

## **Westfield Parish Consultation Statement**

### Introduction

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15 (2). Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- b) explains how they were consulted;
- c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan

### Aims of the Westfield Neighbourhood Plan consultation

The aims of the Westfield Neighbourhood Plan consultation process were:

To involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of Plan development so that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process;

- To ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken;
- To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques; and
- To ensure that results of consultation were fed back to local people and available to read (in both hard copy and via the Steering Group's website) as soon as possible after the consultation events.

### Background

Established in 2011, the Parish Council is keen to explore and preserve the unique history, needs, aspirations and character of Westfield. On 5<sup>th</sup> February 2015 the Parish Council put out a call to local people to become part of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group. As the Chair of the Council said at the time, "This is a multi person task, beyond the reaches of the Parish Council alone and recruitment from the community is absolutely essential".

The call for volunteers elicited five Councillors and six local residents who met on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2015 to discuss their remit and to get organised.

Since then the Working Group has expanded through regular updates in the local press which have attracted more volunteers and at February 2017 consists of six Councillors and seven residents.

### Consultees

The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group has consulted in a variety of different ways in order to reach as many of the hard to reach groups as possible. These are outlined in the Consultation log.

### Consultation Stages

The following stages of consultation were undertaken and the consultation log demonstrates what was done at each stage.

- [Decision on the neighbourhood area and invitations to join the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.](#)
- [Range of Consultations on what should be included within the Neighbourhood Plan, priorities for the area, what people like and what they do not like, a vision for the future.](#)
- [Housing Needs Survey](#)
- [Options Consultation](#)
- [Pre-submission consultation and publicity](#)

**Westfield NDP Regulation 14 Consultation**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment Type (Email/Letter etc)</b>	<b>Comment(s) Made</b>	<b>Westfield NDP Response and changes made to the Plan</b>
<p>David Stuart Historic Places Adviser South West</p> <p>Historic England 29 Queen Square   Bristol BS1 4ND</p>	<p>E Mail 13/11/17</p>	<p>Thank you for your Regulation 14 consultation on the Westfield Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I can confirm that we have no comments on the Plan that we would like to make other than to congratulate your community on its progress to date and wish it well in the subsequent stages to getting it made.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>
<p>The Coal Authority</p> <p><b>Melanie Lindsley BA</b> <i>(Hons), DipEH, DipURP, MA, PGCertUD, PGCertSP,</i></p>	<p>Email 5/12/17</p>	<p>Thank you for the notification of the 30 October 2017 consulting The Coal Authority on the above NDP.</p> <p>The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.</p> <p>As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined coalfield.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>

<p><i>MRTPI</i></p> <p><b>Planning Liaison Manager</b></p> <p>T 01623 637 119</p> <p>E  planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</p>		<p>According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans, there are recorded risks from past coal mining activity in the form of 6 mine entries and areas of recorded coal mine workings at shallow depth. It is noted that the proposed plan does not allocate any sites for future development and therefore we have no specific comments to make. However, if in the future the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to allocate sites for development in these areas then consideration will need to be given to the risks posed to surface stability in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Bath and North East Somerset Development Plan. In addition any allocations on the surface coal resource will need to consider the impacts of mineral sterilisation in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan.</p> <p>In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) please continue to consult The Coal Authority on planning matters using the specific email address of <a href="mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk">planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</a>.</p> <p>The Coal Authority wishes the Neighbourhood Plan team every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
<p>Natural England</p> <p>Amanda Grundy Somerset, Avon &amp; Wiltshire Area Team</p> <p>consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p>	<p>E mail 7/12/17</p>	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 31 October 2017, which was received by Natural England on the same date.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>We have considered the Westfield Neighbourhood Plan - Pre Submission Draft and would like to offer the following comments:</p> <p>The draft Plan appears to demonstrate a good understanding of the area and to reflect the priorities and aspirations of the local community. With respect to the natural environment, we are satisfied the Plan is underpinned by robust evidence and that it should provide a positive framework for guiding future development within the Parish.</p> <p>We particularly welcome the importance given to the protection of landscape character, views, ecological networks, green spaces and green corridors. Although the Plan area does not contain nationally designated sites or landscapes, the draft Plan identifies habitats and landscape features that provide foraging and commuting opportunities for</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>


<p>Customer Services Hornbeam House Crewe Business Park Electra Way Crewe Cheshire CW1 6GJ</p>		<p>greater and lesser horseshoe bats, both species are associated with Bath &amp; Bradford on Avon Bat Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Mells Valley SAC. With the above in mind, we support the proposed 'Green Space' policies, which should help to ensure these important assets are protected as part of future development. We also note Community Aspiration 1 Improving access to Green Spaces and, in principle, Natural England would expect to support future proposals that enhance opportunities for people to safely access, enjoy and learn about the natural environment. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter please contact me on 07900 608311. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk. Yours sincerely Amanda Grundy Somerset, Avon &amp; Wiltshire Area Team</p>	
<p>Mark Richards marichards@savills.com T. 01823 446 988 M. 07720 497 360 F. 01823 445 031 York House Blackbrook Business Park Taunton Somerset TA1 2PX 01823 445 030  On behalf of The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks</p>	<p>Email 11/12/17</p>	<p>I write on behalf of my clients, The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks to make representations in respect of the current consultation on the Westfield Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Draft. This letter sets out my client's views on the proposed policies, supporting text and illustrations included in the Neighbourhood Plan and specifically comments on whether they are considered to be 'sound' for the purposes of the forthcoming Examination in Public. Where concerns are raised in respect of certain aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan this response also makes suggestions on how they might be amended in order to make them sound. <b>Policy 4 - Ecology</b> This policy seeks to safeguard existing ecological habitats, in particular the Waterside Valley and Fosseyway Gardens Corridors. The policy also requires all development proposals to be supported by appropriate ecology survey evidence and mitigation wherever there is potential for impacts upon protected species and and/or their habitats. The map situated above 'Policy 4' sets out the proposed extents of the Waterside Valley Corridor to be protected (shown in green). The extent of the 'green corridor' identified in this map has been designed to accommodate the known areas of ecological value based on comprehensive survey evidence. This is entirely appropriate. In its current form area identified for protection in the map strikes an appropriate balance between securing the long term conservation of the Waterside Valley Corridor without encroaching unnecessarily upon land of lesser ecological value. It is important that this</p>	<p>Comments noted with thanks.</p>

		remains the case in order to allow for the future expansion of the Westfield Industrial Estate in line with Policy 9. Of course, any proposal for the expansion of the Industrial Estate would need to demonstrate that it would not harm the ecological value of the Waterside Valley Corridor (and indeed any other habitat) in line with Policy 4. In light of the above, it is considered that Policy 4 is sound in its current form.	
Savills on behalf of The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks	Email 11/12/17	<b>Map on page 29</b> The map provided on page 29 is included to illustrate the routes of public footpaths across the Westfield Neighbourhood Area. However this map also highlights an extensive area of land to the east of the Industrial Estate in pink hatching. It is unclear what this hatching is intended to represent, however given the title of the map it gives the impression that this land is designated for public access. Given that this not the case the Neighbourhood Plan Group is requested to amend this map so as to avoid confusion regarding the status of this land.	Pink hatching denotes landowner deposits as a right of way. NPWG agreed to remove the pink hatching. Plan amended.
Savills on behalf of The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks	Email 11/12/17	<b>Policy 5 – Rural Landscape Character</b> This intention behind ‘Policy 5’ is generally supported as a method of conserving the landscape character of the Waterside Valley and land north of Highfields. However there is concern over the wording of this policy, which currently requires all new developments within these areas to deliver an ‘enhancement’ to the rural landscape. While it is of course right and proper that proposals for new development should minimise harmful visual impacts through appropriate design and the retention of important landscape features, it is very difficult to imagine that it will be possible to achieve landscape enhancement, particularly in the case of proposals for the development of new employment space. The policy also currently states that new development should not cause significant harm to the ‘undeveloped landscape setting of settlements’. Again it is very difficult to see how proposals for new development will be able to meet this test and there is a concern that the policy could be interpreted by readers to mean that no new development should be allowed to take place in such areas (although I appreciate this is not the intention of the policy). For the avoidance of doubt it is recommended that the wording of Policy 5 is reworded as follows: <i>“To be supported, development proposals within the Waterside Valley and land north of Highfields should, where possible, retain important landscape features including natural field boundaries, watercourses, woodlands and other mature trees. Proposals in these</i>	NPWG commented that conserve and enhance is acceptable wording for the policy wording should be retained as it is.

