Draft Placemaking Plan December 2015



Schedule of Public Consultation Comments



Schedule of Public Consultation Comments on the Draft Placemaking Plan

Draft Placemaking Plan (December 2015)

Schedule of Public Consultation Comments

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. Please note that it does not include the supporting information submitted by respondents.

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.

No comments were received in relation those parts of the Plan (sites, policies or paragraphs) not listed in this schedule.

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

Schedule of Public Consultation Comments on the Draft Placemaking Plan

Contents List

Volume	Plan Order Reference	Page	Page
Volume	Figure Order Reference	from	to
N/A	General comment	1	7
N/A	Alternative Development Site: Bath	8	17
N/A	Alternative Development Site: Keynsham	17	29
N/A	Alternative Development Site: Somer Valley	29	42
N/A	Alternative Development Site: Rural	42	57
N/A	Alternative Development Site: Other	57	61
N/A	Habitat Regulations Assessment	62	62
N/A	Sustainability Appraisal	63	64
N/A	General Comment on the whole Draft Placemaking Plan	66	88
Vol 1: District Wide	General Comment	89	94
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 22	95	95
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 30	96	96
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 33	97	97
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 34	98	98
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 36	99	99
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 39	100	100
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 42	101	101
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 44	102	102
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 46	103	103
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 48	104	104
Vol 1: District Wide	Housing Requirement & Supply	105	136
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 49	137	137
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy DW1	138	138
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 59	139	139
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 60	140	140
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 61	141	141
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 62	142	142
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 63	143	143
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 64	144	144
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 67	145	145
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 68	146	146
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy RA1	147	158
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy RA2	159	164
Vol 1: District Wide	Table 4	165	165
Vol 1: District Wide	Table 5	166	167
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP2	168	169
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP3	170	171
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 101	172	172

Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 108	173	173
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 109	174	174
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy SCR1	175	183
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy SCR2	184	185
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy SCR3	186	187
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy SCR4	188	189
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 120	190	190
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP4	191	195
Vol 1: District Wide	Diagram 19 District Heating Priority Areas	196	196
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 130	197	197
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 131	198	198
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy SU1	199	201
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP6	202	202
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 188	203	203
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D1	204	211
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D2	212	216
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D3	217	220
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D4	221	223
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D5	224	225
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D6	226	227
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D7	228	229
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D8	230	233
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 214	234	234
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 218	235	235
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy D10	236	238
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 221	239	239
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 225	240	240
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 229	241	249
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy HE1	250	255
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 269	256	256
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy HE2	257	257
Vol 1: District Wide	Table 6	258	259
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE2	260	265
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE2A	266	274
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE2B	275	275
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE3	276	278
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE4	279	279
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE5	280	280
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE6	281	283
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 281	284	284
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP7	285	286
Vol 1: District Wide	Diagram 20 Illustrative Green Infrastructure Network	287	287
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy NE1	288	293

Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP8	294	294
Vol 1: District Wide	CP8 Green Belt Boundary Changes	295	298
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy GB1	299	300
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy GB2	301	305
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 310	306	306
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy PCS1	307	308
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy PCS2	309	310
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy PCS3	311	311
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy PCS5	312	312
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 328	313	313
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy PCS6	314	315
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy PCS7	316	316
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 345	317	317
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP9	318	318
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy H1	319	321
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy H2	322	322
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy H4	323	323
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 377	324	324
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy H7	325	331
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy H8	332	335
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR1	336	336
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR2	337	338
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 408	339	339
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR3	340	346
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR3A	347	348
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR5	349	353
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6	354	355
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: General	356	359
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: Alternative Site in Bath	359	359
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: Alternative Site in the Somer Valley	360	360
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: Alternative Site in the Rural Areas	360	362
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGB21	363	363
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGB42	364	364
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGB52	365	365
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGB55	365	367
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGK20	367	367
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR2	368	373
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR3	373	373
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR16	374	378
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR17	378	378
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR18	379	381
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR26	381	383
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR27	384	384

Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGR47	384	385
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGS6	385	385
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGS8	386	386
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGS12	386	387
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGS17	387	387
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGS18	388	390
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGS19	390	391
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGBNDBA (Nominated but not designated in Bath)	391	391
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGBND11	391	505
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGBND40	505	505
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGKND11	506	512
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGRND28	512	514
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR6A: LGRND49	514	514
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 435	515	515
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR7B	516	517
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy LCR9	518	519
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 466	520	520
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 485	521	522
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ED1B	523	523
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ED1C	524	525
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ED2A	526	529
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ED2B	530	531
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy RE1	532	532
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy RE5	533	533
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy RE6	534	534
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP12	535	535
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CR1	536	536
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CR2	537	537
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CR3	538	538
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CR4	539	539
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 593	540	541
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 596	542	542
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ST1	543	549
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 612	550	550
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ST3	551	551
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ST4	552	552
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ST5	553	553
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ST6	554	555
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ST7	556	560
Vol 1: District Wide	Paragraph 638	561	561
Vol 1: District Wide	Diagram 9 Bath City Centre Zone	562	562
Vol 1: District Wide	Diagram 10 Bath Outer Zone	563	563
Vol 1: District Wide	Schedule 2 Parking Standards	564	568

Vol 1: District Wide	Policy ST8	569	570
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy M1	571	571
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy M5	572	574
Vol 1: District Wide	Policy CP13	575	580
Vol 2: Bath	General Comment	581	599
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 8	601	601
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 19	602	602
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 28	603	603
Vol 2: Bath	Policy B1	604	604
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 29	605	606
Vol 2: Bath	Policy B4	607	607
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 39	608	609
Vol 2: Bath	Policy 41	610	610
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 50	611	612
Vol 2: Bath	Design Values (table)	613	614
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 56	615	615
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 60	616	616
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 69	617	617
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 72	618	618
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 77	619	619
Vol 2: Bath	Policy BD1	620	621
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 85	622	622
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 87	623	623
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 89	624	624
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 90	625	625
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 92	626	626
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 93	627	627
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 94	628	629
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 98	630	633
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 102	634	634
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 105	635	635
Vol 2: Bath	Diagram 12 Bath City Centre & Enterprise Area	636	636
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 109	637	637
Vol 2: Bath	Policy B2	638	639
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 113	640	640
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB1	641	645
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 123	646	646
Vol 2: Bath	Vision (SB2)	647	647
Vol 2: Bath	Diagram 5 Central Riverside & Recreation Ground	648	648
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB2	649	655
Vol 2: Bath	Diagram 6 Manvers Street	656	656
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB3	657	660
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 131	661	661

Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB4	662	666
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 135	667	667
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 140	668	668
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB5	669	675
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB6	676	677
Vol 2: Bath	Diagram 11 Land Ownerships at Sydenham Park	678	678
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB7	679	691
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 153	692	693
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 157	694	694
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB8	695	707
Vol 2: Bath	Policy B3	708	709
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 158	710	710
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB9	711	711
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 164	712	712
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 167	713	713
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB10	714	715
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 185	716	716
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 189	717	717
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB11	718	720
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 191	721	721
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB12	722	723
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB13	724	725
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB14	726	727
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB15	728	728
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB16	729	731
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB18	732	733
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 221	734	739
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 222	740	740
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 223	741	742
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 225	743	743
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 226	744	746
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 227	747	752
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 228	753	754
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 229	755	759
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 231	760	760
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 232	761	762
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 234	763	766
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 237	767	767
Vol 2: Bath	Diagram 19 Student Accommodation & Teaching Space	768	769
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 238	770	772
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 241	773	774
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 244	775	775
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 246	776	776

Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 247	777	777
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 249	778	779
Vol 2: Bath	Policy B5	780	804
Vol 2: Bath	Paragraph 254		805
Vol 2: Bath	SB19 (site map)		808
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB19	809	818
Vol 2: Bath	Policy SB20	819	821
Vol 2: Bath	Table 2 Infrastructure for Bath	822	822
Vol 3: Keynsham	General Comment	823	828
Vol 3: Keynsham	Policy KE1	829	831
Vol 3: Keynsham	Diagram 1 Keynsham Spatial Strategy	832	832
Vol 3: Keynsham	Diagram 7 Local Green Space Designations	833	833
Vol 3: Keynsham	Paragraph 49	834	834
Vol 3: Keynsham	Paragraph 50	835	836
Vol 3: Keynsham	Diagram 13 Potential Transport Infrastructure Improvements	837	837
Vol 3: Keynsham	Diagram 16 Keynsham Character Areas	838	838
Vol 3: Keynsham	Policy KE2a	839	839
Vol 3: Keynsham	Paragraph 88	840	840
Vol 3: Keynsham	Table 1 Keynsham Infrastructure		842
Vol 4: Somer Valley	General Comment		843
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Paragraph 13	844	844
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Somer Valley Vision	845	846
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Diagram 2 Somer Valley Strategy Map	847	849
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Diagram 3 Midsomer Norton & Westfield		851
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Policy SV1	852	871
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Paragraph 28	872	872
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Paragraph 29	873	873
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Diagram 5 Strategic Green Infrastructure Network	874	874
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Diagram 6 Key Components of the Ecological Network	875	876
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Diagram 9 Green Setting	877	877
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Diagram 12 Midsomer Norton Town Centre Functional Areas	878	878
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Policy SSV4	879	885
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Paragraph 80	886	886
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Paragraph 82	887	887
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Paragraph 92	888	888
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Policy SV3	889	890
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Radstock Vision	891	892
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Policy SSV20	893	894
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Policy SSV11	895	895
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Policy SSV9	896	896
Vol 4: Somer Valley	Paragraph 156	897	897
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 13	898	898
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 47	899	900

Schedule of Public Consultation Comments on the Draft Placemaking Plan

Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 66	901	901
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Policy SR17	902	904
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 82	905	905
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 87	906	906
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Policy SR5	907	910
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 97	911	911
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 110	912	913
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 140	914	914
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 147	915	915
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 148	916	919
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Policy SR14	920	922
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 159	923	923
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 164	924	924
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Policy SR15	925	939
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Paragraph 172	940	943
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Policy SR2	944	945
Vol 5: Rural Areas	Infrastructure Rural Areas	946	946
Vol 6: Appendices	Annex 1 Map - Policy RA1 HDBs (Batheaston)	947	948
Vol 6: Appendices	Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR8 Revisions to allotments	949	950
Vol 6: Appendices	Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (B&NES)	951	953
Vol 6: Appendices	Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (Bath)	954	954
Vol 6: Appendices	Annex 1 Map - Policy NE2A Landscapes and Settings of Settlements	955	956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number:

Plan Order Reference

Organisation: Environment Agency

Agent Organisation:

Volume: 0, Whole Plan Part: General comment

245

Respondent Number:

Name: Mark Willitts

Agent Name:

Further Information available in the original commen	t? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick	if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	! ?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is i	because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consis	ten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan	, General comm	ent	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
The Agency considers the collective documentation to I particularly the identification and analysis of the respect Agency welcomes the wider	ctive settlements'	designations/constraints. Additionally,	
environmental considerations outlined in the plan's sus references to the National Planning Policy Framework/		•	
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	ation (ticked if ve	5)?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici			
Respondent Number: 3094 Comment Number	r: 4		
Name:	Organisation: P	urnell Property Partnership	
Agent Name: Neil Rowley	Agent Organisa	ion: Savills	
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	? Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick	if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is i	because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consis	ten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan	, General comm	ent	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Proposals Map – General Development Sites			
11 Mav 2016		Pag	ze 1 of 956

We do not understand the relevance of the 'General Development Sites' annotation on the Proposals Map. This does not appear to refer to a policy in the Draft Plan. That notwithstanding, we object that the General Development Site annotation does not include land that was granted permission for development under the outline consent in the south west corner.

For that reason we consider that the Plan is not 'positively prepared' and not 'justified' as it excludes land that has already been granted planning permission from development from the General Development Site annotation.

Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
with does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination:			
Despendent Numbers 2520 Comment Numbers 2			
Respondent Number: 3539 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Eagle One Ltd			
Name: Organisation: Eagle One Ltd Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates			
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No			
Turtier 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') \qed			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , General comment			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Explanatory Note			
The combining of the Core Strategy with the Placemaking Plan makes it a comprehensive Local Plan, all of it which is now subject to consultation and potential amendment. This is reflected in the fact that the Council has made amendments to			
parts of the Core Strategy components of the Plan. It is inconsistent, and unreasonable, for the Council to restrict			
comments only to those parts of the Core Strategy that it has chosen to amend. The entire Plan is therefore now subject			
to consultation and amendment, include the incorporated Core Strategy.			
Q5 Change Requested			
No change required, other than to remove the Explanatory Note and to accept any representations to the incorporated Core Strategy as having been duly made.			
_			
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: 6316 Comment Number: 1			
Name: Organisation: National Grid			
Agent Name: Robert Deanwood Agent Organisation: Amec Foster Wheeler			
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No			

11 May 2016 Page 2 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , General comment The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Bath and North East Somerset Council: Draft Placemaking Plan National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.
Further Advice National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning our networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database:
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?
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number: 8 Name: Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn 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 , General comment The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment

11 May 2016 Page 3 of 956

The adopted Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy identifies that the housing mix of developments should be reflective of that identified in local needs assessments (including the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)). The SHMA

identifies a number of scenarios identifying the potential size mixes which should be reflected in new developments in accordance with Policy CP10. However, the Viability Assessment which has informed the proposed polices of the Placemaking Plan have assumed a very different size mix. These mixes are presented in Table 1

This clearly demonstrates that the Viability Assessment has assumed a size mix which is very different from the need identified in the SHMA. The Viability Assessment assumes that a far greater proportion of houses will be delivered as larger houses which will generate a much greater residual land value available to fund infrastructure items. However, if the Viability Assessment assumed a housing mix in accordance with the need identified in the SHMA, this would negatively impact the finance available to support infrastructure. Without such a consistent assessment, the infrastructure items are not demonstrably deliverable.

negatively impact the finance available to support infrastructure. Without such a consistent assessment, the infrastructure items are not demonstrably deliverable.
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?
Respondent Number: 6453 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Boystown Ltd Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , General comment The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The combining of the Core Strategy with the Placemaking Plan makes it a comprehensive Local Plan, all of it which is now subject to consultation and potential amendment. This is reflected in the fact that the Council has made amendments to parts of the Core Strategy components of the Plan. It is inconsistent, and unreasonable, for the Council to restrict comments only to those parts of the Core Strategy that it has chosen to amend. The entire Plan is therefore now subject to consultation and amendment, include the incorporated Core Strategy.
Q5 Change Requested
No change required, other than to remove the Explanatory Note and to accept any representations to the incorporated Core Strategy as having been duly made.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 4 of 956

Respondent Number: 6456 Comment Number:	1
Name:	Organisation: Biggin Family
Agent Name: Tom Rocke	Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
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') \Box
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	n 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	, General comment
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
subject to consultation and potential amendment. This i parts of the Core Strategy components of the Plan. It is i	g Plan makes it a comprehensive Local Plan, all of it which is now s reflected in the fact that the Council has made amendments to nconsistent, and unreasonable, for the Council to restrict it has chosen to amend. The entire Plan is therefore now subject ed Core Strategy.
Q5 Change Requested	
No change required, other than to remove the Explanate core strategy as having been duly made.	ory Note and to accept any representations to the incorparated
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	tion (ticked if yes)?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	ate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7122 Comment Number:	2
Name:	Organisation: lesis Ltd
Agent Name: Tom Rock	Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
Further Information available in the original comment	? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, General comment
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Explanatory Note	

11 May 2016 Page 5 of 956

parts of the Core Strategy components of the Plan. It is inconsistent, and unreasonable, for the Council to restrict

The combining of the Core Strategy with the Placemaking Plan makes it a comprehensive Local Plan, all of it which is now subject to consultation and potential amendment. This is reflected in the fact that the Council has made amendments to

comments only to those parts of the Core Strategy that it has chosen to amend. The entire Plan is therefore now subject to consultation and amendment, include the Incorporated Core Strategy.

