

Draft Placemaking Plan

December 2015



Schedule of Public Consultation Comments Received Late

Bath & North East
Somerset Council

Draft Placemaking Plan (December 2015)

Schedule of Public Consultation Comments Received Late

A public consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan took place from 16th December 2015 to 3rd February 2016. This schedule sets out the comments received on the Draft Placemaking Plan after the consultation had closed

The comments have been categorised and grouped by plan reference i.e. site number, policy number or paragraph number. Those comments putting forward alternative sites for allocation in the Plan for development have been categorised as 'Alternative Development Site'. Those comments relating to Local Green Spaces have been categorised under Policy LCR6A, sub-categorised by Local Green Space reference number or 'alternative site' where a new site not previously nominated has been proposed.

The comments will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, alongside the Draft Placemaking Plan, for Examination. The schedule of comments is produced in order to assist the Examination Inspector and other parties in considering the comments received by setting them out in plan order. The schedule has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, alongside the Draft Placemaking Plan, for Examination. In addition the Inspector has also been sent copies of the original representations submitted and the supporting information.

Please note that every effort has been made to correctly categorise all of the numerous comments received. Any errors in categorising do not impact on the Inspector's consideration of the issues raised through the Examination process.

Planning Policy, Planning Services
Place Directorate
Bath & North East Somerset Council
Lewis House
Manvers Street
Bath, BA1 1JG
01225 477548
planning_policy@bathnes.gov.uk

Contents List

| Volume Name | Plan Order Reference | Page from | Page to |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| N/A | General comment | 1 | 2 |
| N/A | Alternative Development Site | 3 | 4 |
| Vol 1: District Wide | District-wide general | 5 | 5 |
| Vol 1: District Wide | Housing Requirement & Supply | 6 | 6 |
| Vol 1: District Wide | Policy LCR1A | 7 | 7 |
| Vol 1: District Wide | Policy LCR6A: LGR2 | 8 | 8 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Para 101 | 9 | 9 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB4 | 10 | 10 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB5 | 11 | 11 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB6 | 12 | 13 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB7 | 14 | 14 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB8 | 15 | 15 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy B3 | 16 | 16 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB18 | 17 | 17 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB19 | 18 | 18 |
| Vol 2: Bath | Policy SB20 | 19 | 19 |
| Vol 3: Keynsham | Para 76 | 20 | 20 |
| Vol 4: Somer Valley | Para 30 | 21 | 22 |
| Vol 4: Somer Valley | Policy SSV1 | 23 | 23 |
| Vol 5: Rural Areas | Rural Areas General | 24 | 25 |
| Vol 5: Rural Areas | Policy SR24 | 26 | 26 |

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 0, Whole Plan

Part: General comment

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 10
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , General comment
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Would like to see site allocation 191 RA5 Housing Number extended beyond 2018

7. Ensure the integration of the area should be developed through a neighbour plan with a master plan including enhanced safe attractive pedestrian and cycle routes and bus stops on the main Greater Bristol Bus network corridor to Wells and Bristol

Q5 Change Requested

Reference to a neighbourhood Development Plan

Plan and improvement to local Bus Services To Keynsham Town Centre and Station at Keynsham and The Wells to Bristol Showcase Bus routes as part of The Greater Bristol Network

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

To debate the future Development and Safeguard of Housing Land in Whitchurch part of the Settlement Bridge farm in the City and County of Bristol Council Area.

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 22
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , General comment

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Page 13 need to address public transport access to the Somer Valley and site for protecting the Rail Line alongside the cycleway to the Mendip Council Boundary

Q5 Change Requested

6 Transport the needs of the Somer Valley need better addressing in the Local Plan with Public Transport Corridors to From and Midsomer Norton Radstock to Bath City Centre NE1

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

No look at the Transport Need of ther Placemaking Plan alongside the New Enterprise Zone for Radstock Midsomer Norton

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 0, Whole Plan

Part: Alternative Development Site

Respondent Number: 7220 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: Ryman Engineering
Agent Name: Jeremy Smalley Agent Organisation: Jeremy Smalley Regeneration and Plannin
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA

Q4 Soundness Comment

I am writing in respect of the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset and in particular Radstock Town Centre.

I am writing on behalf of the site owners the Ryman family.

The site, currently occupied by Ryman Engineering Services is approximately 1 acre in size and is directly adjacent to the former railway land currently being developed by NRR and Linden Homes.

Rymans Engineering has secured alternative and more appropriate premises for their business needs in the future and therefore the site in Radstock can be positively considered as part of the Placemaking Plan.

Rymans have had several conversations over the recent months with Karaou Jacques, Neil Best and Emily Price about the future of their site.