		<p><i>areas must be supported by a Landscape and Visual Assessment.”</i></p> <p>It is considered that the suggested wording above still achieves the desired outcome of Policy 5, while removing the opportunity for misinterpretation.</p>	
Savills on behalf of The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks	Email 11/12/17	<p><b>Policy 6 – Important Views</b></p> <p>This policy in part appears to replicate the requirements of Policy 5, in that it seeks to conserve the landscape character of Westfield by identifying particular views that should be protected. In general this approach is supported, however there are some concerns regarding this policy which are considered to require further attention.</p> <p>The policy refers to the views identified on page 44 as being important and worthy of protection. However the current wording appears to imply this is not an exhaustive list and that other (currently unidentified) views could be identified as being of value. In order to ensure the policy is properly interpreted by Planning Officers, members of the public and other parties it is important that this wording is specific. It is therefore recommended that a definitive list of important views is provided within the wording of the policy, thereby providing certainty to all readers.</p> <p>In refining the list of important views it is considered that one of the views currently identified on page 44 (bottom middle) should not be included. This is the view which looks towards the Westfield Industrial Estate from the ridge to the east. Given that the primary feature of this view is the industrial estate with other urban development behind, it is considered that this particular view is of limited public value and thus not worthy of inclusion. Furthermore it is important to consider the potential impact the inclusion of this view could have on the deliverability of other policy ambitions in the Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically Policy 9 seeks to promote Page 3</p> <p>and encourage the future expansion of the Westfield Industrial Estate as a way to attract inward investment and create local jobs, however at present Policy 6 identifies the land adjoining the Industrial Estate as falling within an important view. As such there is clearly some degree of conflict between the two policies as things currently stand.</p> <p>It is considered that with the alterations suggested above Policy 6 can be made sound.</p>	<p>We accept that in order to be interpreted correctly the plan should be clear. Agreed to amend the plan with the addition of labels on the photos to indicate their location. Agreed not to amend the policy wording: the black arrows on the map show the exact location of the views and these arrows remain unchanged in the Plan. The view on the bottom middle of page 44 which includes the trading estate in the mid-distance is an important one, and is marked on the</p>

			<p>map with a black arrow. It is important because of the breathtaking views to the far distance. We would be happy to therefore elaborate in the Plan to state that providing any growth of the trading estate does not create a ridge line which exceeds the current ridge line, then such potential changes to that particular view are acceptable.</p>
<p>Savills on behalf of The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks</p>	<p>Email 11/12/17</p>	<p><b>Map on page 46</b> As is also the case on page 29, the map provided on page 46 illustrates the routes of public footpaths across the Westfield Neighbourhood Area. However this map also highlights an extensive area of land to the east of the Industrial in pink hatching. It is unclear what this hatching is intended to represent, however given the title of the map it gives the impression that this land is designated for public access. Given that this not the case the Neighbourhood Plan Group is requested to amend this map so as to avoid confusion as to the status of this land.</p>	<p>Pink hatching denotes landowner deposits as a right of way. NPWG agreed to remove the pink hatching.</p>



			Plan amended.
Savills on behalf of The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks	Email 11/12/17	<p><b>Policy 9 – Development of Employment</b></p> <p>The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks comprise the vast majority of land ownership adjoining the existing Westfield Industrial Estate to the east. The map below identifies the extent of land ownership covered by these two parties insofar as it is relevant to the potential future expansion of the industrial estate.</p>  <p>The explicit support offered in Policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan for the expansion of the Westfield Industrial Estate is supported by the land owners, who are willing and able to make this land available for development to meet current and future demand for employment space. The land owners are also largely satisfied that the criteria outlined in</p>	<p>Plans to extend the industrial estate are supported by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group in principle.</p> <p>Proposed amendment to item 3, agreed and amended.</p>

		<p>Policy 9 are appropriate to ensure that any future expansion of the industrial estate does not result in unacceptable harm to the landscape setting or protected wildlife and habitats.</p> <p>It is however considered that a slight amendment to the wording of criteria 3 is required in order to ensure that the level of supporting information required to accompany proposals for development are proportionate. As such it is recommended that the wording of criteria 3 is amended to read as follows:</p> <p><i>“3. The proposal provides a comprehensive Transport Assessment/Travel Plan proportionate to the scale of development proposed in accordance with the requirements of the local planning authority.”</i></p> <p>Apart from this minor alteration to the wording of criteria 3 it is considered that this policy is sound.</p> <p>This section of the response will now provide further justification in support of the proposed expansion of the Westfield Industrial Estate.</p> <p><b><i>Justification for expansion of Westfield Industrial Estate</i></b></p> <p>Diagram 4 of the BANES Core Strategy indicates that the Council intends to provide an additional 900 jobs within the Somer Valley Spatial Area (which includes Westfield) over the plan period. This is to include new industrial and warehouse floorspace. Furthermore, Policy SV1 of the Core Strategy indicates that Westfield Industrial Estate should be a focus for accommodating some of this requirement. The proposed expansion of the Industrial Estate as set out in Policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan is entirely consistent with that commitment in Core Strategy Policy SV1. Furthermore, the recently adopted Placemaking Plan also identifies the need for incentivising and allocating additional sites for employment provision.</p> <p>The Westfield Industrial Trading Estate already provides a range of industrial and warehouse units (providing a mix of B1, B2 and B8 uses). With no significant opportunities to accommodate additional new units or expand existing units already operating at the site, the Industrial Estate is now very close to peak capacity. Indeed the Estate already suffers from a shortage of parking provision, which severely limits the potential for delivering further employment space within its existing confines. As such the only logical option to is to allow the Industrial Estate to expand eastwards.</p> <p>Whilst there are some local ecological, geological and landscape designations, the general principles for developing the site, which are outlined below, demonstrate that the site could be sensitively brought forward as an expansion to the existing Industrial Estate. Through</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>appropriate design and layout the development can come forward in a way which minimises harm to the local landscape while securing biodiversity enhancements as part of any proposal.</p> <p>The area of developable land to the east of the Industrial Estate is defined by the extent of local ecological and landscape designations which run along the Waterside Valley Corridor. The result is that two distinct zones are created (north and south), which could be linked via a green pedestrian route. To examine these zones in more detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ The northern portion of the site can be easily accessed via the existing road network and existing public rights of way can be retained as part of the proposals. This eastern most area of this part of the site falls in the area formally designated by BANES for 'Green Infrastructure'. If required this area of land could be safeguarded from development or at least positively planned to achieve opportunities for biodiversity enhancement.</li> <li>□ The southern portion of the site can be accessed directly from Charlton Lane, albeit this may require some widening of the road to serve the site. Alternatively there may also be potential to secure vehicular access directly from the existing Industrial Estate to the west, albeit this would require agreement with third parties to do so. The layout of development in the southern portion of the site will likely be shaped in large part by the topography of the site and also by the watercourse that runs south to north. At this stage it is considered likely that a road crossing across this small watercourse could be achieved through either a culvert or small bridge in the area close to the southern boundary.</li> </ul> <p>Page 5</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the land identified represents a natural extension to the existing Industrial Estate and that a mix of unit types could be delivered to meet demand. Furthermore, the proposal allows for the retention of the existing Green Infrastructure designation and there are opportunities to enhance this designation through the proposed development.</p>	
Savills on behalf of The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks	Email 11/12/17	<p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>To conclude, The Kilmersdon Estate and Mr Weeks would like to applaud the Neighbourhood Plan Group for preparing a Plan with a positive vision for Westfield and which seeks to balance the positive outcomes of development with the need to conserve those features that are of genuine value. These ambitions need not be at odds with one another if pursued in a joined up and positive manner.</p> <p>This response has identified a number of areas where it is felt that some further attention is</p>	Thank you for these comments.