Q5 C	hange	Req	uested
------	-------	-----	--------

No change required, other than to remove the Explanatory Note and to accept any representations to the incorporated Core Strategy as having been duly made.

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: 7123 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: CMBI Ltd
Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , General comment The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Explanatory Note The combining of the Core Strategy with the Placemaking Plan makes it a comprehensive Local Plan, all of it which is now subject to consultation and potential amendment. This is reflected in the fact that the Council has made amendments to parts of the Core Strategy components of the Plan. It is inconsistent, and unreasonable, for the Council to restrict comments only to those parts of the Core Strategy that it has chosen to amend. The entire Plan is therefore now subject to consultation and amendment, include the incorporated Core Strategy.
Q5 Change Requested
No change required, other than to remove the Explanatory Note and to accept any representations to the incorporated Core Strategy as having been duly made.
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: 7124 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Austen Smith
Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 6 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , General comment
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The combining of the Core Strategy with the Placemaking Plan makes it a comprehensive Local Plan, all of it which is no subject to consultation and potential amendment. This is reflected in the fact that the Council has made amendments parts of the Core Strategy components of the Plan. It is inconsistent, and unreasonable, for the Council to restrict comments only to those parts of the Core Strategy that it has chosen to amend. The entire Plan is therefore now subject to consultation and amendment, include the incorporated Core Strategy.
Q5 Change Requested
No change required, other than to remove the Explanatory Note and to accept any representations to the incorporated Core Strategy as having been duly made.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 7 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 0, Whole Plan Part: Alternative Development Site

Respondent Number: 471	9 Comment Number:	1			
Name:	Oı	rganisation: I	Kingswood Sc	hool	
Agent Name: Jo Davis Agent Organisation: GVA					
Further Information available	in the original comment?	No	Attachmen	ts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent conside	r the document is legally co	mpliant? (Ticl	k if indicated '	'yes') \square	
Does the respondent conside	r the document is sound?	Yes, with mir	nor changes		
If the respondent considers t	he Draft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is i	t because it is	s (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared $\ \square$	Not Justified	Not Consi	sten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to:	Volume 0 Whole Plan , A	Alternative De	evelopment S	ite	
The Site Reference (if applicab	le) is: SBA				

Q4 Soundness Comment

We write on behalf of our client, Kingswood School (KWS), to make representations to Bath and North East Somerset Council's (BANES) Draft Placemaking Plan (PMP) Document (December 2015). This follows on from our previous letters of representation made on behalf of KWS to the PMP Launch document and the November 2014 PMP Options document.

As a major landowner, employer and education provider within the city, KWS has a significant interest in the future growth of Bath and in BANES's emerging planning policy framework, which will enable this planned growth to take place and facilitate future development / investment.

Estate Strategy

KWS has prepared an Estate Strategy to consider how it will expand and grow to meet future needs. This has been previously described within our original representations to the PMP Launch Document and has been subject to a preapplication enquiry upon the overall estate strategy options, we have here reiterated the objectives and outputs of the Strategy.

KWS has set two overarching objectives for the Strategy:

- i) To develop and improve its facilities to meet its future needs and enhance its position as the leading co-educational day and boarding school provider of all round education in the Bath area and its growing international reputation. These include improvements to its teaching, boarding and sports facilities.
- ii) To make optimum use of its estate including justifying development of some of its land interests for residential development to allow KWS to re-invest in improving its facilities. This could also assist the growth objectives of the BANES Core Strategy.

In order to achieve these objectives, KWS has also identified three interrelated outputs:

- i) The release of KWS's land interests from the Green Belt in order to enable the School to make optimum use of its estate.
- ii) The designation of the main campus as a 'major existing developed site in the Green Belt'.
- iii) The inclusion of land at Lansdown in any review of land available for potential residential development, and their subsequent removal from the Green Belt.

Upper Tennis Court Site, Lansdown

The estate strategy has identified a site for residential development (including C2 Uses) adjacent to the Lansdown Playing Fields. The upper tennis courts are immediately adjacent to the former MoD Ensleigh North site, and front

11 May 2016 Page 8 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Lansdown Road. The land is previously developed, covered in hardstanding and lies outside of the Green Belt. This site is the main focus of this representation in which we hope to put a case forward so that the redevelopment of the brownfield land can provide funding for further enhancements of the schools facilities. It is noted that the sporting facilities lost would be re-provided within another section of Kingswood Schools Campus.

In this context, KWS wishes to make the following representations to the December 2015 Draft Placemaking Plan Document, in order that BANES give full consideration to addressing these issues as the document emerges. Comment upon the Draft Document

These comments are provided in relation to the different discussion points and development areas identified by the document. This draws upon the previous comments and representations submitted:

- POLICY HE1: Historic Environment – Listed Buildings: Section B of policy HE1 focuses upon listed buildings, in particular it states that "development in their vicinity, will be expected to have no adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic interest, including their settings."

In the context of the upper tennis court site there are heritage assets within the vicinity of the proposed development plot. The impact upon heritage and landscape settings will therefore be a key consideration at a planning stage, particularly given the proximity of the site to Beckford's Tower and the edge of the Lansdown plateau. However, based upon our planning experience with the MoD Ensleigh site, we believe that this could be successfully overcome through a sensitive design scheme. The quantum of development under consideration here is also considerably lower than that considered through the SHLAA (circa 20 dwellings or 60 bed C2 use) which would provide necessary investment for further enhancements to the overall educational facilities.

The approach is endorsed by the NPPF which states at paragraph 134 that Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe that the statement should be adjusted to include the wording "except for where nearby development is shown to have public benefit to the local area"

- Policy D2 - Local Character and Distinctiveness

We challenge the necessity of this policy, given that there is explicit reference to this matter within the NPPF at paragraphs 58, 126 and 131. The draft wording currently seeks to over-emphasis existing planning guidance and place additional hurdles on developers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Remove policy, given requirements are met by the NPPF.

- Policy GB1 - Visual Amenities of the Green Belt:

This policy raises concerns for KWS, given the proximity and relationship of the School to the boundary of the Green Belt. Whilst the stated intention is to provide further guidance upon policy cited in the NPPF, the emerging policy expressed here adds little value or clarity to this. Whilst it remains such an obtusely worded policy, we have concerns that it could be subject to a wide degree of interpretation, unduly restricting development and providing uncertainty for KWS as it pursues its Estate Strategy.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

If the LPA wishes to draft specific local policy relating to visual amenities in the Green Belt, then greater clarity is required to ensure that this does not unduly constrain development adjacent to, but outside of, the Green Belt. This is a particularly important consideration for Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt.

- POLICY LCR5: Safeguarding existing sport and recreational facilities: Policy CR5 focuses upon Development involving the loss of open space and sport/recreational facilities.

Though currently identified as a protected recreational space through the 2007 Local Plan, we believe that should residential development be brought forward upon this site, there is ample space within KWS's estate to accommodate compensatory provision. Furthermore with a new primary school and local convenience store to be delivered at MoD Ensleigh, immediately adjacent to the site, and good public transport links, there are also clear sustainability advantages to delivering further residential development at this location.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

11 Mav 2016 Page 9 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The policy wording should be amended to reflect the Sport England policy requirement of "equivalent or better", which is also reflected in the NPPF at paragraph 74. Given these two policies instruments exist, it is debatable why an additional policy is required to cover the same issue. It is absolutely paramount that the wording at criterion 4 must be revised to remove reference to community access. This amply covered by Sport England's policy guidance. It is not appropriate for education establishments to offer community access without specific control measures.

- Development Potential of Upper School Playing Fields: Policy SB13 of the Document discusses the Former Ministry of Defence sites, including MoD Ensleigh and the Royal High School land, with the intention that the sites are to be developed upon.

In our previous letters of representation to the LPA we highlighted Kingswood land at Lansdown as having potential to deliver residential development. Following pre-application discussions and a review of KWS's long-term development and enhancement strategy, the playing fields are not currently being presented as options for disposal and development. However, the tennis courts which are the subject of this letter is previously developed land within the settlement boundary and therefore should be acknowledged as available for residential development.

Overall, there are strategic advantages to delivering housing upon this site. The land is not located within the Green Belt, relieving it of the most significant constraint upon the principle of future development. The site sits within the boundary of the World Heritage Site, though at its northernmost edge. It also sits at the outside edge of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

As referenced within our comments on Policy LCR5 should residential development be brought forward upon this site, there is ample space within KWS's estate to accommodate compensatory provision, and furthermore there are also clear sustainability advantages to delivering further residential development at this location.

Q5 Change Requested

Conclusions

In summary, following a review of the PMP Draft Document, KWS believes there remain some significant changes that ought to be made before the document reaches a 'sound' stage. We have outlined above those opportunities and alterations that are salient to the Estate Strategy, which has been discussed with the LPA. KWS remains keen to engage with the LPA in the continued drafting of this document, particularly to ensure that it can align with the objectives expressed within their Estate GVA Planning gva.co.uk

Strategy. These include improvements to its teaching, boarding and sports facilities and the exploration of alternative uses of any sites that are no longer required in order to support local policy objectives.

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: 6338 Comment Number: 1	
Name: Organisation: Watkin Jones Group	
Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \square$	
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: SBA	

11 Mav 2016 Page 10 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

- 1.1 PlanningSphere has been instructed to make representations to the emerging Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission Version) on behalf of Watkin Jones Group (WJG) who are the freehold owners of land to the rear of Argos, Midland Road, Bath.
- 1.2 This representation is submitted in accordance with the consultation timetable, and supports an emerging proposal to redevelop the site for a scheme of purpose built managed student accommodation. The representations have been formulated having regard to the Council's evidence paper: Historic and Future Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements in Bath (December 2015).
- 1.3 The representations should also be read with the Site Location Plan which is included at Appendix A.
- 1.4 We reserve the right to submit further representations and supporting evidence in response to subsequent stages of the development plan-making process.

Watkin Jones Group

- 1.5 The Watkin Jones Group (est. 1791) is a market leading national developer, constructer and operator of student accommodation, the latter being under the Fresh Student Living brand. Since 1999 WJG have developed approaching 30,000 bedrooms of purpose built managed student accommodation through the UK with continued completion of up to 5,000 student bedrooms each year. Over 95% of its developments are on site within 6 months of the grant of planning permission.
- 1.6 Managed student accommodation is a recognised means of providing for universities' residential needs and for students to study in affordable, high quality and purpose built accommodation, designed specifically to cater for their needs. This form of provision can assist universities in meeting their accommodation needs, whilst transferring financial risk to the private sector.
- 1.7 At the time of writing WJG are constructing 104 bed spaces at the junction of Lower Bristol Road and Brougham Hayes in Bath (Ref: 14/04728/FUL) which will be delivered for 2016/17 academic year (i.e. by August 2016). This scheme comprises purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) in the form of studio accommodation. A studio is a form of self-contained student accommodation, in which kitchen, dining and living facilities are provided in a student's bedroom (as opposed to a cluster bedroom where several student bedrooms share separate kitchen dining/living facility). Studios are a form of accommodation that appeal to postgraduate, international and later year students, and is more conducive to their studies than a cluster arrangement.
- 1.8 A similar scale and format of PBSA provision is proposed at WJG's newly acquired site at Midland Road, Bath. The Brougham Hayes and Midland Road developments follow WJG's two recent developments on Nelson Street/Rupert Street in Bristol comprising in combination 848 bed spaces, and which have been completed within two years of the grant of planning permission.

Bath student housing: supply and demand

- 1.9 WJG have instructed CBRE to prepare a student housing supply and demand report. A full copy of this report will be included with a forthcoming pre-application enquiry. However, the key facts are summarised below to provide context for these representations:
- The local authority area of BANES administrative area has the 24th largest student population outside of London.
- The proportion of international students in BANES (21.7%) is broadly in line with the national average (22.9%). The proportion of postgraduate students (16.3%) is slightly below the national average (18%).
- 45.6% of students are reliant on the private rented sector (i.e. houses in multiple occupation), which is significantly higher than the national average (30.4%).
- The low proportion of students living in parental homes (7.4%), when compared with the national average (18.9%),

11 Mav 2016 Page 11 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

suggests a lower than average local student population.

