

Representation ID Number: 102 / 1

If this is the alternative to an Urban Extension under the Core Strategy then housing, etc, on the MoD sites is preferable.

Representation ID Number: 224 / 1

The second bullet point (page 4) should be the highest priority.

The vision for the site needs to emphasize the need to achieve its objectives within the brown field land available.

We do not believe there is a mandate for developing green field sites until brown field land across Bath has been built on.

Representation ID Number: 904 / 1

Meet current government requirements by making the whole site custom build and self finish, for both groups and individuals. This enables better quality, better insulated, more sustainable housing, that suits the purchasers and their families and lifestyles, enhances socialising, and reducing fear of crime. Custom builder/occupiers can thus include live-work units, disability friendly, future-proofed designs, and a degree of interest and Individuality within an overall design framework.

More money will be spent locally, the local construction industry and employment will be enhanced. Self builders and self finishers learn many skills, making themselves more employable. Less money from B&NES' local economy goes to off-shore share holders.

Truly affordable houses can be built with sweat equity, paying rent to the housing authority.

Best of all, they build communities of people who know and trust one another, making happier places to live, for generations to come.

Include whole site zero cost, zero carbon waste processing, producing energy and building materials, providing an income for inhabitants and landlords.

Representation ID Number: 2777 / 1

That the development should fit well into the existing scene

Representation ID Number: 2780 / 1

Reduce number of houses

Not sure that land should be built on

Will ruin Colliers Lane

Representation ID Number: 2781 / 1

Post office essential

Representation ID Number: 2784 / 1

Use the Ensleigh Site as a nature reserve - create woodland, glade, hides etc

Representation ID Number: 2786 / 1

Height limits to preserve views from a distance

Some retail provision

Representation ID Number: 2787 / 1

No building to spoil the entry into Bath

Representation ID Number: 2788 / 1

Has consideration been given to

Adequate public transport into Bath

Schedule of comments: What changes would consultees make to the vision?

The additional congestion that 350 homes are likely to produce in the morning rush hour to the M4 - and on the return.

Representation ID Number: 2792 / 1

Whose vision is it? Not mine.

Representation ID Number: 2793 / 1

Have extensive use of dry stone walls to emphasise compatibility

Representation ID Number: 2796 / 1

Mixed use development - shops, schools, workplaces

Slowing down Lansdown Road traffic with several entrances into the site - vehicle, cycle etc.

Excellent public transport

Creating an urban high density rather than suburban (cul-de-sac) permeability. See 'space syntax' principles.

Representation ID Number: 2841 / 1

It is very important to, wherever possible, preserve the existing skyline in an area of beauty.

Representation ID Number: 2842 / 1

Limitation as far as possible of motor transport of all kinds.

Representation ID Number: 2843 / 2

Use high quality developer and limit development to Ensleigh site only and not playing fields

Representation ID Number: 2845 / 1

Can some of the MoD sites be used as car parks.

Representation ID Number: 2846 / 1

Please include a) local shops in the Ensleigh Development. This will reduce traffic amounts??.

Representation ID Number: 2847 / 1

There are NO shops within easy non car access in this area

Representation ID Number: 2852 / 1

Recognise that the Lansdown area has been developed in a low density manner and that the redevelopment of the Ensleigh site needs to be consistent with this theme.

Representation ID Number: 2853 / 1

Bear in mind the Dark Skies initiative followed so successfully in the rest of the city

Integration with existing community in Lansdown, not a feeling of separateness i.e. "you live on the Ensleigh estate"

Representation ID Number: 2864 / 1

Post office and general store

Representation ID Number: 2866 / 1

Honestly, that there should be no building at all on the Ensleigh site

Representation ID Number: 2868 / 1

A much better service to enable and enhance working from home

Representation ID Number: 2893 / 1

Schedule of comments: What changes would consultees make to the vision?