		<p>required to clarify the wording of certain policies. It is considered that these amendments will help to strengthen the Neighbourhood Plan as a whole and assist its passage through the Examination and Referendum processes and so I trust these suggestions will be given due consideration.</p> <p>If you would like further clarification over any aspect of this consultation response then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
<p>George Blanchard</p> <p>Planning Officer - Planning Policy</p> <p>Bath and North East Somerset Council</p> <p>Tel. 01225 477684</p> <p>Email: <a href="mailto:george.blanchard@bathnes.gov.uk">george.blanchard@bathnes.gov.uk</a></p>	<p>Email 11/12/17</p>	<p>Details below.</p>	

**BANES comments raised during the Reg 14 consultation period**

<b>Page no.</b>	<b>B&amp;NES Dept.</b>	<b>Draft Westfield Neighbourhood Plan section / reference (NB these refs may have changed in later drafts)</b>	<b>LPA comments during plan preparation (only policies that have been retained in the submitted NDP are referred to below).</b>	<b>Reason for comments</b>	<b>Westfield NP Working Group response</b>
N/A	Planning Policy	General comment	It is suggested to include paragraph numbering within the document	To improve accessibility in the document.	There may be further formatting required after examination and so this is an issue in terms of timing. We have improved accessibility by increasing section headings and numbering.
N/A	Planning Policy	General comment	Ensure that maps used within the document are high resolution – some currently are difficult to read (eg map on page 39).	To improve accessibility in the document.	All plans re-inserted to the highest resolution possible from Parishes On line.

Pg 22	Planning Policy	Policy 2 – Housing Accessibility	<p>Policy goes further than Placemaking Plan/Planning Obligations SPD (19%). The evidence used for the Placemaking Plan is taken from the Housing Accessibility Standards Needs Assessment shows that during the Plan period the newly arising demand for housing meeting enhanced accessibility standards equates to around 19% of all new market housing to be provided.</p> <p>Important to note that the Government defines these as 'optional' standards. Use of this policy would have implications on the type and mix of housing that would be bought forward within Westfield.</p>	<p>The Examiner would expect to see evidence of need/demand to justify a departure from the Placemaking Plan. Guidance on evidence can be found online: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ho-using-optional-technical-standards">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ho-using-optional-technical-standards</a></p> <p>The findings of the Westfield Housing Need Assessment 2016 are noted; however its use to require that all new homes should be built to Accessible standard is questioned. The 48% stating a need for 'all on one level' is representative of 63 households who completed Part 2 of the survey (people wanting to move to another property within Westfield). Amounting to approximately 30 households.</p> <p>The Census data in Appendix 2 suggests that the highest level of inward migration to Westfield are people aged 25-44 and that the percentage of population that are over 65 is less than the B&amp;NES average.</p> <p>Therefore it can be shown that there is some demand for accessible homes within Westfield; however the need to depart from the requirement within the Placemaking Plan is not currently supported by the evidence put forward.</p>	<p>The NP can require higher accessibility standards than the Placemaking Plan. The premise of M4(2) standard is that even younger people would be able to live within that house for the rest of their lives. The Plan has been consulted on and evidence gained throughout that the community want good accessibility.</p> <p>Amended to read “For market housing, new dwellings should be built to the ‘accessible and adaptable’ standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations, unless specific site conditions make this impracticable. Accessibility standards for Affordable Housing (Part M4(2) and M4(3)) will be applied in accordance with the B&amp;NES Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, or successor guidance.”</p>
-------	-----------------	----------------------------------	---	--	--

Pg 34	Planning Policy	Policy 5 – Rural Landscape Character	<i>To be supported, development proposals within the Waterside Valley and land north of Highfields must demonstrate, via a Landscape and Visual Assessment, <b>that</b> they conserve and enhance rural landscape character, as outlined in this Neighbourhood Plan and do not cause significant harm to the characteristic rural features of the area including the undeveloped landscape setting of settlements, natural field boundaries, water courses, woodlands and other mature trees.</i>	Minor grammatical change	Noted and amended.
Pg 25	Planning Policy	Page 25 – Green Spaces	Update Waterside green corridor map - no longer Draft GI, should refer to PMP Policy NE1 GI Network	Placemaking Plan now adopted	Noted and amended.
Pg 26	Planning Policy	Page 26 – Green Spaces	Update map - no longer draft protected recreational sites, should refer to PMP Policy LCR5 Safeguarded existing sport and recreational facilities	Placemaking Plan now adopted	Noted and amended.
Pg 27	Planning Policy	Page 27 – Green Spaces	As above, update map - PMP Policy NE5 Ecological Networks	Placemaking Plan now adopted	Noted and amended.
Pg 32/33	Planning Policy	Page 32/33 – Green Spaces	Update text 'emerging' Placemaking Plan (is now adopted)  Update map to PMP Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces	Placemaking Plan now adopted	Noted and amended.
Pg 45	Historic Environment	Page 45 – Preserving Heritage	Refers to 'unlisted miners terracing' – alternatively I would say: “ <b>historic miners’ terraced cottages and the planted spoil heaps are locally important heritage assets</b> ” or something like that.		Noted and amended. The word (batches) added after planted spoil heaps.

	Historic Environment	Preserving Heritage	Generally in the heritage section I would suggest: a list of locally important heritage assets (miners' cottages, spoil heaps, pill boxes etc) and a list of designated heritage assets. Both lists should be accompanied by photos.		
Pg 47	Historic Environment	Page 47 – Preserving Heritage	Pit pony stables – states that it's last surviving building of this type in the country =potential candidate for listing and the document may want to make reference to this.		Noted with thanks for the comment and amended.
Pg 51/52	Historic Environment	Preserving Heritage/Policy 8	<p>Pill boxes – the alternative wording I suggest is: '<b>...were also part of a national, strategic line of defence erected in the early part of the WWII conflict.</b>'</p> <p>In terms of the community value I can't advise but happy for this to happen if viable. Some of the pill boxes may be viable as candidates for listing and I am working with Rich Stott to assess this and others in B&amp;NES.</p>		Noted and amended.



	Historic Environment	Preserving Heritage	Regarding all locally important heritage assets these may be considered for being added to the Local List and mention should be made of the emerging SPD.		Added "Policy HE1 of the Placemaking Plan states that proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets, including unscheduled archaeology, unlisted buildings and local parks and gardens, should ensure they are conserved having regard to their significance. Work is progressing on the B&NES Locally Listed Heritage Assets SPD, with the programme adjusted in order to take account of Historic England's Guidance on Locally Listed Heritage Assets, and it is understood that the SPD will be adopted in 2018."
Page 55	Economic Development	Page 55 - Economy, Industry and Jobs - 2nd bullet	Suggest removing ' <u><i>a high quality inward investment</i></u> '	Isn't clear what that means	Noted and amended.

Page 56	Economic Development	Page 56 – Economy, Industry and Jobs - 3rd paragraph	<i>This is to be achieved by promoting, managing and encouraging <b>inward</b> development within the Parish and the Westfield <b>Industrial Estate</b> in particular in order to diversify and strengthen the local economy and in that way ensure Westfield does not simply become a commuting settlement.</i>	Update paragraph	Noted and amended.
Pg 56	Economic Development	Page 56 - Economy, Industry and Jobs	Research mentioned. Often NDPs suffer from poor Economic Development evidence. The Economic and Development Team would be able to provide a short report on business and employment growth in the Parish for use as background evidence		Report requested with thanks.
Pg 57	Economic Development	Policy 9 – Development of Employment	Suggest adding policy requirement that proposed uses fit with the Placemaking Plan Policy ED2a to ensure that industrial/ B class employment is promoted and not lost to retail or other non-appropriate uses.	ED2a is a strategic policy in the Placemaking Plan (PMP) to which the Neighbourhood Plan needs to be in general conformity with.	NP does not consider retail use of the Industrial estate to be entirely non appropriate. Wording amended to recognise compliance with Policy ED2a of the Placemaking Plan and where an alternative use class is proposed it is agreed providing it does not have an adverse impact on the industrial nature of the estate.
Pg 57	Economic Development	Page 57 - Economy, Industry and Jobs	Remove bullet point relating to B&NES Enterprise Zone.	The EZ is at Old Mills	Noted and amended.