- CBRE's research suggests that for 2015/2016 there are a total of 1,023 purpose built privately operated student bed spaces in Bath (of which 611 bed spaces are subject to nomination agreements with Bath Spa University) together with a further 4,996 university operated bed spaces, a total of 6,019 purpose built student bed spaces.
- Bath has a high proportion of university purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) and a low proportion of private PBSA in comparison to the national average.
- Based on the number of purpose built bed spaces at 2015/2016 and the 2013/2014 student population, the ratio of students per bed space is estimated to be 3.11 and over 7,898 students in the target market are unable to access purpose built student accommodation.
- Advice from CBRE indicates that student numbers in Bath are on an upward trajectory which will continue to rise into the foreseeable future. This is also acknowledged in the Council's own evidence base report dated December 2015.
- 2.0 Relevant background information

Site description

- 2.1 The 0.13ha site is located to the rear of Argos, Midland Road, Twerton, Bath and comprises an area of tarmac that was formerly part of the Argos car park. The site is bordered to the north by the retail store and car park of Argos, to the south by the river Avon, and Midland Road to the east. There is a small electricity substation which is located immediately adjacent to the south west boundary of the site.
- 2.2 The wider context includes the Council recycling depot (the 'Destructor Works') to the west of Midland Road; the Territorial Army Volunteer Centre (TAVC) to the east, which is separated by a narrow footpath linking the river to the Upper Bristol Road. A public house lies to the north of the TAVC which fronts onto Upper Bristol Road. Victoria Park lies further to the north on the opposite side of Upper Bristol Road.
- 2.3 The Crest residential development is currently being constructed on the south side of the river comprising large scale 6 storey apartment blocks. At the time of writing the replacement Destructor Bridge is under construction, which is due to open by summer 2016. This will provide a two-way road connection (with cycle path) linking the Crest development to Upper Bristol Road.

Planning history

2.4 The planning history relating to the site includes the following decisions:

Reference Description Date

13/04217/OUT

Erection of eight townhouses and six apartments in three and four-storey buildings, associated off-street car parking and amenity space and relaying of access (outline with some matters reserved)

Permitted

30.03.2015

12/00079/FUL

Erection of part-three/part-four storey buildings to provide eight townhouses and six apartments; associated off-street car parking and amenity space (re-submission)

Refused

16.03.2012

11/00914/FUL

Erection of part-three/part-four storey buildings to provide eight townhouses and six apartments; associated off-street car parking and amenity space

Withdrawn

13.07.2011

2.5 The former Destructor Bridge, constructed in 1905, has been demolished and is in the process of being replaced with a new bridge that will take two-way traffic with a cycleway and pedestrian access as part of the Western Riverside

11 May 2016 Page 12 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

proposals pursuant to planning permission 06/07133/OUT. New landscaping and a ramp to the cycle path (NCNP) has been approved under application 13/03385/COND. The Council are responsible for constructing the ramp but we understand that there may be a funding gap as the s.106 funds secured from Crest are not sufficient to cover the capital costs of the ramp works.

- 2.6 Following the grant of planning permission in March 2015 the subject site was marketed as a residential opportunity by agents, Savills. The freehold interest of the site was offered for sale by informal tender on an unconditional basis. A full pack of information was provided to prospective parties which included: national house builders; a mix of prominent small/medium developers; and Registered Providers.
- 2.7 The site did not generate any significant interest from residential developers, and was sold to the Watkin Jones Group in October 2015. The marketing agents, Savills, have advised that the following feedback was received from prospective residential developer purchasers:
- A number of parties expressed concerns regarding the proximity of the site to the adjacent waste transfer depot, and the associated impact on marketability and values;
- Poor residential amenity owing to the situation of the site to the rear of Argos;
- Concern regarding the proximity of the site to the Argos servicing and delivery area;
- Lack of 'cachet' and 'kerb appeal' following poor quality approach from an open market residential sales perspective; -A relatively onerous Section 106 planning obligations package for the scale of the site;
- Concern relating to the 'complicated' ownership structure for the delivery of the new road and access / agreement required over third party land;
- -Some concern regarding the immediate market supply in the context of the Bath Riverside development (Crest); resultant impact on rates of sale and sales values at the subject site;
- Some expressed concern for reasons of location, scale, or complexity predominantly relating to the affordable housing provision, and also the nature of the proposed development i.e. Terraced houses.
- 2.8 The agents also advised that no interest was received from any developer wishing to pursue an employment scheme on the site. However, in this regard it is understood that the site has a legal constraint only allowing access over the Argos site to enter the subject site for residential purposes only (i.e. Use Class C3 housing and student residential).
- 2.9 In summary, the market testing of the extant residential planning permission 13/04217/OUT has confirmed that the site is situated in unsuitable location for a mixed-tenure scheme of residential development, principally due to adverse amenity considerations but also due to the non-residential character of the surrounding area that would deter owner occupiers from purchasing. The site is also not viable for employment use. The marketing agents, Savills, have advised that the overwhelming majority of the interest in the site was from experienced purpose built student housing developers and investors who advise that the site would suit a single block of purpose built managed student accommodation, and that the vehicular access solution negotiated under the extant residential planning permission would also be suitable for a student housing development.

Applicable planning policies

- 2.10 The subject site lies within the Bath Conservation Area, The World Heritage Site and the defined urban area of Bath. The site is also sited within the Bath Western Riverside Area, which is subject to a Supplementary Planning Document (adopted March 2008), and the Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area under Core Policy B5 (as annotated in Diagram 6: the Central Area and Enterprise Area).
- 2.11 Policy B5 of the adopted Core Strategy (2014) states:
- Off-Campus Student Accommodation: proposals for off-campus student accommodation will be refused within the Central Area, the Enterprise Area and on MOD land where this would adversely affect the realisation of other aspects of the vision and spatial strategy for the city in relation to housing and economic development.
- 2.12 The focus of the enclosed representations relates to Policy B5 of the emerging Placemaking Plan, which seeks to replace Policy B5 of the adopted Core Strategy.

11 May 2016 Page 13 of 956

Off-Campus Student Accommodation: proposals for off-campus student accommodation (whether in the form, C2, C4 or sui generis residential units) or teaching space will be refused within the Central Area and Enterprise Area where this would adversely affect the realisation of the vision and spatial strategy in relation to for delivering housing, and economic development (in respect of office, industrial, retail and hotel space).

2.13 The Council have advised that the scope of comments has to relate to the highlighted text on the basis that the remaining text forms part of adopted Policy B4 of the Core Strategy.

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?
Respondent Number: 7221 Comment Number: 1 Name: Simon Gould Organisation: Mitchell Eley Gould Agent Name: Tim Stanley Agent Organisation: Colliers International Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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: SBA Q4 Soundness Comment INTRODUCTION
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SBA Q4 Soundness Comment

This Representation is submitted by Colliers International on behalf of a Private Landowner, in relation to land at Combe Edge House, Brassknocker Hill, Monkton Combe, Bath & North East Somerset. Colliers International is instructed to promote this land through the Local Plan making process.

The site measures 0.92 hectares of grades 2 3 and 4 of agricultural land located within the district boundary of Bath, as defined on the City of Bath Local Plan Proposals Map. The site is located on the south east periphery of the settlement of Claverton, accessed from Brassknocker Hill (Please see Appendix 1-Site Location Plan).

The site borders agricultural land to the south and south west, beyond the western boundary lies The Sulis Club Cricket Ground, to the north of the site lies the Wessex Water Operations Centre.

The site does not have any known physical constraints relating to topography, access or alike. The land is currently in agricultural use and is currently developable land which can accommodate approximately 25 dwellings; this figure is reflected by its location and the surrounding development. The site is washed over with green belt designation and will require a green belt release or allocation to be brought forward for development.

The development site has a number of designations such as the whole site is washed over by the Green Belt, the AONB and World Heritage designation.

The site is located within the administrative area of Bath and North East Somerset Council. The site can come forward

11 Mav 2016 Page 14 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

and deliver a housing scheme capable of accommodating up to 25 dwellings.

A detailed flood map and modelled flood levels provided by the Environment Agency show that the site is located within Flood Zone 1.

Potential Use

The proposed development site is capable of accommodating a housing scheme with up to 25 dwellings; this is reflected by its location. This is subjected to the constraints analysis, any proposed technical solutions and open space provision.

These representations are made in response to the Bath & North East Somerset consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan (December 2015).

In answering the specific questions posed by the consultation, these representations provide a response that will assist the Bath & North East Somerset in meeting the requirements for plan making set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) tests of soundness and the Duty to Co-operate, both legal and procedural requirements.

Tests of Soundness

To be 'sound' a plan must be:

- Positively prepared- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet the objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified- the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective- the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy- the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework;

Positively prepared

In approach, this plan has been positively prepared and sets out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where.

The plan has considered the overflow needs of the Bristol Housing Market Area within the B&NES Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013.

Despite this there may been the need for a further update of these figures in light of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP), which identified the need for 85,000 dwellings across the West of England Bristol Housing Market Area. This represents an additional 29,000 dwellings above the levels previously identified, Although other planning practices have suggested a higher figure with NLP identifying the FOAN to be 131,551 to 144,928 dwellings over the Plan period, whereas Barton Willmore have presented a FOAN of 153,000 dwellings. Neither approach by NLP or BW is inconsistent with our understanding that 85,000 dwellings is a gross

underestimate of housing needs and that additional housing may be required in parts of B&NES such as Keynsham to help meet this requirement.

Justified

Housing numbers have been forecast accounting for the number jobs likely to be created by the employment allocations within Bath, These numbers have been based on sites approved and allocated under the B&NES Core Strategy part 1, adopted 10th July 2014. Since this document was adopted the Homes and Communities Agency have published new guidance in the form of the Employment

11 Mav 2016 Page 15 of 956

Density Guide 3rd Edition, November 2015.

Through reviewing the volumes of employment space allocated within the this area, we estimate the number of jobs that could be supported by the existing allocation to be in the region of 1,900 (Appendix 1). Should this number be delivered the housing allocation of 2,150 new homes will be inadequate to meet demand.

Effective

The proposed allocations within the Draft Placemaking Plan are deliverable given that many of the allocated sites already have existing planning consent and others have had potential developers identified through the SHLAA. The Council have engaged with neighbouring LPAs to assess the need to accommodate housing demand from these areas although they may not have been supplied with sufficiently accurate information by these authorities.

We are of the opinion that whilst the Draft Placemaking Plan satisfies the test of soundness criteria in respect to Coordinated planning, Co-operation and Monitoring. However it lacks the flexibility to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstance as the majority of housing sites allocated are existing full or outline consents limiting the plans ability to respond to any additional housing need emerging during the period up until 2029 as most of the planned supply will be delivered during the early part of the plan period.

It is our opinion that when considered in the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan, which identifies a number of sites to meet the need for housing within the Bath Housing Market area, that the Draft Placemaking Plan should include a greater proportion of medium to longer tem sites to ensure sufficient flexibility to meet any additional need in areas. Given that infill sites within the town are already accounted for in the draft plan, it will be necessary to locate any additional allocations on the edge of the settlement as such the release of land within the greenbelt should be considered where it facilitates sustainable development.

Consistent with national policy

Insofar as the Draft Placemaking Plan is concerned out our only concern in regard to consistency with national policy whether the plan is based on data that is sufficiently up to date, as required by NPPF paragraph 158, when considered in the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan and updated guidance from the HCA in relation to employment densities.

To positively prepare a local plan the strategy must be proactive in setting and achieving a realistic, yet challenging level of development. This plan is not seeking to deliver against the full objectively assessed need for all types of housing. The gap in need for the delivery of affordable housing will not be fully met by the strategy proposed and an over reliance on the market to provide adequate levels of affordable housing on brownfield and non-green belt sites will not be successful.

The plan requires additional evidence to support its strategy and therefore it is not positively prepared, justified or effective for the purposes of assessing it against national policy.

QUESTION 4: PLEASE GIVE DETAILS OF WHY YOU CONSIDER THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN IS NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT OR IS UNSOUND?

The plan does not deal with the Duty to Cooperate and neither does it consider the objectives of the West of England Joint Strategic Plan.

For the reasons set out above, the plan is neither positively prepared, justified nor effective.

Q5 Change Requested

We would recommend a proportional increase of the housing allocated to account for the volume of employment space allocated and as a contribution towards the 5 year land supply to be included within the JSP. In order to maintain the current ratio of employment to new dwellings, roughly an additional 350 dwellings would need to be allocated within the

11 May 2016 Page 16 of 956

town, half of these could be located on the land at, Claverton Down, Bath.

An allocation on land at Claverton Down would be consistent with general principles of the plan and its inclusion would be consistent with the targets and objectives set out within the draft transport strategy for Keynsham, which notes that there is unlikely to be sufficient demand to support additional transport infrastructure aside from that proposed as part of the S106 agreement for the Somerdale site. This document also states that it is essential that developments are served by good pedestrian routes to pedestrian routes to existing services and recognises that the provision of public transport.

The site is well located in relation to the existing district boundary and the service centres it provides, namely being only 3.02 to the centre of Bath. The site lies within close proximity to the following facilities: The Sulis Club Cricket Ground – 150m, Ralph Allen School- 500m, Nearest Bus Stops are located under 50 metres, Bath Bus Station and Train Station 3km and Prior Park College-1.66km thus helping to achieve the objective of the draft transport strategy. As such the development on the site is likely to encourage cycling and walking as a form of local transport for short journeys.

While the site is part of the Bath greenbelt, it currently consists of built form development.

Although the site is outside of the defined Housing Development boundary and has a number of Heritage and landscape designations, it is a site that can come forward immediately.

There is a realistic prospect that the site will come forward for approximately 25 dwellings use as the site has a willing land owner, who is actively engaged in a formal planning process with the ultimate objective of achieving a planning consent In summary, this site should be considered appropriate for development. It should be included in B&NES Placemaking Plan in order to meet both the local need identified above and to contribute further towards the additional Housing Supply requirement. As the site is Achievable, Deliverable and has a Realistic Prospect of contributing at least 25 dwellings in a sustainable location it should be allocated.

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?

Yes, we would like to be present at the hearing sessions and to present our verbal representations. It is necessary as we would like to highlight the soundness issues presented above. We would also like to take the opportunity to make formal detailed representations regarding the disparities between the housing market information and economic development figures that are not currently aligned for Bath.

