wheelchair access.</p> <p>Sheffield Type Cycle Stand: Tubular parking stand against which 2 cycles can be secured.</p>
<p>SECURITY</p>
<p>The design of new parking provision should take into account the need for security and measures to reduce crime, e.g. lighting, CCTV, parking within view of residents or employees etc.</p>

SCHEDULE TO POLICY T.25
TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS

Land Use	Threshold above which Transport Assessments are required	
	Gross Floorspace*	Site area in hectares for outline applications
Food Retail	1,000 sq.m.	/
Non Food Retail	1,000 sq.m.	/
B1 Offices	2,500 sq.m.	0.4
B2 Industry	5,000 sq.m.	2.0
B8 Distribution and Warehousing	10,000 sq.m.	3.0
D2 Cinema & Conference Centre	1,000 sq.m.	/
D2 other leisure	1,000 sq.m.	/
D2 Stadia	1,500 seats	/
Education	2,500 sq.m.	/
Residential	100 dwellings	3.0

All developers are encouraged to hold early discussions with the local authority in order to clarify whether a Transport Assessment will be required.

Smaller developments ~~may~~ **will** be required to provide a simple statement of transport and car parking needs as appropriate to the scale and location of the proposal. **Full assessments will be required to accompany applications for development below these thresholds if, in the Council's view, circumstances dictate this to be necessary.**

*** Gross floorspace = the entire area of the building measured externally and including all partition, corridors, etc.**

SUMMARY OF POLICIES, GLOSSARY & ABBREVIATIONS

MOD. NO.	PLAN REF	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
SUMMARY OF POLICIES			
M/S/1	Policy 1	4 Overarching Sustainable Development Policy	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R1.10
M/S/2	Policy IMP.1	IMP.1 Planning obligations	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R1.15
M/S/3	Policy D.1	D.1 Impact of development on character	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R1.35
M/S/4	Policy D.3	D.3 Provision of public art	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R1.38
M/S/5	Policy D.5	D.5 Design statements	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R1.43
M/S/6	Policy ET.1	Employment Land Overview	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/S/7	Policy ET.1A	ET.1A Office Sectors in Bath	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R2.3
M/S/8	Policy ET.1B	ET.1B Industrial Sectors in Bath	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.3
M/S/9	Policy ET.1C	ET.1C Small Employment Sites in Bath, Outside Core Employment Areas	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R2.3
M/S/10	Policy ET.1D	ET.1D Other Employment Sites in Bath	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R2.3
M/S/11	Policy ET.2	ET.2 Office Development	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/S/12	Policy ET.3	ET.3 Other Employment development in urban areas Core Employment Sites	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R2.4
M/S/13	Policy ET.3A	ET.3A Coomb End Regeneration Area	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R2.5
M/S/14	Policy ET.10	ET.10 Farm shops	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R2.14
M/S/15	Policy ET.11	ET.11 Tourist facilities	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R2.15
M/S/16	Policy ET.12	ET.12 Purpose built visitor accommodation	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R2.16
M/S/17	Policy SR.1B	SR.1B Protection of land used for informal recreation and play	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R3.23
M/S/18	Policy SR.2	SR.2 Children's Play Areas Allocation of land for recreational use	Error: RDDLP incorrectly refers to 'Children's Play Areas'
M/S/19	Policy SR.3	SR.3 Children's playing space and new development Provision of recreational facilities to meet the needs of new	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R3.29

SUMMARY OF POLICIES, GLOSSARY & ABBREVIATIONS

MOD. NO.	PLAN REF	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
		development	
M/S/20	Policy SR.6	SR.6 Provision of recreational facilities to meet the needs of new development	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R3.29
M/S/21	Policy SR.8	SR.8 All-seater sports stadium	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R3.32
M/S/22	Policy ES.6	ES.6 Water supply and sewerage infrastructure development	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R4.19
M/S/23	Policy ES.8	ES.8 Demand for telecommunications services	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R4.24
M/S/24	Policy ES.11	ES.11 Development in sewage treatment works development restraint areas	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R4.25
M/S/25	Policy HG.2	HG.2 Housing mix in terms of size, type, tenure and affordability	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R5.11
M/S/26	Policy HG.5	HG.5 Residential development in the R.2 settlements	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R5.27
M/S/27	Policy HG.7A	HG.7A Higher residential densities	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R5.29
M/S/28	Policy WM.11	WM.11 Thermal treatment without energy recovery	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's recommendation R6.12
M/S/29	Policy GB.1A	GB.1A Park and Ride Development in the Green Belt	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/2) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report
M/S/30	Policy NE.3	NE.3 Important hillsides (Bath and Radstock)	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.3
M/S/31	Policy NE.6	NE.6 Internationally important wildlife sites (SPAs, SACs)	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.7
M/S/32	Policy NE.7	NE.7 Bat Protection Zones	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R10.10
M/S/33	Policy BH.10	BH.10 Local Parks and Gardens of Historic Interest	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R11.15
M/S/34	Policy BH.16	BH.16 Village buffers	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R11.20
M/S/35	Policy M.3	M.3 Efficient use of minerals	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R12.4
M/S/36	Policy M.5	M.5 Exportation of processed or unprocessed mineral waste and overburden	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R12.7
M/S/37	Policy T.3	T.3 Walking Strategy: pedestrian safety and convenience Promotion of walking and use of public transport	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R13.7
M/S/38	Policy T.4	T.4 Walking Strategy: extension of pedestrian routes	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's

SUMMARY OF POLICIES, GLOSSARY & ABBREVIATIONS

MOD. NO.	PLAN REF	PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE REVISED DEPOSIT DRAFT LOCAL PLAN	COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR THE MODIFICATION
			Recommendation R13.7
M/S/39	Policy T.21	T.21 – Safeguarded land for Lambridge Park & Ride and extension of Odd Down Park & Ride	Proposed modification arising from Inspector's Recommendation R13.19
GLOSSARY			
M/G/1	Glossary	do bssary : 'Ecotourism' – A tourism market based on an area's natural resources that attempts to minimize the ecological impact of the tourism.	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/4) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.
M/G/2	Glossary	do bssary : 'Floodplain' - Floodplains are generally flat-lying areas adjacent to a watercourse, tidal lengths of a river or the sea where water flows in times of flood or would flow but for the presence of flood defences where they exist.	To accord with the Inspector's Recommendation R13.28
ABBREVIATIONS			
M/A/1	Abbreviations	Sustainable Underground Drainage Systems	Pre-Inquiry Change (PIC/5) has been endorsed by the Inspector as confirmed in the letter appended to the Report.