Pg 57	Economic Development	Page 57 - Homeworking Bullet point and paragraph.	Suggest removing reference to homeworking	The principle of home work units is sound; however from a Planning Policy point they are very difficult to manage and are ripe for abuse and loss of the employment space. There is adequate housing delivery in the area, new development should be for employment only.  Where is the evidence base to support the comments of self-employment and home-based working?	Noted. Since it is not part of the policy NPWG would like to retain reference to home working because it is an important part of Westfield's employment profile
Pg 58	Planning Policy	Policy 10	Policy title combines with the policy text - suggest changing to match format of all other policies. Eg <b>Policy 10 New business development ...</b>	To match document formatting	Noted and amended.
Pg 58	Economic Development	Policy 10	Need to define where this is applicable as PMP ED2a covers this for Westfield industrial estate.  Also suggest promoting office based uses outside of the industrial estate		Noted. There are a number of business areas in Westfield, the industrial estate being one of them.
Pg 58	Planning Policy	Policy 11	Policy title combines with the policy text - suggest changing to match format of all other policies. Eg <b>Policy 11 New or additional retail floor-space ...</b>	To match document formatting	Noted and amended.
Pg 58	Economic Development	Policy 11	Suggest adding - 'The provision of any new or additional retail floor-space <b><u>in local centres</u></b> '  Suggest providing a list of use classes that are acceptable	To accord with NPPF	Noted. Map showing retail areas (not exhaustive) running through Westfield has been added.

Pg 58	Planning Policy	Policy 12	Policy title combines with the policy text - suggest changing to match format of all other policies	To match document formatting	Noted and amended.
Pg 58	Economic Development	Policy 12	Need to identify where this policy would apply geographically ie ED2a  Define 'employment benefits' as this presently contradicts the first section		Noted and amended in line with Planning Policy Officer's recommended wording.
Pg 59	Planning Policy	Policy 13	Delete 's' at end of sentence - Proposals for recreational and tourism activities and facilities will be supported providing that the siting, design and scale of the development conserves or enhances the quality of Westfield's built, natural, conservation and historic environments.	Grammatical	Noted and amended.
Pg 59	Economic Development	Policy 13	Suggest adding " <b>... and does not negatively impact in surrounding employment uses</b> "  Again stipulate area or exemptions ie PMP ED2a		Noted and amended.
Pg 62	Planning Policy	Policy 16 – Broadband Provision	Add a comma after "To be supported"	Grammatical	Noted and amended.

Pg 65	Planning Policy	Policy 18 – Traffic Hazards	<p>Suggest altering traffic hazards to road dangers.</p> <p>Alternative Policy could be:</p> <p><b><i>Development proposals that are likely to generate significant amounts of movement must be accompanied by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment outlining the transport implications during both construction and in operation, in particular addressing impacts on:</i></b></p> <p><b><i>a) Road dangers</i></b>  <b><i>b) Pedestrian environment and movement</i></b>  <b><i>c) Cycling infrastructure provision</i></b>  <b><i>d) Public transport</i></b>  <b><i>e) The street network</i></b></p>	<p>Similar policy was suggested by the Examiner for Whitchurch NDP. The suggested policy has regard to national policy, contributes towards sustainable development and is in general conformity with strategic policy.</p>	
Pg 67	Planning Policy	Policy 19 – Air Quality	<p>Suggest deleting 2nd sentence of the policy.</p>	<p>Similar wording was used for Whitchurch Village NDP where the Examiner recommended deletion of the second sentence as it does not have regard to national policy concerning air pollution and does not provide a practical framework for decision making. By retaining the first sentence, the concerns of the local community are sufficiently addressed.</p>	Noted and amended.

Pg 67/68	Planning Policy	Air Quality	Last line states "The first 3 months data is likely to be available in September 2017" – Is this data now available?	For consistency and could be used in the evidence base to support the policy.	Paragraph amended with the removal of the last four sentences and the addition of 'significant' in the first line – given the significant volume of traffic ...
Pg 68	Planning Policy	Policy 20	<p>Policy 20 of the Neighbourhood Plan makes the baseline minimum 2 spaces per dwelling, garages are removed from the minimum standard. The policy also increases visitor spaces to become 0.5 per dwelling.</p> <p>This is a deviation from PMP Policy ST7. There is concern that this could lead to developments that are dominated by car parking.</p>	<p>Policy ST7 is a strategic policy in that it applies district-wide and is an important component of the strategy for managing traffic and parking provision. A parking standard that does not include a garage is not in general conformity with Policy ST7, given that this would result in a significant &amp; material difference of the level of parking provided (for smaller dwellings a 50% difference).</p> <p>Examiner would need to see evidence of a local need for a departure from the position in the Placemaking Plan.</p>	<p>Consulted Transport Planner for advice on any other way this can be addressed through policy which would conform with the PMO or other mechanisms or perhaps be addressed through design policy, with no response.</p> <p>Agreed to allow one space per one bed dwelling.</p>

The comments below are from BANES in response to the NPWG's comments/questions on the Reg 14 responses.

Date	Source	Question from NPWG	BANES Response	NPWG comments/response
18/12/17	Savills response to Policy 6	<p>Savills included the recommendation below in their response:</p> <p>Policy 6 – Important Views  <i>This policy in part appears to replicate the requirements of Policy 5, in that it seeks to conserve the landscape character of Westfield by identifying particular views that should be protected. In general this approach is supported, however there are some concerns regarding this policy which are considered to require further attention.</i>  <i>The policy refers to the views identified on page 44 as being important and worthy of protection. However the current wording appears to imply this is not an exhaustive list and that other (currently unidentified) views could be identified as being of value. In order to ensure the policy is properly interpreted by Planning Officers, members of the public and other parties it is important that this wording is specific. It is therefore recommended that a definitive list of important views is provided within the wording of the policy, thereby providing certainty to all readers.</i>  <i>In refining the list of important views it is considered that one of the views currently identified on page 44 (bottom middle) should not be included. This is the view which looks towards the Westfield Industrial Estate from</i></p>	<p>Industrial Estate*</p> <p>Have discussed with B&amp;NES Landscape Officer, who was happy with the policy as previously written and for the views to remain within the plan. Some improvements could be made to the map to improve clarity and to link the photos with the view.</p> <p>Happy run the re-worded policy past our Landscape Officer if you would like.</p> <p>Will there be a response to Savills suggestion for Policy 5 or is this to be agreed at the Steering Group meeting?</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b> to amend the map with the removal of the pink hatching.</p> <p><b>Agreed</b> to label the photos so that their location is clear</p>

	<p><i>the ridge to the east. Given that the primary feature of this view is the industrial estate with other urban development behind, it is considered that this particular view is of limited public value and thus not worthy of inclusion. Furthermore it is important to consider the potential impact the inclusion of this view could have on the deliverability of other policy ambitions in the Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically Policy 9 seeks to promote and encourage the future expansion of the Westfield Industrial Estate as a way to attract inward investment and create local jobs, however at present Policy 6 identifies the land adjoining the Industrial Estate as falling within an important view. As such there is clearly some degree of conflict between the two policies as things currently stand. It is considered that with the alterations suggested above Policy 6 can be made sound.</i></p> <p>Whilst I am trying to be as accommodating as possible, please would you advise if the following response be acceptable:</p> <p><b>We accept that in order to be interpreted correctly by planners the wording should be specific. We therefore remove the implication that this is not an exhaustive list. However, the black arrows on the map show the exact location of the views and these arrows remain unchanged in the Plan. The view on the bottom middle of page 44 which includes the</b></p>		
--	--	--	--



		<p>trading estate in the mid-distance is an important one, and is marked on the map with a black arrow. It is important because of the breathtaking views to the far distance. We would be happy to therefore elaborate in the Plan to state that providing any growth of the trading estate does not impede the view to the far distance and is not out of keeping with the existing design of the trading estate, then such potential changes to that particular view are acceptable.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

18/12/17	Savills response	<p>Savills made the following comment about the footpaths and rights of way map on Page 29 of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p><i>The map provided on page 29 is included to illustrate the routes of public footpaths across the Westfield Neighbourhood Area. However this map also highlights an extensive area of land to the east of the Industrial Estate in pink hatching. It is unclear what this hatching is intended to represent, however given the title of the map it gives the impression that this land is designated for public access. Given that this not the case the Neighbourhood Plan Group is requested to amend this map so as to avoid confusion regarding the status of this land.</i></p> <p>The map came from Parishes on line and the pink hatching denotes landowner deposits as a right of way. Please would you clarify exactly what that means and whether it is relevant to include it within the context of pages 29 and 46. If it is relevant to include it, I will simply amend the Plan with the addition of a map legend for clarity.</p>	<p>Under Register of Landowner Deposits under Highways Act 1980 and Commons Act 2006 Landowners are entitled to deposit documentation with the Council to prevent public rights being recorded on their land.</p> <p>The pink hatching denotes landowner deposits that have been submitted by landowners. This should be removed from the rights of way map.</p>	<p><b>Agreed</b> map to be amended to remove the pink hatching.</p>
----------	------------------	---	--	---