It had been indicated in the Pre Consultation draft Placemaking Plan and in subsequent discussions with officers that the site would be allocated within the Placemaking Plan.

It is however not specifically allocated in the Placemaking Plan and whilst this does not preclude redevelopment the Ryman family would like to object to its exclusion as a potential development site from the Placemaking Plan.

The Councils rationale at paragraph 112 suggests redevelopment won't happen due to viability or deliverability. It is not clear what evidence supports that assertion.

On behalf of Ryman Engineering I have been trying to liaise with the Hope House Surgery (and have a date in the near future to progress discussions) about a potential relocation and extension of health services provision for Radstock using the Ryman Engineering site.

This has been encouraged by Bath and North East Somerset over a number of years and has proved slow in recent months due to the Surgery awaiting a B&NES led report on suitable alternative premises.

Hope House Surgery has in the last few days suggested the alternative site assessment by BANES Council is unfavourable

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

to the Ryman site. Ryman Engineering have not seen this report or been engaged in any alternative site assessment.

I am confident a new health facility, housing, a care home or a mix of those uses can be accommodated on the site, are viable and deliverable in the Plan period. You will be aware a feasibility study I conducted into the uses was submitted to the Council in June 2015.

I would be grateful for confirmation that this representation will be considered.

Whilst writing I would also be grateful for a copy of the feasibility report into alternative locations for Hope House Surgery mentioned by the Practice Manager at Hope House Surgery.

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide

Part: District-wide general

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 8
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , District-wide general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The policy requires to be clear of BANE policy to bring forward a plan for Integrated Transport Strategy for East of Bath including provision of a Park and Ride site within the Sites Development Plan
rewrite Policy ST6 to reflect the policy of a need for an East of Bath Park and Ride site to be allocated

Q5 Change Requested

Wording to allocate a Park and Ride site on the East site of the East side of Bath as part of a Transport Interchange and Integrated Transport Strategy for East of Bath and West/North Wiltshire with smaller site such as those around Salisbury on Transport Corridor A4 / A46 / A36 around Bath, this requires cooperation with Wiltshire County Council and South Gloucestershire, Somerset County Councils Duty to Cooperate

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

to address the Councils and West of England Transport Board policy on allocation of the East of Bath Park and Ride sites

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide

Part: Housing Requirement & Supply

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 9
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Housing Requirement & Supply
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

This policy fails to provide a 5 year land supply and requires additional housing land to be allocated within these communities as part of 2016 Review of the Greater Bristol/ Bath City Region Core Strategies

Q5 Change Requested

The policy needs to change in line with the needs of a 5 year land supply and sustainable development on transport corridors around especially around Keynsham with good road and rail links to Bristol and Bath and along A37 Wells to Bristol Corridor around Whitchurch Village.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

To test the 5 year land supply for housing around Bath Odd Down, Keynsham and Whitchurch. The result will require Bristol Market Area for provide more high density housing.

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide

Part: Policy LCR1A

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 15
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR1A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The NPPF also acknowledges the valued facilities and local authorities should safeguard against the unnecessary loss

Q5 Change Requested

We would like to see a policy strengthen to prevent the loss of the village and suburban public houses in Bath and North east someset

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

401 para The LCR1A is not strong enough to prevent the loss of public houses and Hotels being turned into houses. We like a stronger policy

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide

Part: Policy LCR6A

Respondent Number: 7230 Comment Number: 1
Name: Bryn Howells Organisation: Manor Farm Estates
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR2

Q4 Soundness Comment

MFE are instructed by the owners of the above parcel to object to the proposed designation of this land as a Local Green Space. We understand that a consultation period was held on this proposal ending 3/2/16 but our client was not contacted and in any event is obliged to spend time abroad for business reasons. I trust in these circumstances, and having regard to the rules relating to equity, the objection will be deemed within time. I would be grateful for your formal acknowledgement of this point and indeed the objection overall.

The site was considered for development by way of a Planning Appeal ref: APP/F0114/A/10/2139096 decision date 29/3/2011. The application was a full application for 4 dwellings. The inspector made some key points in this decision which should be reflected in any policy designation on this site. Whilst it is acknowledged the Appeal was refused; this was, of course, on the particular facts of the full application. The Inspector's decision did not suggest that no development was possible on the site. Indeed, a well-crafted development proposal could deliver the benefits sought by this designation in perpetuity. Contrarily, allowing the present agricultural use only to continue will encourage permitted development of agricultural structures with far more impact upon the visual quality of the locale. The site could cater for a low density or even single dwelling scheme which would meet custom house building aspirations which recent Government guidance has very much encouraged and which is specifically referred to in the NPPF Guidance.