Low rise development (no more than 2 storeys)
No development beyond MOD land
Protect the cemetery opposite the site

Representation ID Number: 2897 / 1

It has been suggested that any future development on the site should include provision for a reasonable proportion of sheltered single storey retirement homes. This would help to ensure a balanced community and should limit competing requirements for public transport or traffic congestion at peak working hour travelling times. Moreover it could also have the advantage of releasing larger properties in the Bath area for alternative occupation and would be likely to be attractive financially to prospective developers.

There also would seem to be a need for some retail provision in the area such as a newsagent and a small grocery or general store as this would help to minimise traffic and demands on public transport.

Representation ID Number: 2899 / 1

Low rise development (no more than 2 storeys)
No development beyond MOD land
Protect the cemetery opposite the site
All private housing to be detached houses

Representation ID Number: 2907 / 1

Add:
Integration with the existing local community (please see our detailed Suggestions and Concerns)

Representation ID Number: 2909 / 1

The principal vision is flawed; this is not consultation but imposition of a vision of homes and the urbanisation associated with it (roads, roundabouts, traffic signs etc). For this reason I suggest the vision be to demolish the existing MoD hutments and return the land either to:

- a) Agricultural land. This is in keeping with the remaining land along the East side of the whole of Lansdown or
- b) Natural wilderness suitable for wildlife, family walks, horse and cycle riding, personal reflection and general de-stressing from the pressures of urban living.

Representation ID Number: 2914 / 1

Having observed elsewhere how ugly a non integrated development can be, every effort should be made to keep all building harmonious, of high quality and preferably done by one, high quality, builder.

Representation ID Number: 2927 /

I would keep the new housing development on the MOD site small & not re-develop the existing playing fields, at all. I agree fully with the objections sent. Current residents especially fear "development creep" because BANES is encouraging development of the playing fields. We object to playing fields being re-sited within the AONB, as they would bring noise & traffic & spoil the visual beauty of the quiet fields surrounding our homes; new residents within the re-developed Ensleigh site would suffer similarly. Currently, the MOD site offers the potential to new residents of being surrounded by rural peace; this effect can only be achieved by building a SMALL new community there which DOES NOT spill beyond the borders of MOD's land.

Representation ID Number: 2948 / 1

Given the acknowledged sensitivity of the site I would like to be clear whether the MOD has an entitlement to sell the land, under the terms of their original agreement with the owners of the land, and similarly concerning the Royal School playing field.

Representation ID Number: 2950 / 1

Creating sustainable neighbourhoods where people are proud to live and work
Building a stronger locally based economy

Schedule of comments: What changes would consultees make to the vision?

Encourage creativity that supports contemporary living and working

Representation ID Number: 2951 / 1

As expressed in the BANES Draft Concept Statement, the MOD site is extraordinarily sensitive in terms of visual impact, and prone to seriously negative effects of the wrong sort of development on this site. It is vital in the first instance to address the question of the terms under which the land was made available to the MOD, and whether the MOD is entitled, under this original agreement, to sell this land on? BANES should also address the similar question in relation to the Royal School playing field. The results of both these findings should be made public

Representation ID Number: 2955 / 1

Green Spaces for People and Nature: Certainly. As long as the new development contains about the same proportion of green space as the present Enleigh site, that would seem about right.

Low Carbon Sustainable Development: Of course. But isn't this more a matter of relevant building regulations?

Building Homes, Protecting Heritage: Hardly. MoD Enleigh was never an architectural treasure.

Building Homes, Creating Distinctive Places: Probably not; should be in keeping with Bath as a Heritage City.

Accessible for Walking, Cycling and Buses: Certainly.

1. It shouldn't matter much if car drivers occasionally have to drive a lot further than a direct route.

2. Bus use and cycling should be positively encouraged.

3. Ideally pedestrians should not have to make gratuitous lengthy detours when they want to go just a short distance.

However, there is a potential conflict here, with the wishes for some residents to have a high level of protection against petty crime and nuisance. Easy access for lawful residents also means easy access for burglars, vandals etc.