Respondent Number: 6346 Comment Number: Name: Agent Name: Tom Rocke	3 Organisation: N Agent Organisa	00		
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Attachments s	sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	No No	ŕ	•	
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consis	sten 🗸 🛮 🗈	Not Effective 🔽	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SKA	, Alternative De	velopment Site		

11 Mav 2016 Page 17 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

The safeguarded land is needed now and should be allocated through the PMP. As has been established through the recent Appeals decisions at Midsomer Norton and Paulton, there is already a shortage in the five year supply of deliverable housing land necessitating the release of additional sites. Moreover, the Joint West of England SHMA has confirmed that there will be a requirement for a further substantial uplift in housing delivery. It has also confirmed that the district's main settlement, the City of Bath, will not be suitable for a strategic scale of development. It follows from this that the focus must be on what is acknowledged to be the district's second most sustainable settlement at Keynsham.

Having regard to the lead time in bringing forward strategic sites to the stage at which they can deliver development, the process must start now. A comprehensive approach to development would also permit a more holistic urban design approach, providing better sense of place and more integrated and sustainable community. Absent such a change, it is considered that the Plan would be neither positively prepared nor effective.

In their submissions to the Core Strategy, Mactaggart and Mickel promoted a more comprehensive development to the east of Keynsham and west of Saltford to provide a new parkland community for Keynsham and Saltford. The benefits of a more comprehensive approach to the land between the two settlements was promoted through a document that forms part the evidence base that informed the Core Strategy (CD13/8). A copy of the document 'Creating a New Parkland Community for Keynsham and Saltford' is resubmitted with these representations (at Annex 1), and can also be accessed via the hyperlink to the Core Strategy Core Documents below1. In summary, this document identified the potential for this area to accommodate a mixed development scheme in the order of 800 new dwellings and 12.3 hectares of employment, all within a parkland setting.

In response to a request by the Core Strategy Examination Inspector Statements of Common Ground were prepared both the allocated site and the larger strategic allocation promoted by Mactaggart and Mickel. Attention is drawn to the following extracts from 'Summary of Agreed Matters' in the Statement of Common Ground relating to the comprehensive allocation comprising circa 65.54 hectares of land to the south of the A4 and 32.66 hectares north of the A4, as shown in the Development Concept document at Annex 1:

- Removal of land east of Keynsham and west of Saltford from the Green Belt would not reduce the openness of the gap between either Keynsham and Bristol or Saltford and Bath. (SoCG, para. 5.9).
- 1 http://www.bathnes.aov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Plannina-and-Buildina-Control/Plannina-Policy/Core-Strateav/CoreDocumentsnotsavedelsewhere/cd13- 8 cs rep supporting info mactaggart mickel.pdf
- •A gap based on the requisite buffer zone around the gas pipeline would ensure some separation between Keynsham and Saltford for as long as the pipeline is in operation, and can be give appropriate planning policy protection to ensure its permanence. (SoCG, para. 5.10)
- •There is no prescribed width of gap that is necessary to maintain adequate separation between settlements. The appropriate extent of separation between built-up areas will vary dependent on location. (SoCG, para. 5.11)
- •Correspondingly, the existing gap between Bristol and Whitchurch, and the ensuring gap between Bath and Southstoke as a result of the proposed strategic allocation at Odd Down (B3A), are/will be less than the residual gap between Keynsham and Saltford based on the proposals for the enlarge site in the Mactaggart and Mickel Development Concept Document. (SoCG, para. 5.12)
- •Consistent with para. 81 of the NPPF, the residual Green Belt gap between Keynsham and Saltford has the potential to be positively enhanced through strategic planting. (SoCG, para. 5.13)

It was also common ground that there were no overriding landscape, ecological, or other environmental constraints on the larger allocation, and it offered the potential for more comprehensive transport solutions that could encourage non-car modes between Keynsham and Saltford, which was particularly important having regard to the new Primary School that is proposed as part of the strategic allocation, and the proximity of Wellsway Secondary School on the east side of Keynsham.

The Examination Inspector held as follows:

The landowner/promoter here had previously advocated a much larger allocation to include the safeguarded land and land on the western edge of Saltford ('Creating a new parkland community for Keynsham and Saltford' CD/13/8). There may be some benefits of such a scheme, such as an alternative bus route between Saltford and the Broadmead

11 Mav 2016 Page 18 of 956

roundabout and the creation of a new park where development is constrained by the gas pipeline. However, the delivery of the 13,000 housing requirement does not require this scale of development. (IR, para. 208).

It is therefore clear that the Examination Inspector did not perceive there to be overriding Green Belt or other environmental constraints to the comprehensive development scenario promoted by Mactaggart and Mickel between Keynsham and Saltford, subject to demonstration of need.

The need for the more comprehensive solution based on the principles set out in "Creating a New Parkland Community for Keynsham and Saltford" is now clear for a combination of reasons.

The allocated Core Strategy employment site to the west of the gas pipeline is of uncertain deliverability. It is in fragmented ownerships, includes existing residential properties which escalate land values, and is subject to overage agreements. A number of developers have already shown interest in bringing it forward, but have taken their interest elsewhere when the realities of the constraints affecting the land have become apparent. In the meantime, key businesses seeking to relocate from existing sites in Bath have been lost to the district because of the lack of suitable sites within it, and the planned redevelopment of sites following relocation of existing occupiers has been frustrated. The Core Strategy Examination Inspector acknowledged the importance of the employment allocation as follows:

In summary, the Council's justification for the scale of employment allocation here is that the land is well located for industrial uses displaced as a result of redevelopment of sites in Bath for more intensive, higher value uses; it will support increased self containment at Keynsham; and that it is a good business location, being in the favoured Bath-Bristol corridor and thus has the potential to facilitate economic growth ... The Council accepts that the scale of allocated land is more than is justified solely on floorspace forecasts, but see it as providing flexibility to accommodate higher economic growth, which I highlighted as a requirement in ID28. (IR, para. 199).

I consider that the Council's case for the employment allocation is well made and is consistent with the aim of the Framework to promote economic growth. (IR, para. 200).

Given the Inspector's findings that the employment allocation at East Keynsham is critical to delivering the economic, and wider, development strategy of the plan, its lack of deliverability would render the plan unsound since it would be neither positively prepared nor effective. There is therefore an urgent need to release additional land east of Keynsham that will deliver the location-specific benefits of economic development. The only option is land to the north of the A4, south of the railway, east of the pipeline and west of Saltford, as shown in the Development Concept brochure (Annex 1). It is both suitable, available and in the single ownership of a willing landowner. There is an urgent need to bring it forward now to deliver employment requirements

The shortfall in the five year housing land supply means that additional housing land must be identified now. As has been confirmed through the recent Appeals decisions at Midsomer Norton and Paulton, that shortfall arises largely from the Bath policy area (where there was a deficiency of over 1,000 dwellings), and is unlikely to have improved owing to the delays in bringing forward previously- developed sites. Since the Placemaking Plan is placing considerable additional reliance on previously- developed sites in Bath for delivering the housing requirement, including a number that require relocation of existing users/occupiers before they can be redeveloped, the risks of delivery falling further behind the trajectory would seem to be high.

Some of the shortfall can be accommodated through planned release of the safeguarded land at East Keynsham now, as urged in the objection to Policy KE3b above. However, as was acknowledged by the Core Strategy Inspector the scale of the safeguarded land is not so great as to be significant in any further sub-regional assessment of where development should take place to meet wider housing needs, and it would only account for a small element of the shortfall. Therefore, reference is again made to the Core Strategy evidence document "Creating a New Parkland Community for Keynsham and Saltford", and the Inspectors comments above,

It is therefore clear that there is a need to plan now for the longer term. There is an urgent need to release deliverable employment land at Keynsham in a location that is attractive to businesses as an alternative to the allocated site at East

11 May 2016 Page 19 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Keynsham. Failure to do so will result in the continued loss of businesses from the district, will have a knock-on effect on the delivery of housing since the redevelopment of the sites that are reliant on the relocation of those existing occupiers will be subject to continuing delays, and the economic strategy for the district will not be realised. It is also clear from the emerging Joint Spatial Strategy that housing needs will continue on an upward trajectory, and there are limited options in Bath and North-East Somerset for accommodating it in sustainable locations. Since the main urban area of Bath is unable to perform a strategic role in terms of accommodating Comprehensive development of land to the east of Keynsham and west of Saltford, as previously promoted by Mactaggart and Mickel and held to have some merit by the Core Strategy Examination Inspector, albeit not to be justified by growth requirements at the time, is therefore a sustainable development option that is needed now. It would embody Garden City principles, with the focus on an extensive community parkland based on the cordon sanitaire associated with the high pressure gas main. As is acknowledged in the NPPF:

The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns that follows the principles of Garden Cities. (para. 52).

There is little scope for accommodating a new settlement, in either the district or the wider sub-region. Planning for larger scale development at Keynsham in a location where the fundamental purposes of the Green Belt will not be compromised, and the secondary purposes of maintaining the separation of the non-principal settlements can be satisfactorily protected, is one of few sustainable options. There is a need for planned release of additional land in this location now, if the greater quantum of growth with necessary and desirable supporting infrastructure, not least the central parkland, is to be delivered in a timely manner. The persistent under-delivery of housing experienced in previous plan-periods has resulted from the Council's reliance on undeliverable and aspirational sites. If those mistakes, and the severe adverse consequences for balanced housing and jobs growth, are not be repeated, the process of forward planning must start through this Plan.

Q5 Change Requested

INTRODUCTION

Amendment of Policies KE3a and KE3b, and/or the inclusion of new policies, to provide for larger scale development to the east of Keynsham and west of Saltford (as shown on the Plan at Annex 2) following the principles of Garden Cities as set out in Core Document CD13/8 of the Core Strategy Examination and resubmitted as Annex 1 to these representations.

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: 7149 Comment Number: 2		
	Name: Mr Hemmings Organisation: Colliers International		
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Tom Stanley			
	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 ✓		
	ne representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site		
_	4 Soundness Comment		
•	i Journaliess Committee		

11 Mav 2016 Page 20 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

This Representation is submitted by Colliers International on behalf of a private landowner, in relation to the land to the west of, Keynsham, Bath & North East Somerset. Colliers International is instructed to promote this land through the Local Plan making process.

The proposed development site measures 8.3 hectares of developable land to accommodate approximately 200+ dwellings, this figure is reflected by its transitional urban edge location and the density of surrounding development. The site is washed over with green belt designation and will require a green belt release or allocation to be brought forward for development.

The site is currently open fields and as such has little recreational, biodiversity or ecological benefit. The development site in question does not have a specific landscape designation other than the Statutory Green Belt designation; however the site does lie adjacent to a site of Nature Conservation interest. It is understood that the Nature Conservation feature will be of local value and any future development of the site could incorporate mitigation measures such as buffer planting that would avoid any adverse impacts on this feature; but equally could facilitate improved accessibility to the Nature Conservation site of interest.

The site is bordered on its eastern boundary by large residential development. The development site is adjacent to open countryside at its northern, southern and western boundary however just beyond the southern boundary is a 2 acre industrial site. The Land to the west of Keynsham site is currently served by access provided via St Francis Road; it is important to note that various access options are available which can be pursued via Lays Drive, Westfield Close or Heathfield.

A detailed flood map and modelled flood levels provided by the Environment Agency show that the site is located within Flood Zone 1.

Potential Use

The proposed development site is capable of accommodating up to approximately 210 dwellings; this is reflected by its transitional urban edge location and density of the surrounding development. This is subjected to the constraints analysis, any proposed technical solutions and open space provision. The proposed development will comprise a mixture of housing which range from two storeys semi-detached and terraced properties, which is consistent with the surrounding and adjacent residential properties.

These representations are made in response to the Bath & North East Somerset consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan (December 2015).

n answering the specific questions posed by the consultation, these representations provide a response that will assist the West of England Partnership in meeting the requirements for plan making set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) tests of soundness and the Duty to Co-operate, both legal and procedural requirements.

QUESTION 1: WHAT ARE YOU COMMENTING ON?

These representations relate to Policies KE1, KE2, KE2b, KE3a KE3b and KE4 contained within Volume 3, The Vision – Keynsham of The Draft Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission version), dated December 2015.

Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy

It is acknowledged that Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy seeks to protect the and maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, however it is also acknowledged that the council will "allow the release Green Belt land to the east and west of Keynsham to accommodate employment and housing growth". The land we are promoting is situated to the West of Keynsham and does not fulfil all the purposes of why land should be included within the Green Belt.

The land to the west of Keynsham is well related to the existing settlement and will be capable, through masterplanning, of providing a distinct and defendable boundary to the green belt as the topography to the west of the site boundary does

11 Mav 2016 Page 21 of 956

not lend itself to development,

Policy KE2: Town Centre/Somerdale Strategic Policy

No comment

Policy KE2b: Riverside and Fire Station Site

No Comment

Policy KE3a: Land adjoining East Keynsham Strategic Sites Allocation

Land to the south west and west of Keynsham needs to be removed from the Green Belt to meet the full objectively assessed need for housing. At present Keynsham is considered as the most sustainable location for development outside of Bath. As a consequence, the need to provide sufficient land for development is significantly higher in locations such as Keynsham. The land to the west of Keynsham performs fewer purposes of why land should be included in the Green Belt than the land adjoining East Keynsham. As such, the land to the west of Keynsham is more appropriate as an allocation. The need to release this site from green belt is driven by the requirement to plan better for the future. The future development pattern for the area is being strongly influenced by the West of England Partnership's Joint Strategic Plan and as such, the requirement to focus development towards Bristol is much stronger than the spatial distribution towards Bath.

Policy KE3b: Safeguard Land at East Keynsham

Policy 3d: Infrastructure and Delivery

QUESTION 2A: DO YOU CONSIDER THE DOCUMENT IS LEGALLY COMPLIANT?

No. the plan does not consider the duty to cooperate and the need to assist in the delivery of any overspill from the Wider Bristol Strategic Housing

QUESTION 2B: DO YOU CONSIDER THE DOCUMENT IS SOUND?

No. The Plan does not seek to deliver the correct amount of housing in sustainable locations and areas of least impact, especially when considering the performance of specific sites identified for release from the Green Belt and those that are available and have not been considered for release from the Green Belt.