The proposed designation confuses this site with Millers Walk which is far more central to the settlement as well as land associated with the floodplain and other areas well outside existing settlement boundaries and topographically not suitable for development. It is not appropriate to apply the same designation to this land which is readily developable with an appropriate scheme. We have not, for example, seen any proper landscape and visual Impact assessment to justify this designation. The triangular land is surrounded on all sides by highways and on two sides by existing housing of very little outstanding or unusual architectural merit. To conclude that the land is important to the setting of the settlement in this context is very unusual. A well-crafted scheme might well improve the setting rather than highlight these existing housing areas.

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Para 101

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 18
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 101
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Duty to co-operate with Wiltshire County Council / Mendip and Somerset County Council

No mention of the provision of New passenger station on the Bristol to Swindon Rail line as per West of England Metro West Plan for station at Saltford and Corsham in Wiltshire to relieve congestion within the city centre

Q5 Change Requested

Reference to the Metro West Rail plan phase No 1 Portishead to Bath / Severn Beach provision of New Stations can make in the need to reduce traffic congestion on the city centre as permitted by the West of England Partnership - soon to be the Metro Mayor and Combined Authority

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

The West of England Partnership Rail Plan and mention of walking with Wiltshire and Somerset County Council and Rail Strategy for Bath City Mayor

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB4

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 6
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Page 52 para 14 and 15 fails to address public transport access and provision to the important regeneration site in Bath city centre and the city region whilst considering the need to retain 500 spaces for car parking

Bus service is very important to the site within a city with air quality over statutory EU regulations

No provision has been made for the set down and pick up point for tourist coaches from the Avon Street coach park whilst coach parking is at Western Riverside First Group Depot

Q5 Change Requested

Policy change and re-written to include provision for sustainable public transport access to Bath Quays SB4 and bus priority measures within the scheme and clean fuel buses

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

To review sustainable public transport policy to access Bath Quay regeneration site

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB5

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 5
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The policy which addresses routes 3/4 public realm 15 16 17 18 Cycle Parking Public Transport provision does not appear to have been address andf the use of a sustainable bus corridor via Lower Bristol Road to SW the site with community or the provision of river ferry land stages

Q5 Change Requested

The policy is not clear within the City of Bath or the surrounding area of BANES/South Gloucestershire about student housing vlocks on or off campuses

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB6

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 4
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB6
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The development and design principles requirement have again failed to address access by bus services along the Lower Bristol Road or bus service infrastructure provision

Q5 Change Requested

The policy is not clear within the City of Bath or the surrounding area of BANES/South Gloucestershire about student housing blocks on or off campuses

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 19
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB6
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The development and design principles requirement have again failed to address access by bus services along the Lower Bristol Road or bus service infrastructure provision

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Q5 Change Requested

The policy is not clear within the City of Bath or the surrounding area of BANES/South Gloucestershire about student housing vlocks on or off campuses

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB7

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 3
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB7
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The universities within the master plan need to address the need of student housing within both university campus and housing blocks with the city centre or in South Gloucestershire and Emerson Green centres.

128 bus service terminus provision with university of Bath

Q5 Change Requested

The policy is not clear within the City of Bath or the surrounding area of BANES/South Gloucestershire about student housing blocks on or off campuses

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB8

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 17
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB8
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Would like to see a better plan for Integrated Transport Through this site and provision made for more affordable Housing south of the city centre Bath Rd Towards Newbridge Rd Windsor Bridge

Q5 Change Requested

Student blocks for use by RUH Student Nurses and other Student Blocks should be allowed to be developed Within Western Riverside to free up housing in Bath City Centre and Oldfield Park

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Changes to policy in Houses in Multiple Occupation within Bath City Centre Western Riverside

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy B3

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 16
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The inclusion of the protection of the Midland Railway Corridor to Newbridge Kelton and Bitton Oldland and Warmley as a sustainable Transport Corridor to include the Avon Valley Railway as a Tourist attraction.