Consideration of the larger area for development: Does this mean encroaching on all the lovely playing fields, woods, and farms, nearby?

Already there is a protracted conspiracy in operation to ruin the Woolley Valley. I sense the same danger here.

This document so general that it is difficult to add very much. However, it reads as if the author felt it necessary to insert the right buzz-words as often as possible, just to impress: "vision", "green" "sustainable, etc etc.

Representation ID Number: 2955 / 2

I am strongly against any of Kingswood's land being built on.

It is essential that the houses look traditional with no gimmicky wood fascias or other modernistic silliness.

The school should be designed to be used as a community centre in the evenings with a hall able to be used separately.

Other children from existing houses would use the school as St Stephen's is too small, so there is no need for a larger development on more than MOD land.

Representation ID Number: 2956 / 1

I would like to see the vision amended as follows:

- Development that delivers high-quality homes of a density that appropriately reflects the context of the site, the character of the local environment and surrounding AONB

- Delivery of a scheme that preserves and enhances the World Heritage Site

- A housing-led development that will generate minimal extra traffic on local roads

Representation ID Number: 2957 /

- Develop ONLY the existing MOD site NOT the playing fields

- Maintain and restrict any future land use of the existing school playing fields as playing fields.

- Constrain development to high quality residential only – plus the potential for a small convenience store

- Constrain the Enleigh North and Enleigh South developments within one fully coordinated master plan

- Ensure that the lanes at the North East end of Granville Road are protected/restricted access – no rat runs, ensure restricted access etc

- Drastically reduce the number of units from 350, which is massively excessive overdevelopment (clarify the provenance

Schedule of comments: What changes would consultees make to the vision?

of this figure relative to the usable land

- No materials permitted to be taken off site during construction – eg re-use all excavated materials for landscaping/bunding etc
- All building material to come into the site from the North West – ie nothing up or down Lansdown road from the city side
- Confirmation that EIA shall be required – include controls over aesthetics
- Ensure high quality architecture, use of materials, aesthetics all in keeping with this unique World Heritage Site and Area of Natural Beauty

Representation ID Number: 2963 /

A new school should only be considered once the main Lansdown Road entrance is available, because it will attract families from further afield thus adding to the traffic problems.

Representation ID Number: 2967 /

The MOD redevelopment is necessary but will have a large impact on the surrounding area in terms of traffic. Doubling the size of the development to include the playing fields will take away a valuable amenity from the area and existing residents..

Representation ID Number: 2970 /

The entire vision is unacceptable both in principle and in detail. The Ensleigh site should be used as an opportunity to develop green spaces on the margins of Bath where it meets the AONB, for example as part of the Forest of Avon project.

Representation ID Number: 2973 /

Restrict the footprint to the existing MOD site. The knock-on effects of expanding into the surrounding playing fields would be overwhelming in terms of impacts on the World Heritage Site.

Representation ID Number: 2974 /

- The need for the development to be on a density appropriate to the local area and the surrounding AONB and the World Heritage Site.
- The need to carry out any development in a way which does not detract from the World Heritage Site and which is consistent with the World Heritage Site Management Plan which the Council has endorsed. .
- The need to minimise the impact on traffic flows on the Lansdown Road.

Representation ID Number: 2975 /

More specification on transport, amenities and a commitment to no further expansion

Representation ID Number: 3066 / 1

Improved attention to the heritage of Bath.

Representation ID Number: 3066 / 2

No buildings should appear over the skyline of the brow of the hill overlooking to the south.

Representation ID Number: 3067 / 1

The removal of any intent to develop the adjoining playing field sites of the Royal High and Kingswood Schools.

Representation ID Number: 3072 / 1

Some small retail units/post office

Representation ID Number: 3076 / 1

Change "green spaces" to "homes with gardens for people and nature".

I agree with "protecting heritage" but "creating distinctive places" is extremely vague. What places do you mean?