18/12/17	Planning Policy response to Policy 2	<p>BANES made the following response to Policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p><i>Policy goes further than Placemaking Plan/Planning Obligations SPD (19%). The evidence used for the Placemaking Plan is taken from the Housing Accessibility Standards Needs Assessment shows that during the Plan period the newly arising demand for housing meeting enhanced accessibility standards equates to around 19% of all new market housing to be provided.</i></p> <p><i>Important to note that the Government defines these as 'optional' standards. Use of this policy would have implications on the type and mix of housing that would be bought forward within Westfield.</i></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan can require higher accessibility standards than the Placemaking Plan. The premise of M4(2) standard is that even younger people would be able to live within that house for the rest of their lives. The Plan has been consulted on and evidence gained throughout that the community wants good accessibility. Is it possible for us to go to examination with the Policy as it stands, and be ready with a back up if an amendment is required at examination?</p>	<p>The overall aim of this policy is understood and is generally supported but the previous concerns are that the policy lacks evidence still stands. Also the wording of the policy (“x or x”) does not set out the proportion of each type that should be built as required in the Guidance. It is considered likely that with the current wording M4(2) would be built over M4(3). We would recommend that the Steering Group review the National Guidance on setting accessibility standards in Local Plans: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-optional-technical-standards">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-optional-technical-standards</a></p> <p>Specifically: <b>“What accessibility standards can local planning authorities require from new development?”</b></p> <p><i>“Where a local planning authority adopts a policy to provide enhanced accessibility or adaptability they should do so only by reference to Requirement M4(2) and/or M4(3) of the optional requirements in the Building Regulations and should not impose any additional information requirements (for instance provision of furnished layouts) or seek to determine compliance with these requirements, which is the role of the Building Control Body. They should clearly state in their Local Plan what proportion of new dwellings should comply with the requirements. There may be rare instances where an individual’s needs are not met by the wheelchair accessible optional requirement – see <a href="#">paragraph 011 below</a> Local Plan policies should also take into account site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography, and other circumstances which may make a specific site less suitable for M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings, particularly where step free access cannot be achieved or is not viable. Where step-free access is not viable, neither of the Optional Requirements in Part M should be applied.”</i></p> <p>Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 56-008-20160519</p> <p><i>“Local Plan policies for wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling.”</i></p> <p>Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 56-009-20150327</p> <p>If the Steering Group wishes to proceed with Policy 2 we would suggest the following re-wording:</p> <p><b>“All new dwellings should be built to the ‘accessible and adaptable’ standard in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations, unless specific site conditions make this impracticable”</b></p> <p>This would be general conformity with National Policy. The requirements set out in the Placemaking Plan/Planning Obligations SPD could then be used for M4(3) homes</p> <p>Regarding the examination: The examiners role is limited to checking that the Plan meets the basic conditions. The examiner can make modifications and limited changes to policies to ensure that the Plan meet the basic conditions. The examiner may also recommend the deletion of policies. During the examination the Steering Group may be asked questions for clarification purposes but it is not possible for the Steering Group to make alternative suggestions for policies at that stage.</p>	Policy amended as detailed in the further comments below.
----------	--------------------------------------	---	---	---

18/12/17	Locally Listed Important Buildings	Many thanks for this information on the SPD. Since we have not seen the 2018 version of the SPD, I wonder if you would be kind enough to give us some suggested wording in relation to the emerging SPD.	Happy to advise on the wording, would be helpful to see an up to date draft of the plan (with the other changes to the heritage section included)	Amended to read "Policy HE1 of the Placemaking Plan states that proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets, including unscheduled archaeology, unlisted buildings and local parks and gardens, should ensure they are conserved having regard to their significance. Work is progressing on the B&NES Locally Listed Heritage Assets SPD, with the programme adjusted in order to take account of Historic England's Guidance on Locally Listed Heritage Assets, and it is understood that the SPD will be adopted in 2018."
18/12/17	ED – Policy 11	Please would you mind providing us with a list of classes of business use which would be appropriate for inclusion in policy 11?	<a href="https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use">https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use</a> Part A Uses	Many thanks.

18/12/17	Planning Policy – Policy 20	<p>In looking at the Neighbourhood Plan policy on parking, which differs from BANES Policy, the Transport Planner has written</p> <p><i>Policy ST7 is a strategic policy in that it applies district-wide and is an important component of the strategy for managing traffic and parking provision. A parking standard that does not include a garage is not in general conformity with Policy ST7, given that this would result in a significant &amp; material difference of the level of parking provided (for smaller dwellings a 50% difference).</i></p> <p>Is it possible please for the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group to explain to the Transport Planner the problems in Westfield and ask if there is a way forward that this can be addressed through policy that would conform with PMP or other mechanisms or perhaps to be addressed within design policy? Please would it be possible to forward this to the Transport Planner who wrote the comment?</p>	<p>It is recognised that this is an important issue within the Parish. We are meeting with our transport colleagues to discuss parking standards in relation to the new Local Plan and to agree an approach for Neighbourhood Plans, as this issue has arisen in other areas.</p> <p>ST7 is a Strategic Policy but the wording does suggest that there is opportunity for more provision on a case by case basis. Policy could look to link to this?</p> <p>Could also be the opportunity to suggest design solutions – eg on street parking</p>	<p>As a rural area it is felt that the Parking Policy should reflect the differing needs to those in Bath.</p> <p>The importance of conveying the strong views held by local people about parking provision was upheld.</p> <p>Removed the requirement of two spaces per one bed dwelling.</p>
----------	-----------------------------	---	--	--

18/12/17	Addressed to GIS Team – Maps in Plan	<p>One of the comments which came back from BANES officers on our Draft Neighbourhood Plan was that the resolution of the maps needed to be improved. Can you help at all on this? Below is a link to our Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p><a href="http://www.westfieldparishcouncil.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/">http://www.westfieldparishcouncil.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/</a></p> <p>Any advice at all on improving the maps would be much appreciated. As you can appreciate I am looking to get this resolved as quickly as possible.</p> <p>I am also assuming that their inclusion should include the copyright wording at the bottom of each map?</p>	<p>Question sent to Martin Laker.</p> <p>My response would be that the more recent maps included in the Plan are a lot clearer, eg Pill Box Map. If not already done so, I would advise saving the map as a PNG from Parishes Online and inserting the map as a picture into the document (rather than copy and pasting).</p> <p>Some loss in the quality of images and maps can occur when compressing to PDF, this can sometimes be a trial an error process. Happy to advise further if required.</p> <p>Also the copyright wording is required for each map.</p>	Many thanks for this advice.
----------	--------------------------------------	--	--	------------------------------

19/12/17	ED – Policy 9	<p>BANES has made the following comment on policy 9</p> <p><i>Suggest adding policy requirement that proposed uses fit with the Placemaking Plan Policy ED2a to ensure that industrial/ B class employment is promoted and not lost to retail or other non-appropriate uses.</i></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not consider retail to be an entirely non appropriate use of the trading estate? Please may I ask your advice on how this issue can be addressed.</p>	<p>Westfield Industrial Estate is identified as a Strategic site within B&amp;NES under Policy ED2a, with a presumption in favour of retaining B1c, B2 and B8 uses. As a basic condition, Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in general conformity with strategic Local Policy.</p>	<p>The NPWG discussed the evidence showing that manufacturing is only 13% of business in Westfield. IT discussed the devastating effect on Westfield should class B8 warehousing expand. The conflict between the Local Plan which promotes the industrial estate for manufacturing and does not reflect the true nature of business in Westfield as shown in the evidence circulated and the view of the NPWG that the aim of the industrial estate is primarily for employment was discussed. Policy amended with new wording at item (1) to demonstrate the proposal is compliant with ED2A.</p>
----------	---------------	---	---	---

### Additional comments from B&NES raised outside of the Reg 14 consultation

		Additional Comments received from B&NES	Reason	NPWG Comment
19/1/18	Policy 15	<p><i>(2) Recreation Grounds - The Neighbourhood Plan will promote greater use of the recreation grounds and play areas within the parish, prioritised to the north of the parish. Developments of over 10 dwellings should include provision for children"s safe play for all ages and abilities.</i></p> <p>The inclusion of play areas within developments of 10 dwellings is unreasonable and would result in a play area's maintenance being underfunded by the development. The Green Space Strategy 2015 suggests a threshold of 50 dwellings for the inclusion of a play area.</p> <p>For offsite play space provision include:</p> <p><b>"The Neighbourhood Plan will support the provision of Play Areas for community use where there is an identified need. To be promoted using funding from CIL and grants where available."</b></p>	To comply with Green Space Strategy 2015 and National Guidance on Developer Contributions/CIL	These comments are new and have been raised by BANES outside of the statutory reg 14 consultation period. However we have amended the policy in line with the wording and added 'safe and accessible play' in line with local consultation.