Q5 Change Requested

The Avon Valley Railway included in protection in the Transport Corridor from Bath Newbridge to Bath via Kelton to Oldland and Warmley alongside the cycleway

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

The rail plan within the Bath Newbridge area Riverside plan along the Railway from the Park and Ride site

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB18

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 7
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB18
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Royal United requires a full sustainable transport policy for integrated transport including provision of improved bus services to the rest of Bath and North East Somerset Bristol Bath City Region and Wiltshire
The policy should not be just to allocate NHS land for car parking instead of health care provision

Q5 Change Requested

Policy rewritten to include a more positive policy by NHS Bath Trust and CCG BANES and Wiltshire towards integrated public transport strategy including improvement to bus facilities as well as car parking

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

A proper sustainable transport policy for Royal United Hospital at Bath and funding of bus service provision to redirect use of the private car on the site. NHS hospital Bath requires a full sustainable transport plan as part of the sites regenerations with the merger with the Royal National Hospital for Rheumatic Disease RNHRD for the area of Somerset Gloucestershire and Wiltshire as part of the master plan in the same way as Southmead Hospital NHS North Bristol Trust or Royal Hospital Gloucester object to phase 1 b. Car park located immediately in the front gate with a integrated transport strategy. Whilst bus links to Wiltshire and South Gloucestershire for patients and staff

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB19

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 1
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB19
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The universities within the master plan need to address the need of student housing within both university campus and housing blocks with the city centre or in South Gloucestershire and Emerson Green centres.

128 bus service terminus provision with university of Bath

Q5 Change Requested

The policy is not clear within the City of Bath or the surrounding area of BANES/South Gloucestershire about student housing blocks on or off campuses

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

To look at student housing and flats provision within the university site campus and transport access.

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath

Part: Policy SB20

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 2
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB20
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The universities within the master plan need to address the need of student housing within both university campus and housing blocks with the city centre or in South Gloucestershire and Emerson Green centres.

128 bus service terminus provision with university of Bath

Q5 Change Requested

The policy is not clear within the City of Bath or the surrounding area of BANES/South Gloucestershire about student housing blocks on or off campuses

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham

Part: Para 76

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 13
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Para 76
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Wish to see protection of public transport corridor and provision on the High Street and Ashton Way within the Town Centre Policy for bus services

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley

Part: Para 30

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 20
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley , Para 30
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Tourism and Heritage Chapters need to make references to protection of the Railway Corridor to From and up to the County boundary with Somerset County Council in line with Mendip District Local Plan and Somerser Local Transport Plan

Q5 Change Requested

Connectivity which mentions public transport connexion by public transport to other settlements but need to include protection of the Radstock to From corridor Rail Corridor for future use

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

To bring the policy in line with with Mendip District Council Plan and Somerset County Council Local Transport Plan. The policy need to outline public transport improvement in Transport Corridors alongside the Greater Bristol Bus network

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 23
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley , Para 30
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Draft Plan fails to address protection fo the Rail Corridor and Cycleway as per the Core Strategy of Mendip District Council and BANES Council

Q5 Change Requested

The Rail Corridor to be protected as part of the placemaking plan for future use alongside the New Housing estates Green Corridor land as per Mendip Local Plan

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

To address the issue of safeguarding the Rail and Greenway Corridor Between Radstock and From to the BANES County Boundary

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley

Part: Policy SSV1

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 21
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley , Policy SSV1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Concerned about the design of new Bath College and Design of the Campus and Visual Impact of the site and Need to improve public Transport provision to and from Bath City Centre for students

Q5 Change Requested

We would like to see a Master Plan for the college laid out more clearly in terms of urban design landscape detail and a Transport Plan for connections to and from Bath City Centre and detail of Student Housing in the area

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

We would like to see a Master Plan for the site and Transport Plan

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas

Part: Rural Areas General

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 12
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Rural Areas General
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Draft Spatial Strategy requires 85000 homes in Bristol Area and villages 50 Homes is far to smaller number to house the rural community needs on the main A37 Transport Corridor with 18-7 bus services 7 days a week Bristol TM via Pensford to Wells and Street Corridor / Radstock Bath 178 route

Q5 Change Requested

147 raise the number into within the service village 200 units within the plan period with SR15 165 Development Site on the Western side of the village towards Farmborough common

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

o provide rural affordable houses within these service villages

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 14
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Rural Areas General
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

The village should provide housing for rural needs within the Clutton Neighbourhood area.

Q5 Change Requested

Delete the wording limited to infill development and rural exception site

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

The need to provide affordable Rural Housing within the Rural areas

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received late (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas

Part: Policy SR24

Respondent Number: 837 Comment Number: 11
Name: David Redgewell Organisation: South West Transport Network
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consistent Not Effective

The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR24
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

70 homes is a small number of houses in a main square village on A37 Bristol to Wells Bus Corridor and will not provide for rural housing needs.

Q5 Change Requested

To provide rural affordable housing for the local community to provide for the rural economy and to support a service village in the West of England Draft Spatial Strategy of 85,000 homes

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

To provide a policy on Rural Housing Allocation with Camely and Temple Cloud Parish A37 as a service village