The plan is not justified as a consequence of the inadequate supporting evidence.

QUESTION 3: IF YOU CONSIDER THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN IS UNSOUND, IS IT BECAUSE IT IS NOT: POSITIVELY PREPARED, JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE AND CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY

Tests of Soundness

To be 'sound' a plan must be:

- Positively prepared- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet the objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified- the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective- the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy- the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework;

Positively Prepared

In approach, this plan has been positively prepared and sets out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. The plan has considered the overflow needs of the Bristol Housing Market Area within the B&NES Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013.

11 Mav 2016 Page 22 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Despite this there may been the need for a further update of these figures in light of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP), which identified the need for 85,000 dwellings across the West of England Bristol Housing Market Area. This represents an additional 29,000 dwellings above the levels previously identified, Although other planning practices have suggested a higher figure with NLP identifying the FOAN to be 131,551 to 144,928 dwellings over the Plan period, whereas Barton Willmore have presented a FOAN of 153,000 dwellings. Neither approach by NLP or BW is inconsistent with our understanding that 85,000 dwellings is a gross underestimate of housing needs and that additional housing may be required in parts of B&NES such as Keynsham to help meet this requirement.

Justified

Housing numbers have been forecast accounting for the number jobs likely to be created by the employment allocations within Keynsham, These numbers have been based on sites approved and allocated under the B&NES Core Strategy part 1, adopted 10th July 2014. Since this document was adopted the Homes and Communities Agency have published new guidance in the form of the Employment Density Guide 3rd Edition, November 2015.

Through reviewing the volumes of employment space allocated within the Keynsham area, we estimate the number of jobs that could be supported by the existing allocation to be in the region of 1,900 (Appendix 1). Should this number be delivered the housing allocation of 2,150 new homes will be inadequate to meet demand.

Effective

The proposed allocations within the Draft Placemaking Plan are deliverable given that many of the allocated sites already have existing planning consent and others have had potential developers identified through the SHLAA. The Council have engaged with neighbouring LPAs to assess the need to accommodate housing demand from these areas although they may not have been supplied with sufficiently accurate information by these authorities.

We are of the opinion that whilst the Draft Placemaking Plan satisfies the test of soundness criteria in respect to Coordinated planning, Co-operation and Monitoring. However it lacks the flexibility to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstance as the majority of housing sites allocated are existing full or outline consents limiting the plans ability to respond to any additional housing need emerging during the period up until 2029 as most of the planned supply will be delivered during the early part of the plan period.

It is our opinion that when considered in the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan, which identifies Keynsham the potential site of town expansion to help meet the need for housing within the Bristol Housing Market area, that the Draft Placemaking Plan should include a greater proportion of medium to longer tem sites to ensure sufficient flexibility to meet any additional need in areas. Given that infill sites within the town are already accounted for in the draft plan, it will be necessary to locate any additional allocations on the edge of the settlement as such the release of land within the greenbelt should be

considered where it facilitates sustainable development.

Consistent with National Policy

Insofar as the Draft Placemaking Plan is concerned out our only concern in regard to consistency with national policy whether the plan is based on data that is sufficiently up to date, as required by NPPF paragraph 158, when considered in the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan and updated guidance from the HCA in relation to employment densities.

To positively prepare a local plan the strategy must be proactive in setting and achieving a realistic, yet challenging level of development. This plan is not seeking to deliver against the full objectively assessed need for all types of housing. The gap in need for the delivery of affordable housing will not be fully met by the strategy proposed and an over reliance on the market to provide adequate levels of affordable housing on brownfield and non-green belt sites will not be successful.

The plan requires additional evidence to support its strategy and therefore it is not positively prepared, justified or effective for the purposes of assessing it against national policy.

11 May 2016 Page 23 of 956

QUESTION 4: PLEASE GIVE DETAILS OF WHY YOU CONSIDER THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN IS NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT OR IS UNSOUND?

The plan does not deal with the Duty to Cooperate and neither does it consider the objectives of the West of England Joint Strategic Plan.

For the reasons set out above, the plan is neither positively prepared, justified or effective.

Q5 Change Requested

QUESTION 5: PLEASE SET OUT WHAT CHANGE(S) YOU CONSIDER NECESSARY TO MAKE THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN LEGALLY COMPLIANT OR SOUND?

We would recommend a proportional increase of the housing allocated to Keynsham to become consistent with the quantity of employment space allocated and as a contribution towards the 5 year land supply that will be led by the JSP. In order to maintain the current ratio of employment to new dwellings, roughly an additional 350 dwellings would need to be allocated within the town, half of these could be located on the land to the west of Keynsham.

An allocation on the land to the West of Keynsham would be consistent with general principles of the plan and its inclusion would be consistent with the targets and objectives set out within the draft transport strategy for Keynsham, which notes that there is unlikely to be sufficient demand to support additional transport infrastructure aside from that proposed as part of the S106 agreement for the

Somerdale site. This document also states that it is essential that developments are served by good pedestrian routes to pedestrian routes to existing services and recognises that the provision of public transport is considerably better in the west of Keynsham than on the east of the town, with bus services from the west of Keynsham running to Bristol every 15 minutes and to Bath every half hour.

The site is well located in relation to the existing settlement boundary of Keynsham and the service centres it provides, namely the Town Centre and Queens Road Local Centre. The edge of the site lies within closed proximity to the following facilities: Town Centre-900metres, Queens Road-650metres, Nearest Bus Stops are located under 50 metres, Keynsham Train Station 1,500 metres and St Keyna School- 500 metres thus helping to achieve the objective of the draft transport strategy. As such the development on the site is likely to encourage cycling and walking as a form of local transport for short journeys.

While the site is part of the Bristol greenbelt, it currently consists of two large arable fields to the southern section of the site and three separate rough grazing parcels to the northern edge. The development site has no redeeming features or characteristics of any significance or importance.

Although the site is outside of the defined Housing Development boundary and is covered by the Forest of Avon designation, it has no other specific landscape designations in relation to flood risk or heritage.

The site is located adjacent to a site of Nature Conservation; however any future development of the site could incorporate mitigation measures such as buffer planting that would avoid any adverse impacts of the feature.

There is a realistic prospect that the site will come forward for residential use as the site has a willing land owner, who is actively engaged in a formal planning process with the ultimate objective of achieving a planning consent.

In summary, this site should be considered appropriate for development. It should be included in B&NES Placemaking Plan in order to meet both the local need identified above and to contribute further towards the additional Housing Supply requirement identified within the West of England Joint Spatial Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document. As the site is Achievable, Deliverable and has a Realistic Prospects of contributing at least 200 dwellings in a sustainable location.

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?

11 Mav 2016 Page 24 of 956

It is necessary as we would like to highlight the soundness issues presented above. We would also like to take the opportunity to make formal detailed representations regarding the disparities between the housing market information and economic development figures that are not currently aligned for Keynsham.

Respondent Number: 7153 Comment Number	r: 1
Name:	Organisation: Halsall Homes
Agent Name: Tom Stanley	Agent Organisation: Colliers International
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an 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 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SKA	, Alternative Development Site

Q4 Soundness Comment

This Representation is submitted by Colliers International on behalf of Halsall Homes, in relation to land at Broadleaze Nursery, Keynsham, Bath & North East Somerset. Colliers International is instructed to promote this land through the Local Plan making process.

The proposed development site measures 0.6 hectares of developable land to accommodate approximately 25 dwellings, this figure is reflected by its transitional urban location and the density of surrounding development. The site is washed over with green belt designation and will require a green belt release or allocation to be brought forward for development.

The site is currently operational for most of the year as Broadleaze Nursery, selling Christmas trees through winter and then as a nursery throughout the spring and summer. The built form is typified by the extensive coverage of glasshouses and poly-tunnels synonymous with this type of use. Over 75% of the site has some built form. The development site in question does not have a specific landscape designation other than the Statutory Green Belt designation.

The site is located to the east and outside of, but adjacent to, the Keynsham settlement boundary. The site is within the administrative area of Bath and North East Somerset Council. The site can come forward and deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme for up to 25 dwellings.

Adjacent to the site is the strategic employment allocation at East Keynsham. The concept map for East Keynsham shows the proximity of the various access points and pedestrian and cycle links.

A detailed flood map and modelled flood levels provided by the Environment Agency show that the site is located within Flood Zone 1.

Potential Use

The proposed development site is capable of accommodating 100% affordable housing scheme with up to 25 dwellings; this is reflected by its transitional urban location and density of the surrounding development. This is subjected to the constraints analysis, any proposed technical solutions and open space provision.

11 Mav 2016 Page 25 of 956

These representations are made in response to the Bath & North East Somerset consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan (December 2015).

In answering the specific questions posed by the consultation, these representations provide a response that will assist the Bath & North East Somerset in meeting the requirements for plan making set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) tests of soundness and the Duty to Co-operate, both legal and procedural requirements.

QUESTION 1: WHAT ARE YOU COMMENTING ON?

These representations relate to Policies KE1, KE2, KE2b, KE3a KE3b and KE4 contained within Volume 3, The Vision – Keynsham of The Draft Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission version), dated December 2015.

Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy

It is acknowledged that Policy KE1: Keynsham Spatial Strategy seeks to protect the and maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, however it is also acknowledged that the council will "allow the release Green Belt land to the east and west of Keynsham to accommodate employment and housing growth". The land we are promoting is situated to the North East of Keynsham and does not fulfil all the purposes of why land should be included within the Green Belt.

Policy KE2: Town Centre/Somerdale Strategic Policy

No comment

Policy KE2b: Riverside and Fire Station Site

No Comment

Policy KE3a: Land adjoining East Keynsham Strategic Sites Allocation

Broadleaze Nursery, Keynsham needs to be removed from the Green Belt to meet the full objectively assessed need for housing. At present Keynsham is considered as the most sustainable location for development outside of Bath. As a consequence, the need to provide sufficient land for development is significantly higher in locations such as Keynsham. The land at Broadleaze Nursery performs fewer purposes of why land should be included in the Green Belt than the land adjoining East Keynsham. As such, the land at Broadleaze Nursery should be considered appropriate as an allocation. The need to release this site from green belt is driven by the requirement to plan better for the future. The future development pattern for the area is being strongly influenced by the West of England Partnership's Joint Strategic Plan and as such, the requirement to deliver a greater volume of residential development, in particular 100% affordable development, is significant.

QUESTION 2A: DO YOU CONSIDER THE DOCUMENT IS LEGALLY COMPLIANT?

No. The plan does not consider the duty to cooperate and the need to assist in the delivery of any overspill from the Wider Bristol Strategic Housing Market Area.

QUESTION 2B: DO YOU CONSIDER THE DOCUMENT IS

SOUND?

No. The Plan does not seek to deliver the correct amount of housing in sustainable locations and areas of least impact, especially when considering the performance of specific sites identified for release from the Green Belt within this version of the plan and those sites that are available and have not been considered for release from the Green Belt.

The plan also does not consider the need to meet the full objectively assessed needs for affordable housing provision as a market-led development strategy will not meet the needs of the Authorities affordable housing provision.

The plan is not justified as a consequence of the inadequate supporting evidence.

QUESTION 3: IF YOU CONSIDER THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN IS UNSOUND, IS IT BECAUSE IT IS NOT: POSITIVELY PREPARED, JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE AND CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY

11 Mav 2016 Page 26 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Tests of Soundness

To be 'sound' a plan must be:

- Positively prepared- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet the objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified- the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective- the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy- the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework;

Positively prepared

In approach, this plan has been positively prepared and sets out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. The plan has considered the overflow needs of the Bristol Housing Market Area within the B&NES Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013.

Despite this there may been the need for a further update of these figures in light of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP), which identified the need for 85,000 dwellings across the West of England Bristol Housing Market Area. This represents an additional 29,000 dwellings above the levels previously identified, Although other planning practices have suggested a higher figure with NLP identifying the FOAN to be 131,551 to 144,928 dwellings over the Plan period, whereas Barton Willmore have presented a FOAN of 153,000 dwellings. Neither approach by NLP or BW is inconsistent with our understanding that 85,000 dwellings is a gross underestimate of housing needs and that additional housing may be required in parts of B&NES such as Keynsham to help meet this requirement.

Justified

Housing numbers have been forecast accounting for the number jobs likely to be created by the employment allocations within Keynsham, These numbers have been based on sites approved and allocated under the B&NES Core Strategy part 1, adopted 10th July 2014. Since this document was adopted the Homes and Communities Agency have published new guidance in the form of the Employment Density Guide 3rd Edition, November 2015.

Through reviewing the volumes of employment space allocated within the Keynsham area, we estimate the number of jobs that could be supported by the existing allocation to be in the region of 1,900 (Appendix 1). Should this number be delivered the housing allocation of 2,150 new homes will be inadequate to meet demand.

Effective

The proposed allocations within the Draft Placemaking Plan are deliverable given that many of the allocated sites already have existing planning consent and others have had potential developers identified through the SHLAA. The Council have engaged with neighbouring LPAs to assess the need to accommodate housing demand from these areas although they may not have been supplied with sufficiently accurate information by these authorities.

We are of the opinion that whilst the Draft Placemaking Plan satisfies the test of soundness criteria in respect to Coordinated planning, Co-operation and Monitoring. However it lacks the flexibility to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstance as the majority of housing sites allocated are existing full or outline consents limiting the plans ability to respond to any additional housing need emerging during the period up until 2029 as most of the planned supply will be delivered during the early part of the plan period.

It is our opinion that when considered in the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan, which identifies Keynsham the potential site of town expansion to help meet the need for housing within the Bristol Housing Market area, that the Draft Placemaking Plan should include a greater proportion of medium to longer tem sites to ensure sufficient flexibility to meet any additional need in areas. Given that infill sites within the town are already accounted for in the draft plan, it will be necessary to locate any additional allocations on the edge of the settlement as such the release of land within the greenbelt should be

11 Mav 2016 Page 27 of 956

considered where it facilitates sustainable development.

Consistent with national policy

Insofar as the Draft Placemaking Plan is concerned out our only concern in regard to consistency with national policy whether the plan is based on data that is sufficiently up to date, as required by NPPF paragraph 158, when considered in the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan and updated guidance from the HCA in relation to employment densities.