19/1/18	Policy 15	<p><i>(3) Allotments - Where the individual garden size of any development of five or more houses is smaller than the footprint of the actual building, excluding any hard surfaced parking, the Neighbourhood Plan will require specific contributions for the provision of allotments for community use, prioritised on the north side of the Parish.</i></p> <p>The above policy is unworkable and won't meet the CIL regs, I agree that the Examiners wording from the Stowey Sutton Examination below is preferable.</p> <p><b>“The Neighbourhood Plan will support the provision of allotments for community use where there is an identified need. To be promoted using funding from CIL and grants where available.”</b></p>	To comply National Guidance on Developer Contributions/CIL regs	These comments are new and have been raised by BANES outside of the statutory reg 14 consultation period. However we have amended as suggested.
14/2/18	Plan Period	<p>At a meeting on the 14/2/18 to discuss the Plan submission it was noted that the Reg 14 version of the NDP had 2018-2038 on the cover page but then had an end date of 2035 mentioned on page 3.</p> <p>It was recommended that this be updated for consistency in the Plan and that an end date of 2036 could be used to tie in with the Plan period for the West of England Joint Spatial Plan and the emerging B&amp;NES Local Plan.</p>	For consistency in the plan	<p>These comments were raised outside of the Reg 14 consultation period.</p> <p>The Plan period has been updated as recommended. Plan period updated to 2016 – 2036.</p>

**Additional comments received from Residents of Welton Road regarding Community Aspiration 5 – Jan 2018 (By email)**

Comment	NPWG Response
<p>CHARLTON ROAD V WELTON ROAD.</p> <p>Having perused the draft Plan ref Community Aspiration 5. Known Highway Hazards, may I make some comments and invite your readers to reply.</p> <p>The only road quoted as dangerous is Charlton Road. Am I not correct in thinking that this road has not one but pedestrian pavements on both sides. Is it mainly level and straight and does not suffer from undue parking and, within reason, does not have traffic breaking the 20mph speed limit to a very great extent. It is, however, on the narrow side especially for buses and school coaches.</p> <p>Welton Road has NO pedestrian pavements whatsoever, it is mainly a single carriage way, BOTH ways, with the ensuing chaos that that causes and the 20mph speed limit completely ignored with NO Police deterrent to enforce it. Nobody can walk or drive on this road with any degree of safety and it is used in the main by locals as a Rat Run due to the unsuitable traffic flow in Radstock.</p> <p>It is, therefore, a surprise that Welton Road has NO mention whatsoever in this plan as it is without doubt the most dangerous road in Westfield. May I suggest that the authors of this draft plan walk the length of Charlton Road and Welton Road to compare the dangers as should any of your readers who are going to reply on this very local situation.</p> <p>Kindest regards John.L.Hamer 01761 438877 Coordinator, Welton Rd BA3 3UD Neighbourhood Watch Scheme</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group shares concerns over safety at Welton Road. Community Aspiration 5, Residential Traffic, underlines such concerns across the Parish. A cross section of comments about Welton Road will be added to the Plan.</p> <p>These comments were raised outside the reg 14 consultation period</p>
<p>On 31 Jan 2018 13:04, "Christian Wach" &lt;<a href="mailto:needle@haystack.co.uk">needle@haystack.co.uk</a>&gt; wrote: Dear John,</p> <p>Thank you for raising the concerns of Welton Road residents. I fully agree with your assessment. It surprises me that Cllr Ron Hopkins states that no comments regarding Welton Road were ever received. However, given that our Neighbourhood Watch Scheme is new (and given the relatively high turnover of properties - and therefore residents) perhaps I should be less surprised.</p> <p>Looking at the current draft of the Neighbourhood Plan, I note that it makes no mention of the new addition to the Bath College campus. It is this development which has spurred many residents of Welton Road into</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group shares concerns over safety at Welton Road. Community Aspiration 5, Residential Traffic, underlines such concerns across the Parish. A cross section of comments about Welton Road will be added to the Plan.</p> <p>These comments were raised outside</p>

action - since it will provide places for around 500 new students and thus cause an even greater weight of traffic (cars, cycles and pedestrian) along Welton Road. To me, this seems like a significant oversight in the plan.

I would also point to the changing demographics of Welton Road as an additional cause for concern: in recent years we have seen it change from being populated largely by older people to the influx of many families with children. The implication of this shift is that the primary concern of many residents is for the welfare of children, whose behaviour on the roadside is often less predictable than that of the older residents they have replaced. It makes the issue all the more pressing in the eyes of many, including myself, and should provide the Working Group with a very good reason to address the concerns of residents even at this stage of proceedings.

Speaking personally, I fully support the contents of "Community Aspiration 5 Residential Traffic" - especially point (b) "Making some areas Access Only" which I see as the only viable long-term solution for Welton Road. I have discussed the options privately with a number of neighbours - here are some views that I strongly agree with:

- \* Making Welton Road one-way is likely to increase the speed of traffic since drivers would know there's nothing coming in the opposite direction. This is particularly problematic because the 20mph speed limit is unenforceable.

- \* The "pseudo-pavement" gives children (in particular) a false sense of security because they believe that car drivers will respect the space allocated to pedestrians. They do not.

- \* Residents understand that the emergency services value Welton Road as a time-saving route. Should the road be blocked off at one end (the lower end makes most sense) then access for the emergency services could be retained with radio-controlled bollards which Fire and Police vehicles could have sole control over.

- \* The increase of traffic through central Radstock could be alleviated through relatively minor adjustments to the lanes and approaches. There is already a little-used "left-only" lane in front of Radco that would take much of the traffic that currently comes down Welton Road. In the other direction, the approach to the double-roundabout could have a more formal lane for right-turning traffic. Both of these routes would involve little work to make significantly better.

Lastly, I share your concern that nothing will be done until it is too late.

Best regards,

Christian

the reg 14 consultation period

<p>On 31 Jan 2018, at 14:00, Maryce Grubb &lt;<a href="mailto:maryce.grubb@gmail.com">maryce.grubb@gmail.com</a>&gt; wrote:</p> <p>Having read your email. We live in the bungalows we find it impossible to get out of the drive way because of traffic coming down at great speed.nobody takes any notice of 20mph speed limit.go out after 5.30 at night the traffic goes down at excessive speed you find yourself jumping out of the way.also parking cars opposite driveways doesn't help, no matter whether it be child or older person all life matters .we have always said NOTHING will be done untill there is a bad accident and the way things are going there will be .maybe it would be ideal making Welton Road open for residents only the police are bogged down with red tape and the council doesn't do anything</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group shares concerns over safety at Welton Road. Community Aspiration 5, Residential Traffic, underlines such concerns across the Parish. A cross section of comments about Welton Road will be added to the Plan.</p> <p>These comments were raised outside the reg 14 consultation period.</p>
<p><b>From:</b> <a href="#">Dinah O'Connell</a>  <b>Sent:</b> 30 January 2018 18:09  <b>To:</b> <a href="#">John Hamer</a>  <b>Subject:</b> Re: Fw: RE: Westfield Neighbourhood Plan: Draft copy.</p> <p>In my opinion, Welton Road is a serious accident waiting to happen. The pedestrian line holds no fear for the manic rush hour traffic that speed up the road and the pedestrians wait patiently for the cars to pass far too near for comfort. I live at number 11 and only have a short walk to take my disabled daughter to college but many times the cars have passed within inches of our legs! This is not acceptable. As Mr Hamer says, the speed limit is never monitored and in the evening when there is not quite so much traffic the cars zoom down in an effort to get to the bottom before a car needs to come up. I have lived here 20 years and although we were trying to get speed bumps or a one way (supported then by the local police), the problem now is far worse. There is no comparison between us and Charlton Road who have pavements and wider roads but maybe a few more influential people living in the area.</p> <p>Dinah O'Connell</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group shares concerns over safety at Welton Road. Community Aspiration 5, Residential Traffic, underlines such concerns across the Parish. A cross section of comments about Welton Road will be added to the Plan.</p> <p>These comments were raised outside the reg 14 consultation period.</p>

Hello John,

Thanks again for taking the time on this. We completely agree with Christian and his comments.

I think the only way someone would appreciate our concern is not only walking down this busy road, but walking holding the hand of one of their children or grandchildren to understand the extent of the problem.

I find it fascinating that there is a comparison between Charlton road where as you say, there exists real pavements, a school which would slow down traffic and a zebra crossing that would also slow down traffic. In comparison we have nothing but a road that gets congested which then frustrates drivers who then speed down the road out of aggression!

I work at the secondary school on Charlton road and it wasn't until a child was hit by a car and broke his leg until a proper crossing was added to silver street. I find it deeply upsetting that they would like to wait until that happens to one of our children or residents until some sort of action is taken to slow down traffic on our road.

Thanks again John for all your time spent on this.

Sian, Chris and Ffion

Thank you for these comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group shares concerns over safety at Welton Road. Community Aspiration 5, Residential Traffic, underlines such concerns across the Parish. A cross section of comments about Welton Road will be added to the Plan.

These comments were raised outside the reg 14 consultation period

Valerie and Dave Webster

Hello John

Thank you for your efforts on our behalf regarding the safety concerns in Welton Road and keeping it in the forefront of local councillors minds. We support Christian's comments and if 'access only' became a future possibility I am sure there would have to be a certain amount of debate about this, as we could see our drive becoming a major turning area for delivery vehicles and others having to make their way back up the road. Also not sure that we would want to have to go via the Radstock roundabouts when visiting the tip, Midsomer Norton or the A37 which we do quite a lot. One for the future maybe. Definitely don't want one way system.

I understand and agree with the remarks about the unpredictable behaviour of children on the road, but would also comment on the fact that personally I can be a little wobbly and unpredictable at the road side when trying to get as near to the edge when cars are rushing by, because the road drops away into the gully when walking up the hill (opposite yours John) which I do quite regularly.

I have to admit that I only previously scanned the Plan when comments were requested in the Westfield Warbler. As it appeared to mainly refer to housing etc I never got to the part about roads etc. As Dave relied on me for information we took no further action. I'm sorry about this admission but living at the bottom of Welton Road on the fringes of Westfield, the Plan didn't seem to have anything to do with us. Not a very neighbourly admission we realise but as our normal experience of Westfield is to drive through it on the A367 towards Stratton etc that is how we feel. We normally go to Radstock for doctors, shops and other facilities.

Regards Valerie & Dave

Thank you for these comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group shares concerns over safety at Welton Road. Community Aspiration 5, Residential Traffic, underlines such concerns across the Parish. A cross section of comments about Welton Road will be added to the Plan.

These comments were raised outside the reg 14 consultation period

## Logbook of the Westfield Neighbourhood Plan Activity

<b>Date</b>	<b>Type of activity</b> (neighbourhood plan meeting, consultation event etc)	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Summary of the consultation</b>
5/2/15	<a href="#">Article in the Journal</a> (file 4, div 1)	n/a	"Westfield begins its Plan" - Call for volunteers to be part of the Neighbourhood Plan
February 2015	<a href="#">Article in the Westfield Warbler</a> (file 4, div 2)	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	"A neighbourhood plan for Westfield?" – background to the Plan and a call for volunteers
26/3/15	<a href="#">Annual Parish Meeting for the residents of Westfield – included a section on the Neighbourhood Plan, inviting residents to become involved.</a> (file 4 div 3).	18 members of the public, 6 Councillors and 3 members of staff	The Bath and North East Somerset Officer was unable to attend at the last meeting and a presentation was not given, so instead, both the Chair of the Council and the Chair of the Environment and Development Committee gave an off the cuff talk about the Neighbourhood Plan.
May 2015	<a href="#">Annual Review 2014/</a> (file 4, div 4)	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	Highlighted the Neighbourhood Plan , its purpose and the need for volunteers.
June 2015	<a href="#">A call for volunteers in the Westfield Warbler</a> (file 4, div 5)	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	"Volunteers needed for the Neighbourhood Plan for Westfield" – an outline of the work and call for volunteers
29 July 2015	<a href="#">First meeting of Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (NPWG)</a> (file 1 div 1)	5	Getting organised
20 <sup>th</sup> August 2015	<a href="#">Tweet on the Parish Council Twitter feed about the Neighbourhood Plan</a> (file 4, div 6)	n/a	"Volunteers needed if you would like to help with the Neighbourhood Plan to improve Westfield for future generations contact us"
September 2015	<a href="#">Westfield Warbler</a> (file 4, div 7)	Went to all homes	"Neighbourhood Plan for Westfield" A half page

		and businesses in Westfield door to door	report about the first meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group with full details and a reference to the page on the Westfield Parish Council website dedicated to the Neighbourhood Plan <a href="http://www.westfieldparishcouncil.co.uk">www.westfieldparishcouncil.co.uk</a>
24 September 2015	<a href="#">2<sup>nd</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 2)</a>	9	Gathering consultation evidence so far and amalgamating it into a single document
November 2015	Article in the Westfield Warbler in the Parish Clerk's message (file 4, div 8)	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	"First steps have been taken in the formation of a Neighbourhood Plan ..."
6 <sup>th</sup> November 2015	<a href="#">3<sup>rd</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 3)</a>	7	Arranging community consultations
24 <sup>th</sup> November 2015	<a href="#">4<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 4)</a>	8	Arranging a logo competition
12 <sup>th</sup> January 2016	<a href="#">5<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 5)</a>	12	Learning from Clutton Parish Council
February 2016	<a href="#">Westfield Warbler full page by the Chair of the NPWG (file 4, div 9)</a>	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	Full details of the Neighbourhood Plan remit and highlighting forthcoming consultation events in Westfield
2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2016	<a href="#">Focus Group on Young Mothers (file 4, div 11)</a>	Attended Community Bus at Westfield Sports and Community Centre	This is a resource for parents, carers and children, where they can meet up, talk and play. Consultation by form and interview, collated into the report by the South West Foundation.
2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2016	<a href="#">6<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 6)</a>	8	Arranging SWOT analysis
23 <sup>rd</sup> February 2016	<a href="#">7<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 7)</a>	9	Consultations reviews
11 <sup>th</sup> February 2016	<a href="#">Article in the Journal (file 4, div 10)</a>	Readership in Midsomer Norton, Radstock and district	"Neighbourhood Plan next for Westfield"
12 <sup>th</sup> February 2016	<a href="#">Consultation event at Fosseyway Café, Fosseyway School 10.30-12.30pm (file 4, div11)</a>	3 local businesses	Consultation by form and interview, collated into a report by South West Foundation