To positively prepare a local plan the strategy must be proactive in setting and achieving a realistic, yet challenging level of development. This plan is not seeking to deliver against the full objectively assessed need for all types of housing. The gap in need for the delivery of affordable housing will not be fully met by the strategy proposed and an over reliance on the market to provide adequate levels of affordable housing on brownfield and non-green belt sites will not be successful.

The plan requires additional evidence to support its strategy and therefore it is not positively prepared, justified or effective for the purposes of assessing it against national policy.

QUESTION 4: PLEASE GIVE DETAILS OF WHY YOU CONSIDER THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN IS NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT OR IS UNSOUND?

The plan does not deal with the Duty to Cooperate and neither does it consider the objectives of the West of England Joint Strategic Plan. For the reasons set out above, the plan is neither positively prepared, justified nor effective.

Q5 Change Requested

We would recommend a proportional increase of the housing allocated to account for the volume of employment space allocated and as a contribution towards the 5 year land supply to be included within the JSP. In order to maintain the current ratio of employment to new dwellings, roughly an additional 350 dwellings would need to be allocated within the town, half of these could be located on the land at Broadleaze Nursery, Bristol.

An allocation on land at Broadleaze Nursery would be consistent with general principles of the plan and its inclusion would be consistent with the targets and objectives set out within the draft transport strategy for Keynsham, which notes that there is unlikely to be sufficient demand to support additional transport infrastructure aside from that proposed as part of the S106 agreement for the Somerdale site. This document also states that it is essential that developments are served by good pedestrian routes to pedestrian routes to existing services and recognises that the provision of public transport is considerably better in the west of Keynsham than on the east of the town, with bus services from the west of Keynsham running to Bristol every 15 minutes and to Bath every half hour.

The site is well located in relation to the existing settlement boundary of Keynsham and the service centres it provides, namely the Waitrose and a number of dining out facilities. The site lies within close proximity to the following facilities: Keynsham Leisure Centre-170km, Queens Road-650metres, Nearest Bus Stops are located under 50 metres, Keynsham Train Station 1.90km and Wellsway School-1km thus helping to achieve the objective of the draft transport strategy. As such the development on the site is likely to encourage cycling and walking as a form of local transport for short journeys.

While the site is part of the Bristol greenbelt, it currently consists of built form development.

Although the site is outside of the defined Housing Development boundary it has no other specific landscape designations in relation to flood risk or heritage.

There is a realistic prospect that the site will come forward for a 100% affordable residential use as the site has a willing land owner, who is actively engaged in a formal planning process with the ultimate objective of achieving a planning consent In summary, this site should be considered appropriate for development. It should be included in B&NES Placemaking Plan in order to meet both the local need identified above and to contribute further towards the additional Housing Supply requirement. As the site is Achievable, Deliverable and has a Realistic Prospect of contributing at least 25 dwellings in a sustainable location it should be allocated.

11 May 2016 Page 28 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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?

It is necessary as we would like to highlight the soundness issues presented above. We would also like to take the opportunity to make formal detailed representations regarding the disparities between the housing market information and economic development figures that are not currently aligned for Keynsham.

Respondent Number: 1503 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Shoscombe Parish Council Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?
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 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 believe the green belt in BANES should be maintained. The only infill permitted should be inside existing Housing Development Boundaries.'
My view is that PSJ should not expand further beyond what has currently attained planning permission. Its facilities are strained at the moment and there is no significant growth in employment to justify any further population growth here It is already a significant commuter town with the associated daily traffic problems particularly towards Bath on the A367.
In particular, the site known as PEA10, should not be developed. Although it is outside the green belt it is an extremely prominent site visually and inside the "Landscape Setting" area around PSJ & Shoscombe as defined in the draft Placemaking Plan. This area should remain undeveloped. We fully support the proposed Landscape Setting area here as we further recommend the green belt be extended here across this area to give added protection to this vital area.
Easement of the Green Belt If there is a Government initiative to allow easement of the Green Belt to allow for increased housing this should apply to the areas immediately surrounding Bristol.
Bristol is the highest area of employment in BANES and therefore new developments need to be within easy travelling distance where there are rail and road systems, the ring road, M32 and M5 which can be adapted to accommodate the extra traffic.
The impact of easement of the Green Belt surrounding Peasedown St John for further development would impact greatly on the village of Shoscombe. We have been told by BANES that Shoscombe is 'washed over greenbelt' The concern for Shoscombe is the bypass defined the housing development boundary for Peasedown St John.
REF: p13 Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy
4 Housing (Partidential development on sites outside the Housing Development Roundary will be assentable only if identified in an
'Residential development on sites outside the Housing Development Boundary will be acceptable only if identified in ar adopted Neighbourhood Plan'

11 May 2016 Page 29 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

There is only a narrow strip of farmland a mere 400m wide south of the bypass separating the settlement of Peasedown St John from the Parish of Shoscombe. Therefore if PSJ decide to adopt a Neighbourhood Plan and alter the housing development boundary that could impact greatly on Shoscombe We could lose our identity as a village and be melded into Peasedown St John.

The other tract of land which could then also be developed if the housing boundary changes is a tract of land PEA 10 which was assessed for potential development in the SHLAA 2013. This tract of land is I believe classed as White belt and therefore has the potential to be considered for development as the landowner has already agreed.

PEA 10 Area and Description

- 19.5ha
- -Currently in agricultural use
- -Open countryside to east, south and west
- -Peasedown to the north across the A367 bypass

Housing Potential

- About 600 at 30 dph

Q5 Change Requested

One of the main factors against this development is that it would create yet another separate community, isolated from the rest of PSJ by the by pass. Peasedown St John would lose its identity as a village and become a dormitory settlement for Bath and Bristol resulting in urban sprawl.

- How would residents of that area, if it was developed, be able to get to the facilities in the village by foot when separated from the rest of the village by a very busy bypass?
- There is very little local employment for the increased population which would mean a significant increase in the number travelling further afield on already congested roads into Bath and Bristol and Midsomer Norton.
- The volume of traffic, which is already a problem, would be greatly increased causing commuters to find alternative routes on the narrow country lanes around the village of Shoscombe which are already used as short cuts at peak times and are in very poor repair.
- The infra structure of the village of Peasedown St John is inadequate to accommodate another 600 households. I.e. School places, doctors' surgery, bus service shops etc.
- The development would be on prime agriculture land which is also a wildlife habitat.
- There could be impact of possible flooding on the village of Shoscombe which lies in the valley and is in very close proximity if development was permitted on PEA 10. The surface water from such a large development could possibly encroach on the village.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		
Respondent Number: 3094 Comment Number: 2		
Name: Organisation: Purnell Property Partnership		
Agent Name: Neil Rowley Agent Organisation: Savills		
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 Desitively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not Effective		

11 Mav 2016 Page 30 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA **Q4 Soundness Comment** Failure to Allocate 'CCRC' site Paragraph 145 of the 'Somer Valley' Volume of the Local Plan states that "both Paulton and Peasedown have accommodated large numbers of new dwellings in the recent past; a recent planning permission for large scale development at Greenlands (Peasedown) will add to this number in the future. Because of this, and because additional Greenfield sites adjoining the Somer Valley settlements of Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John do not need to be allocated in the Placemaking Planin order to meet the Core Strategy housing requirement, no housing sites are identified for inclusion within the Placemaking Plan. This is, again, an anomalous position. There is a brownfield site within Paulton that is appropriate for residential development. It is in an existing settlement and a sustainable location. The Council is under significant pressure to allocate land for housing. It is a significant waste of a site that is available and suitable for residential development in all other respects. Accordingly, we consider the site is suitable for residential development and should be allocated as such. The Plan is therefore not considered to be Consistent with National Policy as it does not make the best use of previously developed land by allocating that land for residential development. For the reasons above we consider that the Plan is not 'positively prepared' as it does not take a positive approach to the development of the site, given that the CCRC use has not come forward. Q5 Change Requested Proposed Change: We consider that the 'CCRC' site should be allocated for residential development. 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: 4532 Comment Number: 3 Name: Kevin Bird Organisation: The Silverwood Partnership Agent Name: Laura Wilkinson Agent Organisation: D2 Planning Ltd 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):

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site

Not Justified

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA

Q4 Soundness Comment

Not Positively Prepared ✓

Land North of Kilmersdon Road, Manor Farm, Haydon, Radstock

Objections are lodged to the non-allocation for residential purposes of land North of Kilmersdon Road, Manor Farm, Haydon, Radstock. The site is located adjacent to the development boundary relating to Haydon, as shown on the proposals map which accompanies the adopted Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (2007). The Council's SHLAA (2013) identifies the site (RAD 31c) as having potential to deliver a yield of about 100 dwellings. The site was rated as

Not Consisten 🗸

Not Effective ✓

11 May 2016 Page 31 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

being 'moderate/high' suitability for development. It states:

"In respect of the smaller area only (RAD 31c), development would have a low to moderate impact on landscape character. Whilst it would be seen from a distance, it would relate well to the rest of Haydon village on the ridge top." The site is suitable for development and can be delivered immediately after planning permission is granted. The objectors have carried out all the necessary technical and environmental surveys. There are no access constraints and the site can be adequately drained. There are no issues on the grounds of archaeology and the SSSI can be adequately protected. Furthermore, there are no issues of ecological importance on the site. In all there are no constraints to residential development coming forward on the site. It is a sustainable, suitable and deliverable site.

A Planning Application for the development of the site for up to 100 dwellings has already been considered by the Local Planning Authority. The reasons for refusal can be overcome and there are no technical objections to the development of the site for residential development. The site could deliver up to 100 dwellings and all of these would be delivered within 5 years following the granting of planning permission.

Objections are therefore lodged to the non allocation for residential purposes of land north of Kilmersdon Road, Manor Farm, Haydon. These objections should also be read in conjunction with our objections to Policy NE2A relating to the designation of the site as part of the landscape setting of Radstock.

Q5 Change Requested

Allocate the site for residential development. Deallocate the proposed Landscape Setting Designation.

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?

Because the issues are complex and need to be subject to debate as part of the oral examination.

Respondent Number: 6350 Comment Number: 2

Name: Organisation: The Property Development Co Ltd

Agent Name: Robert Selwood Agent Organisation: Sellwood Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') **V**

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 Consisten 🗸

Not Effective ✓

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA

Q4 Soundness Comment

The proposed Radstock site allocations (SSV14 to 20) will not provide sufficient housing for the Town in the remainder of the plan period to 2029. In total, only three sites are allocated (SSV14 Charlton Timber Yard, SSV17 Radstock County Infants and SSV20 Former St Nicholas School), all three are previously developed land in the centre of Radstock and do not represent a range and choice of sites for different sections of the local housing market.

It is also uncertain that all of these sites will come forward within the plan period. Each of them is subject to a range of constraints including the appropriate reuse of historic buildings, ecology, contamination and viability. Indeed, the former St Nicholas School already has a history of planning refusals for development.

The remedy for this lack of soundness is to allocate additional well located housing sites at Radstock. The Property

11 May 2016 Page 32 of 956

Development Company Ltd proposes that an additional allocation is made on land which it owns at Smallcombe Road, Clandown, Radstock shown outlined in red on plan IMA-13-060.

This land is outside the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but adjoins the built up area boundary. It is well located in terms of access to the facilities in the centre of Radstock. The site is also well served by bus services on the A367 between Radstock, Peasedown St John and Bath which would give residents a real choice to use public transport rather than the car.

The site has an area of 1.4 hectares and was assessed in the SHLAA (Site RAD17) of having a capacity of around 40 dwellings at 30 dwellings to the hectare. Plan IMA-13-060 demonstrates how the site is surrounded by development on all sides other than a small neck of land (40 metres wide) which adjoins undeveloped land to the south east. This adjoining land is also owned by The Property Development Company and is shown blue on the plan. Part of theblue land could be used as public open space and to provide improved public footpath access to Coomb End and Radstock. The plan shows how two alternative points of access are available on to Smallcombe Road. The site is controlled by a developer and has no other known constraints that would prevent its early development. It is therefore a sustainable and deliverable site.

Q5 (Change	Requested
~~	-	ricquesteu

The plan can be made sound by a modification to add the following additional housing site.

Land at Smallcombe Road, Clandown, Radstock: Residential development for approximately 40 dwellings with access from Smallcombe Road.

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 Property Development Co Ltd is keen to ensure that the Placemaking Plan adopts a positive and proactive attitude to the development of sufficient housing to meet local needs.

Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn
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
Land off Bath Old Road has been promoted through the SHLAA and can provide a sustainable location for future development in response to future housing needs.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 Mav 2016 Page 33 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA
Q4 Soundness Comment
The consequence of this is that there will be a need for further delivery in the Somer Valley (in additional to the small site windfall allowance), even when compared to the CS minimum housing requirement.
It is within this context that we present, through the Placemaking Plan consultation, details of a site under the control of
our client. This 4.3 hectare site (Appendix 1) has the capacity to provide for approximately 82 dwellings supported by
associated parking, open space provision and strong pedestrian linkages from the site to surrounding areas.
This site, linear in nature, runs parallel with the Five Arches Greenway recognised as a sustainable transport route for
pedestrian/ cyclists providing an important link between Radstock town centre and Midsomer Norton town centre. It
comprises an area of undeveloped land at the heart of the urban area, contained by existing development and within
easy walking distance of the three district centres providing access to a full range of community facilities and services.
Moreover, the development site will provide an opportunity to deliver housing, including affordable homes, in response
to identified need, either that which is identified in the existing adopted CS, or that to be identified through the JSP
process, without encroachment into the open countryside or with any erosion of the urban area.
The development site will also make efficient use of land, in a highly accessible location at the centre of the conurbation
of Norton/Radstock/Westfield, supported by strong pedestrian/cycle linkages Development should not be at any costs
and the constraints associated with this site are acknowledged. However, such constraints should not result in a blanket
restriction on development. In this context we refer to paragraph 187 of the NPPF which, in the context of decision-
taking, states: "Local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek
to approve applications for sustainable development where possible".
Within the context of the site constraints there exist opportunities to develop appropriate strategies to protect and
enhance ecological interests associated with the site, through sensitive and responsive design and layout future development can preserve, protect and where appropriate enhance the character and appearance of the Radstock
Conservation Area. In addition landscape considerations and associated impacts can be addressed through an
appropriate landscape strategy, one that protects and enhances established hedgerows and avoids adverse impact to
important trees.

11 May 2016 Page 34 of 956

Therefore, although the site is not without constraints, these represent key considerations in the formulation of proposals upon which future development can, as far as possible protect and reinforce whilst creating an attractive built environment that the reflects the character of the area. Through holistic masterplanning, responding positively and sensitively to the site and its surrounds, future development proposals can also facilitate the provision of a new town park which has been a longstanding aspiration of local planning policy.

It is therefore considered that the site provides a suitable and appropriate development opportunity, providing flexibility in housing land supply to ensure that the quantitative provisions of the CS can be achieved whilst also providing further opportunities to respond to needs arising through the CS Review and the JSP.

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

Q5 Change Requested

hy does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group
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 Sustified Not Consisten Not Effective
he representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site he Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA
4 Soundness Comment
ne consequence of this is that there will be a need for further delivery in the Somer Valley (in additional to the small te windfall allowance), even when compared to the CS minimum housing requirement. It is within this context that we resent, through the Placemaking Plan consultation, details of a site under the control of our client. This 1.61ha hectare te (Appendix 1) consists of pasture land on the north-west edge of Peasedown St. John. The site is surrounded on three des (east, south and west) by existing residential development with pasture land to the north which separates this site om the residential development on Church Road. The site is therefore contained by development and although outside if the current Development Boundary, it is well related to existing residential development.

village and the site is located outside of the Green Belt. The development proposals can be successfully provided in a manner which is sensitive and responsive to its wider landscape settings. A landscape strategy will ensure the retention of existing boundary trees and hedgerows, the provision of open space, including incidental green space and children's

The development site is not subject to any specific landscape designation and there are no Conservation Areas in the

The site is in close proximity to Peasedown Village centre located approximately 300 metres to the south. The Village Centre provides a range of services and facilities, including a post office, convenience store, food stores, dental practice

The proposed development site has capacity to provide up to 55 residential dwellings and associated infrastructure, with access available via a new junction on Church Road, in the north-west corner of the site. Pedestrian access into the site

and a primary school. A doctor's surgery is also within walking distance to the proposed development site.

can be achieved from Church Road and new access from Hillcrest and Highfield roads respectively.

11 Mav 2016 Page 35 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made Comments received (in Plan Order)	
play provision with associated hard landscaped areas.	
It is therefore considered that the site provides a suitable and appropriate development opportunity, providing flexibility in housing land supply to ensure that the quantitative provisions of the CS can be achieved whilst also providing further opportunities to respond to needs arising through the CS Review and the JSP. Q5 Change Requested	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 6434 Comment Number: 1 Name: David Webb	
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	
1 . Introduction	
1.1. The land at Tyning Hill, Radstock (centred on National Grid Reference ST 696 553; hereafter referred to as the 'site') is being promoted for residential development.	
1 .2. The Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) Placemaking Plan allocates specific sites for development and outlines a district-wide suite of planning policies. It complements and seeks to deliver the strategic framework set out in the Adopted Core Strategy. The Pre-Submission Draft (December 201 5) Part 4: Somer Valley indicates that the site supports 'UK Priority Habitat' (Diagram 6; pg 1 7).	
 1.3. This briefing note: Defines UK Priority Habitats and describes how they are protected; Summarises the existing ecological resources at the site, based on detailed surveys undertaken by Tyler Grange in 201 4; and Describes how a strategy could be devised to compensate for the loss of existing ecological resources through design of 	
development and use of adjacent land controlled by my client.	
2. Definition and Protection	
2.1. UK Priority Habitats are habitats that have been identified as being the most threatened and requiring conservation action under the UK. Their identification was required under Section 41 (England) of the Natural Environment and Rural	

11 Mav 2016 Page 36 of 956

2.2. The presence of a UK Priority Habitat does not preclude development, though the NPPF states that developments

Communities (NERC) Act 2006.

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

should "promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats" (paragraph 1 1 7).

- 2.3. The presence of such habitats can in certain circumstances be used to justify the designation of a Local Wildlife Site (known in Bath and North East Somerset as Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs), identified in accordance with the "Procedure for designation of Local Sites in Bath and North East Somerset"). The site is not designated as a LWS, though even if it were, saved policy NE.9 of the 2007 BANES Local Plan states development can be permitted where "compensatory provision of at least equal nature conservation value is made".
- 3. Existing Ecological Resources
- 3.1 . An ecological assessment report was produced by Tyler Grange in 201 5 to inform a planning application for up to 55 residential units at the site. The valuable ecological resources recorded at the site are summarised below.

Context

3.2. The site is at the foot of a southeast facing slope, adjacent and to the north of a colliery spoil heap (Tyning Tip) that now supports mixed woodland and acid grassland. The site was once the location of colliery workers' cottages, though these have been demolished leaving the building platforms, roads and rubble piles. To the north and northeast of the site supports farmland fields that support rough grassland and scrub bounded by hedgerows.

Protected Sites

3.3. The site is not covered by any statutory or non-statutory protection. No statutorily protected sites are present within 2km, and there are no sites protected at a European level with 5km. Fourteen Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs) have been identified within 2km though owing to the scale of development that is likely, and the distances involved, impacts to these SNCIs are not considered likely.

Habitats

- 3.4. Based on the 201 4 surveys, the site comprised of a mosaic of habitats that are typical of brownfield or abandoned farmland, including pioneer vegetation, dense scrub and rank grassland. The pioneer habitats were relatively speciesrich. A few fruit trees were also present. In the absence of intervention, the habitats will become increasingly dominated by scrub of lower value than the existing habitat mosaic. Similar, unmanaged grassland and scrub habitats extend up were recorded adjacent to the site to the north and west.
- 3.5. The Tyler Grange report concluded the habitats when considered together were of local value.
- 3.6. It is understood that Bristol Regional Environmental Records Centre's data concluded that the site supports UK Priority Habitat. This information was not available at the time of writing, but presumably this referred to the grassland and 'open mosaic' habitats.
- 3.7. In terms of fauna:
- The site supported four notable invertebrates and the assemblage is considered to be of county value. At least three of these are likely to exist in similar habitats that extend well beyond the site boundary to the west and north;
- Common reptiles of local value were present;
- Bats would not roost at the site, and whilst the habitats are not likely to be of importance for foraging, bats could commute across the site, with the woodland edge adjacent to Tyning Tip being the most obvious commuting route;
- The site is likely to be of some value to nesting and foraging birds, though there is an abundance of similar habitat locally; and
- No badger setts were recorded within the site during the survey, though a third party informed that one is situated close to the north-eastern site boundary.
- 4. How the Site Could be Developed in Accordance with Planning Policy
- 4.1. A strategy was proposed in the 201 5 Tyler Grange report to compensate for habitat losses.

11 Mav 2016 Page 37 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

- 4.2. Informal consultation with Lucy Corner, ecologist for BANES, in June 201 5 (after the application was submitted) confirmed that she would require additional information that demonstrates that a subsequent application would be in conformity with planning policy protecting ecological resources.
- 4.3. To demonstrate compensation for loss of valuable habitats (whether UK Priority Habitats or not) the losses would need to be quantified, as would the value of the compensatory habitat provided.
- 4.4. The land that is contiguous with the site is owned by my client. This is not managed to maximise its biodiversity potential, and I consider it could be enhanced to compensate for habitat losses by means of a commitment to a management plan. Lucy Corner confirmed that this would be acceptable if it can be demonstrated that the impacts would indeed be mitigated (or more than
- mitigated). She stated that a management plan should be submitted with a new application to provide certainty that this can be delivered.
- 4.5. The management plan would also need to ensure that the valuable fauna species that are displaced by development could be accommodated on adjacent land. Development design would also need to ensure fauna species are not affected by, for instance, lighting.
- 5. Discussion and Conclusions
- 5.1 . The fact that the site has been identified in the draft BANES Placemaking Plan as supporting UK Priority Habitats does not preclude future development. Planning policy requires that for development to be acceptable then adequate compensation for habitat losses would be necessary.
- 5.2. Lucy Corner, ecologist at BANES, has confirmed in informal consultation what would be required in a future planning application to demonstrate that the impacts could be mitigated. The detail of the mitigation and enhancement strategy would be devised and agreement sought in advance of a planning submission, though I conclude that with the land controlled by my client that is
- available and outside of the proposed development area, there can be confidence that such a strategy is capable of being agreed, and controlled through planning.

Previous consideration of the land

- 1. The site to realise the vision totals approximately 2.2 hectares. A larger site of 8.3 hectares was promoted through the two previous Plan reviews and considered as RAD19. in the BANES's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in respect of the Core Strategy.
- 2. In 2013 pre-application advice was sought for the larger site which was later reduced to encompass the site now considered. The response largely depended on Inspectors comments from the last two Local Plan Inquiries and did not benefit from a site visit.
- 3. There are are number of distinct material differences between the RAD.19 site and the one now proposed which represents approximately 25% of the area. This highlights the need for a fresh approach. In particular:
- The land lies outside the Conservation area. The previous site included large areas of land within the Conservation Area.
- The land is screened by woodland to the west, degrees of screening to the north and east and residential development to the south. The previous site being larger did not benefit from such screening.
- The land is considered to be previously developed land. The previous larger site was considered as a whole with the proposed site only representing approximately 25% of that proposal.
- 4. In addition to the above material points it is important to understand the context of comments made by Local Plan Inspectors in respect of the wider site.

11 May 2016 Page 38 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

- 5. Comments from the Inspector of the Wansdyke Local Plan make clear that a larger area of land was initially promoted, but that this area was later reduced during the Plan Inquiry. The Inspectors introduction to site highlights this change. However, on reading specific references to the site and its characteristics the Inspectors comments clearly relate to the larger site and not the reduced area. (See paragraphs 9.26.1-9.26.4 of the Inspectors Report to the Wansdyke Local Plan). This is evidenced from the description of the site. At paragraph 9.26.4 it states, "In my view there is little to distinguish the the wooded and open land on the objection site
- from nearby fields and woods, and they appear to be part of the countryside which encloses and penetrates into this part of the town".
- 6. The site now proposed and the reduced site during that Plan Inquiry did not include wooded land. Clearly the reference to the site was based on the wider site and not 25% of the site which is also now being considered.
- 7. It should further be noted that since the first Local Plan Inquiry the definition of Previously Development Land (PLD) has changed three times (Annex C to PPG3, PPS3 and the NPPF).
- 8. In respect of previous Local Plan Inquiries, the definition used was taken from PPG3 Annex C and included a line at the end of the definition which was "to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings". This is an important point again highlighting the context of the site's consideration by Inspectors. The larger site was compared to the wider natural surroundings. The smaller site (also now proposed) was not compared with the wider site where characteristics were and still remain very different. It is a detailed point but an important one to give context to the Inspectors comments.
- 9. It is also now the case now that in determining PDL, comparison of a site's characteristics with the wider area has been removed from the Government's definition. Therefore material changes have occurred in terms of the site area considered and its relationship to its context.
- 10. In terms of blending back into the landscape, this has not been the case. Ariel pictures show this but more importantly it is clear when on site. In this respect it should be noted that; there are hard standings on the site which was acknowledged by the Inspector in 2006; an estate road still exists on site which shows up on BANES's proposals maps and on ariel photos; and an electricity sub station exists on site together with street lights that line the frontage of the site. All of these characteristics are clearly ones of previously developed land.
- 11. It is noted that in the glossary of the adopted BANES Core Strategy, the definition of previously developed land differs slightly from provisions contained in the NPPF. Here the position in summary is that a brownfield site does not automatically mean it is acceptable for development. Accordingly, this document and the Outline Planning Application provide the sustainability credentials of the site, how constraints and opportunities have been addressed, together with the placemaking vision for the that provides numerous benefits.

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?

The proposed changes relate to a specific site rather than a general change that may be could be suggested by other people making representations. For this reason participation is considered necessary.

Respondent Number: 7111 Comment Number: 1

Name: Ian Cannock Organisation:

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 39 of 956

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 \square Not Justified \square Not Consisten \square Not Effective \square
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA
Q4 Soundness Comment
I believe the green belt in BANES should be maintained. The only infill permitted should be inside existing Housing Development Boundaries.
My view is that Peasedown St John should not expand further beyond what has currently attained planning permission. Its facilities are strained at the moment and there is no significant growth in employment to justify any further population growth here. It is already a significant commuter town with the associated daily traffic problems particularly towards Bath on the A367.
In particular, the site known as PEA10 mentioned in some of the supporting evidence, should not be developed. Although it is outside the green belt it is an extremely prominent site visually and inside the "Landscape Setting" area around Peasedown St John and Shoscombe as defined in the draft Placemaking Plan. This area should remain undeveloped. We fully support the proposed Landscape Setting area here and we further recommend the green belt be extended here across this area to give added protection to this vital area.
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?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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):
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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):
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☑ The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □ The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA

11 May 2016 Page 40 of 956

business. However, the site is not necessarily the most appropriate location for a heavy industrial use notwithstanding its lawful use.