16 <sup>th</sup> February 2016	<a href="#">Interviews with businesses on the Westfield Trading Estate (file 4, div 11)</a>	11 local businesses	Consultation by form and interview, collated into a report by South West Foundation
1 <sup>st</sup> March 2016	<a href="#">Tweet on Westfield Parish Council Twitter feed (file 4, div 12)</a>	23 followers	"A chance to comment on the local area ..."
22 <sup>nd</sup> March 2016	<a href="#">Consultation event at Trinity Methodist Church Hall, Wells Road, Westfield 10am-12 noon (file 4, div 13)</a>	Approx. 10	Consultation by form and interview, collated into a report by South West Foundation
March 2016	<a href="#">Letter to all residents (file 4, div 14)</a>	Door to door to all homes in Westfield	Alerting them to the forthcoming Housing Needs Survey and urging them to respond
15 <sup>th</sup> March 2016	<a href="#">8<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 8)</a>	8	Contacting local businesses, developing an area profile
March 2016	<a href="#">Housing Needs Survey went out (file 4, div 15)</a>	By post to all homes in Westfield	Collated into a Housing Needs report by Worcester Research
5 <sup>th</sup> April 2016	<a href="#">9<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 9)</a>	6	Local Treasures – what makes Westfield?
18 <sup>th</sup> April 2016	<a href="#">Tweet on Westfield Parish Council Twitter feed (file 4, div 16)</a>	23 followers	"DON'T FORGET! – Neighbourhood Plan consultation tomorrow at Mardons 2pm -4pm. Have your say about what you want to see in Westfield"
19 <sup>th</sup> April 2016	<a href="#">Consultation event at Mardons Club, Nightingale Way estate, Westfield 2pm-4pm (file 4, div 13)</a>	Approx 10	Consultation by form and interview, collated into a report by South West Foundation
26 <sup>th</sup> April 2016	<a href="#">Westfield Annual Parish Meeting (file 4, div 17)</a>	20 people	Report by the Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group and highlighting consultation events
12 <sup>th</sup> May 2016	<a href="#">Article in the Journal (file 4, div 18)</a>	Readership in Midsomer Norton, Radstock and district	"Westfield pupils are all logo winners" – article on the Neighbourhood Plan logo competition
12 <sup>th</sup> May 2016	<a href="#">Article on the Somerset Guardian (file 4, div 19)</a>	Readership in North East Somerset	"Pupils are all winners in logo design competition"
16 <sup>th</sup> May 2016	<a href="#">Tweet on the Westfield Parish Council Twitter feed (file 4, div 20)</a>	23 followers	Highlighting the consultation event the following day
17 <sup>th</sup> May 2016	<a href="#">Consultation event at Westfield Sports and Community Centre, Westhill Road, Westfield 7pm-9pm (file 4, div 13)</a>	Approx 10	Consultation by form and interview, collated into a report by South West Foundation
23 <sup>rd</sup> May 2016	<a href="#">Voluntary Sector consultation (file 4, div 11)</a>	2 voluntary organisations	Consultation by form and interview, collated into a report by South West Foundation

24 <sup>th</sup> May 2016	<a href="#">10<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1 div 10)</a>	6	Structuring the Neighbourhood Plan
May 2016	<a href="#">Neighbourhood Plan Facebook Page set up, with an article about the Neighbourhood Plan logo competition with Westfield School and the presentation of prizes (file 4, div 21)</a>	459 views	
21 <sup>st</sup> June	<a href="#">11<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 11)</a>	7	Developing themes, Green space designations, housing needs
June 2016	<a href="#">Full page article in the Westfield Warbler by the Chair of the Working Group (file 4, div 22)</a>	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	Update on work so far and inviting input from local people
14 <sup>th</sup> July 2016	<a href="#">Article in the Journal (file 4, div 23)</a>	Readership in Midsomer Norton, Radstock and district	“Putting Westfield on the map” A treasure hunt at the local fete highlighted the boundary of Westfield and the article outlined the Neighbourhood Plan as it moves into its second year
21 <sup>st</sup> July 2016	<a href="#">Article on the Neighbourhood Plan Facebook Page (file 4, div 24)</a>		Inviting local people to give input into the process
21 <sup>st</sup> July 2016	<a href="#">Tweet on the Westfield Parish Council Twitter feed (file 4, div 25)</a>	23 followers	“Join us for a Neighbourhood Plan meeting ...”
24 <sup>th</sup> July 2016	<a href="#">Received the Community Consultation Report 2016 (file 4, div 26)</a>		Facilitated and written by South West Foundation
25 <sup>th</sup> July 2016	<a href="#">12<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 12)</a>	10	Finding out about food, energy, allotments issues
27 <sup>th</sup> July 2016	<a href="#">Entry on the Westfield Neighbourhood Plan Facebook page about allotment needs in Westfield (file 4, div 27)</a>		“At the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group meeting this week there was a great presentation ...”
Aug 2016	Consultation with Westfield Allotment and Garden Society (WAGS) (file 4, div 30)	WAGS membership	Increase access to allotments
September 2016	<a href="#">Westfield Warbler one page article by Chair of Working Group (file 4, div 28)</a>	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	A Neighbourhood Plan for Westfield
26 <sup>th</sup> September	<a href="#">13<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 13)</a>	6	Emerging themes from the consultations:

2016			Traffic data, area profile, empty properties
24 <sup>th</sup> October 2016	<a href="#">14<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 14)</a>	8	Emerging themes from the consultations: Green space designations
28 <sup>th</sup> November 2016	<a href="#">15<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 15)</a>	7	Emerging themes from the consultations: Community centre feasibility study
December 2016	<a href="#">Two page spread in Westfield Warbler (file 4, div 29)</a>	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	"1964 and all that" – written by a Working Group member on the heritage aspect of the Plan
23 <sup>rd</sup> January 2017	<a href="#">16<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 16)</a>		Writing objectives and developing policies
February 2017	<a href="#">Article in the Westfield Warbler (file 4, div 30)</a>	Went to all homes and businesses in Westfield door to door	
27 <sup>th</sup> February 2017	<a href="#">17<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 1, div 17)</a>	9	Creating the draft plan for consultation
27 <sup>th</sup> March 2017	<a href="#">18<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 2, div 18)</a>	6	Clarifying the options for consultation
24 <sup>th</sup> April 2017	<a href="#">Annual Parish Meeting (file 2, div 19)</a>	19	Update on progress to the local community. Consultation on the community centre
30 <sup>th</sup> May 2017	<a href="#">19<sup>th</sup> NPWG meeting (file 2, div 20)</a>	5	Options consultation – agreeing the final draft
5 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	Testing the Options Consultation document	6	Document tested for comprehension and length of time it takes to fill it in.
w/c 12 June 2017	<a href="#">Postcard to every household and business in Westfield (File 4, div 32)</a>	2500	'Don't throw this away. This is important ...'
12 June – 31 July 2017	<a href="#">Options Consultation (File 4, div 32)</a>	All residents and businesses invited to respond	
26/6/17	<a href="#">Press release regarding options consultation (file 4, div 31)</a>	The Journal	Help Shape Westfields future
26/6/17	<a href="#">Notice for noticeboards regarding options consultation (file 4, div 32)</a>	Nightingale Way and local shops	Help shape Westfields future
August 17	<a href="#">Westfield Warbler article on the Options Consultation (file 4, div 33)</a>		
9/8/17	Consultation with Westhill Sports Football Club (file 4, div 34)	Meeting with four	Discussing the future needs of Westhill in terms

		members of the Club and Cllrs Geoff Fuller and Phil Wilkinson	of recreation and specifically football, but more widely a community facility at Westhill.
29/8/17	<a href="#">20<sup>th</sup> Neighbourhood Plan Working Group meeting (file 2, div 21)</a>	10	Review of the Options consultation responses
1/9/17	Publication of the Options Consultation responses, with comments from the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group <a href="http://www.westfieldparishcouncil.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/analysis-of-consultation-responses-with-comments/">http://www.westfieldparishcouncil.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/analysis-of-consultation-responses-with-comments/</a>	Published on the website	Publication of all comments and if/how the Plan was amended accordingly.
23/10/17	<a href="#">Press release regarding Reg 14 Consultation (file 4 div 35) To the Journal.</a>	The Journal, reaching readers in Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Radstock	Launch of the formal Reg 14 Consultation on the Pre submission draft
30/10/17	<a href="#">Launch of the Reg 14 consultation – emails to BANES, Mendip and Somerset Planning; neighbouring parishes of Radstock, Midsomer Norton, Stratton on the Fosse and Kilmersdon. (file 4, div 36)</a>	Neighbouring Parishes and Planning authorities	As per the reg.14 requirements
30/10/17	Paper copy of the Pre Submission Draft and comments sheet for the reg 14 Consultation on display at the Reception of the Oval Office, Cobblers Way, Westfield	All visitors to the Parish Council	As per the reg. 14 requirements
30/10/17	<a href="#">Articles for the Westfield Warbler on the Reg 14 consultation, delivered to every household in Westfield.</a>	Delivered to every household and business in Westfield	As per the reg. 14 requirements
1/11/17	<a href="#">Tweet on the Westfield Parish Council twitter feed</a>	62 followers	Draft Neighbourhood Plan ready for comment
22/1/18	21st Neighbourhood Plan Working Group meeting (file 2, div 23)		Review of the Reg 14 responses
13/2/18	Meeting to finalise the consultation responses	4	Review of the Reg 14 responses