- 4.2 This is largely due to the fact that the surrounding context of the site is primarily residential. Bidwell Metals consider that it might be more appropriate to redevelop the site for housing and relocate the business to a purpose-built facility located away from residential uses.
- 4.3 Part of the site at Chapel Lane is located within the Housing Development Boundary as proposed in the Placemaking Plan. The easterly site, located adjacent to Bath Old Road lies adjacent to the development boundary, as shown below in figure 1 (shown with a black outline).
- 4.4 A small part of the site at Chapel Road is located within a proposed landscape setting designation (delineated by green hatchings) but this is largely obscured by trees and hedgerows and as such the site cannot be seen from the surrounding landscape.
- 4.5 Other than this proposed designation in the Placemaking Plan neither site is subject to any other designations such as an SSSI, AONB, SAC, or within a Flood Zone. The site at Chapel Road is located within the Conservation Area but the site to the west, adjacent to Bath Old Road has no designation.
- 4.6 It is clear that many nearby residents would prefer the recycling facility to not be located adjacent to existing residential properties and as such Bidwell Metals are happy to relocate to a purpose built facility that would cause less disturbance and amenity issues. However, without consideration that this land could be used for some other purpose it is not viable nor feasible for them to move.
- 4.7 Both sites are in close proximity to everyday facilities and services as well as methods of public transport and therefore are sustainably located. The accompanying indicative layout plan shows how approximately 70 dwellings could be accommodated comfortably between the two sites, with 45 dwellings at Chapel Road and 25 at land adjacent to Badminton Road, including Public Open Space. Plans in respect to both sites are included in appendix A and B to this document.
- 4.8 Few technical constraints have been identified which would outweigh the benefits of developing both sites and furthermore redeveloping brownfield land is a key priority of national planning policy in order to significantly boost the supply of housing.
- 4.9 Brownfield sites such as these, located adjacent to the Housing Development Boundary in sustainable locations, should be considered for development to ensure that BANES is continually found to have a five year housing land supply over the plan period and delivering such sites will avoid this happening again. In light of other constraints in BANES, such as the AONB, Green Belt and World Heritage Site, restricting housing growth in the Somer Valley and particularly within Midsomer Norton and Radstock where development should be most directed to would directly conflict with policies set out in the Bath Core Strategy to deliver 2,470 homes and policies within the NPPF.

Q5 Change Requested

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 In summary we have concerns regarding the emerging Placemaking Plan because the document does not sufficiently allocate the number of homes for each settlement within the Somer Valley and restricts growth in this area, failing to adapt and react to rapid change, a key requirement of the NPPF.
- 4.2 As a result, if the delivery of development continues to rely on neighbourhood plans as set out in part 4 of Policy SV1, areas such as Radstock and Midsomer Norton will have stymied growth for both housing and employment. However, if a permissive approach is set out for land, particularly brownfield land which presents significant redevelopment opportunities, adjacent to the Housing Development Boundary the plan will ensure choice and flexibility and allow further delivery of homes to occur should it be required.

11 Mav 2016 Page 41 of 956

4.3 Bidwell Metals control two brownfield sites which are sustainably located adjacent to the Housing Development Boundary and are therefore suitable for housing, which in turn will support the everyday key facilities and services located within both Radstock and Midsomer Norton. As national government policies aim to promote brownfield land as a priority over Greenfield sites, this land should be considered within the Placemaking Plan and can contribute to the rolling five year housing land supply.
4.4 Further to this we have assessed the constraints and opportunities of the site and have found that the development of this land would not give rise to any adverse impacts that would outweigh the substantial benefits that this development would bring.
4.5 Accordingly we consider that the site should be allocated, or at least a permissive approach set out in relation to this land should be considered in the emerging Placemaking Plan.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 234 Comment Number: 1 Name: Michael Fenton Organisation: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
Agent Name: Alistair Macdonald Agent Organisation: RPS Planning & Development
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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: SRA
Q4 Soundness Comment
Introduction
On behalf of our client, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, RPS Planning and Development (RPS) write in response to the consultation for the Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) Draft Placemaking Plan. This representation is made in the context of our client's land interest at Chilcompton Road, Midsomer Norton.
Background
The land subject to our client's interest is outlined on the attached plan. It comprises two parcels of agricultural land situated to the east and west of Chilcompton Road, on the southern edge of Midsomer Norton. The site is relatively flat, falls within flood zone 1, and does not fall within the Bath/ Bristol Green Belt, the AONB, or an area of special landscape

The site, including an additional land area to the west, was assessed within the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (April 2015), and the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) (November 2013). The report of findings identify the site as 'Chilcompton Road (MSN.38)' and 'South Of Follys Close /Riverside Gdns (MSN 38)' respectively.

interest.

11 Mav 2016 Page 42 of 956

Taylor Wimpey also submitted the site to the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) Call for Sites in January 2015 for assessment within the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, which will inform the JSP. The call for sites response form confirms the availability of land at Chilcompton Road for residential development. The JSP 'Call for Sites Schedule and Mapping' (November 2015) register identifies the land under refs. BN000102 and BN000103.

Q5 Change Requested

We note that the eastern parcel of the land at Chilcompton Road has been identified as a forming part of the 'Green Infrastructure' (GI) corridor which runs from north to south across Midsomer Norton. We are unclear on the specific features contained within the site that contribute towards the purpose of the GI and seek further clarification on this. Further, we would highlight the significant potential benefits that development would have on the site in terms of enhancing Green Infrastructure links through design, master-planning and landscaping.

Nonetheless, we would request that the wording of Policy NE2A is amended to ensure that protection of locally designated landscape areas is 'commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to the importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks' (para. 13 of the NPPF). I.e Landscape Settings designated in Policy NE2A should not be given the same weight as national designations such as the AONB.

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 also request that we are given the opportunity to appear and speak at any forthcoming Examination Hearings.

Respondent Number: 4808 Comment Number: Name: Mr and Mrs Currell	3 Organisation:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organisatio	on:	
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally consider the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	No is unsound, is it b	pecause it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not Consiste	en ☐ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA	Alternative Deve	elopment Site	

Q4 Soundness Comment

We consider that land to the rear of High Street (Site SR7 in the Options Document - November 2014), provides an alternative site which should be allocated for development in the draft Plan. The site is located immediately to the rear of the existing properties fronting High Street and to the north of the former builders' yard which is currently under development in accordance with planning permissions first granted in 2009 (amended 2012).

Site SR7 benefits from an existing access off High Street, capable of serving additional dwellings without significant improvement, and is well located in relation to existing facilities and amenities within the village (including primary school/nursery pre-school; church; village shop and public house/restaurant). There are a number of existing services running through the site capable of serving a modest housing development including: mains gas; water; public foul sewer and electricity.

Whilst the site falls within the AONB and, partly, within the Conservation Area, it is considered that a modest development on the southern part of Site SR7, utilising a 'conservation-led' approach, would not adversely affect the natural beauty and character of the AONB and, with careful design and use of traditional building materials and techniques, would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. Development restricted to the

11 May 2016 Page 43 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

southern part of the site would ensure that existing important views, both in to and out of the village, would be protected and/or enhanced.

It is noted that the Parish Council comments from the planning toolkit (December 2013/February 2014) confirmed, in respect of Site SR7, as follows:

- -Good location within village, well connected and with good access
- -No obvious environmental constraints or designations which would need mitigation in order to be acceptable for development
- -The site is well located and has lower environmental sensitivity to change

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

-The site would need to be sensitively designed and high quality development required in order to be acceptable within/adjacent to the conservation area.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?	✓

To examine alternative sites.

Respondent Number: 6411 Comment Num	ber: 1					
Name:	Orga	nisation: Em	nergy Ltd			
Agent Name: Georgina Tibbs	Agen	nt Organisatio	on: Barton V	Villmore		
Further Information available in the original comm	nent?	No .	Attachments	s sent with the	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is leg Does the respondent consider the document is sou If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking	und? No	0	·	,	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸 Not Justified 🔽		Not Consiste	en 🗸	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Pl	lan . Alte	ernative Deve	elonment Sit	Α		

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA

The Placemaking Plan proposes no allocations for residential development at Hinton Blewett. One very small site (SR9) will be incorporated within the settlement boundary to provide 2-3 dwellings.

This strategy of minimal growth at Hinton Blewett is not consistent with national policy. The Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306) states that "all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas— and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence".

In our view the proposed approach at Hinton Blewett, which involves no allocations and the designation as Local Green Space of our clients' land south of Lower Road (one of the only sites proposed for development) is tantamount to a blanket restriction on development at the village.

That approach is therefore not consistent with government policy on the delivery of sustainable development and is not sound.

The failure to allocate land at Hinton Blewett is also symptomatic of wider issues of soundness with the plan.

First, it is important to note that the plan is being advance within the strategic context of the preparation of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (WoE SHMA) has been

11 May 2016 Page 44 of 956

published and indicates a need for housing within the area which is considerably higher than that currently being planned for. Barton Willmore's own

assessment (copy enclosed), submitted on behalf of clients to the recent JSP issues and options consultation, indicates that actual housing need is significantly above the level suggested by the WoE SHMA.

In the context of the evidence of need in the Housing Market Area, the Placemaking Plan should, in accordance with paragraph 14 NPPF, to incorporate sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.

The timing of preparation of the Placemaking Plan already fits uncomfortably with the JSP Core Strategy Review timetable. If it does not incorporate sufficient flexibility by identifying additional sites to boost supply, the Placemaking Plan risks being overtaken by events. Unless the Placemaking Plan adopts sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, it will not be sound in that it will not be consistent with national policy, justified nor positively prepared.

Second, the Placemaking Plan does not provide an updated housing supply trajectory. It therefore does not demonstrate how it would contribute to the delivery of the Core Strategy's requirements for market and affordable housing. For this reason, the plan therefore fails the tests of being justified and effective.

Summary

In summary, there are a number of issues of soundness with the policies for Hinton Blewett and the housing policies of the plan generally, including:

- Failure to support the contribution of Hinton Blewett to delivering sustainable development and indeed adopting a negative strategy of seeking to block development (contrary to national policy).
- Failure to produce a positively prepared plan which has regard to its strategic context and adopts sufficient flexibility to respond to impending rapid change (again also contrary to national policy).
- Failure to demonstrate the contribution of the plan to delivering a supply of market and affordable housing.

Q5 Change Requested

In light of these issues of soundness and the government's view that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, the plan should allocate a site for development at Hinton Blewett.

This could be achieved through allocation of our clients' land at Lower Road, for residential development. The site is available and capable of being developed to deliver up to 19 dwellings. We enclose the design and access statement prepared for our clients' recent planning application which demonstrates how the site could be developed.

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:	6411	Comment Number:	2					
Name:		(Organis	sation: Er	mergy Ltd			
Agent Name: Georgina	Tibbs	,	Agent C	Organisat	ion: Barton \	Willmore		
Further Information ava	ilable in t	he original comment?	N	lo	Attachment	s sent with the	comment?	Yes
Does the respondent co	nsider the	e document is legally c	omplia	nt? (Tick	if indicated '	yes') \square		
Does the respondent co	nsider the	e document is sound?	No					
If the respondent consid	ders the D	raft Placemaking Plan	is unso	ound, is it	because it is	(ticked where i	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	✓	Not Justified 🗹	No	ot Consist	ten 🗸	Not Effective	✓	

11 Mav 2016 Page 45 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA

Q4 Soundness Comment

For the BANES Placemaking Plan to be found sound under the four tests of soundness as defined by paragraph 182 of the NPPF, the Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The Plan as drafted is not positively prepared and plans for the minimum housing requirement.

The plan is being advanced within the strategic context of the preparation of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (WoE SHMA) has been published and indicates a need for housing within the area which is considerably higher than that currently being planned for. Barton Willmore's own assessment (copy enclosed), submitted on behalf of clients to the recent JSP issues and options consultation, indicates that actual housing need is significantly above the level suggested by the WoE SHMA. The Plan should seek to meet an Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for the Joint Spatial Plan area of the West of England. There is no reference to the JSP in the Draft Plan. All Councils preparing new plans are required to comply with the Duty to Cooperate and BaNES appears to be allocating sites and working with a housing requirement that does not plan for the OAHN for the Wider Bristol Area. Unless the Placemaking Plan adopts sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, it will not be sound in that it will not be consistent with national policy, justified nor positively prepared.

The Placemaking Plan proposes only one allocation for Cameley-Temple Cloud. This is a Site that has planning permission (70 dwellings). The strategy for minimal growth at Temple Cloud is not consistent with National Policy. The Draft Placemaking Plan should encourage new residential development rather than restrict. The Planning Practice Guidance (Para 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306) states that "blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence."

The Placemaking Plan does not provide an updated housing supply trajectory. It therefore does not demonstrate how it would contribute to the delivery of the Core Strategy's requirements for market and affordable housing. For this reason, the plan therefore fails the tests of being justified and effective.

In summary, there are a number of issues of soundness including:

- Failure to support the contribution of Cameley-Temple Cloud to delivering sustainable development and indeed adopting a negative strategy of seeking to restrict development (contrary to national policy).
- Failure to produce a positively prepared plan which has regard to the JSP context and adopts insufficient flexibility to respond to impending rapid change (again also contrary to national policy).
- Failure to demonstrate the contribution of the plan to delivering a supply of market and affordable housing.

Q5 Change Requested

The Draft Placemaking Plan should allocate further Sites for development in the Rural settlements.

All settlements can pay a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, the plan should allocate further sustainable sites for development in the Cameley-Temple Cloud area.

The Placemaking Plan should identify land at the Former Garden Nursery site in Temple Cloud as an allocation for residential development. The site covers an area of approximately 0.49 ha and comprises of areas of hardstanding and shrubbery. The hardstanding is what remains of the former garden nursery. The developable area has the capacity for 15 dwellings at an approximate density of 30 dph. However, given the location and context the sketch layout enclosed illustrates a layout for 10 dwellings.

The Former Garden Nursery site is separated from the Housing Development Boundary of Temple Cloud. However, it is located adjacent to the A37, opposite a cluster of existing buildings in the area known as Cholwell. The proposed development of 10 dwellings will add to this cluster of dwellings and the site is well related to Temple Cloud being less than a 350 metre walk to the centre of the village. The site is well served by frequent bus services (376 and 379) to Bristol and Wells. The north and south bound bus stops are within a 350 metre walk from the site.

11 Mav 2016 Page 46 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Technical studies have been undertaken these studies demonstrate:

- -The existing access is able to provide a safe access and egress to serve potential development;
- -There are no significant ecological constraints that are likely to affect the principle of development;
- -The area identified for development is within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding).

We enclose the design and access statement prepared for our clients' recent planning application which demonstrates how the site could be developed.

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?

Significant issues require discussion at examination.

Respondent Number: 7120 Comment Number: 1				
Name: Guy Boyer Org	anisation:			
Agent Name: Veronica Barbaro Age	nt Organis	sation: GVA		
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachmer	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally com	pliant? (Ti	ck if indicated	'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?				
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is u	ınsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸 Not Justified 🗸	Not Cons	sisten 🗸	Not Effective 🔽	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alt	ternative D	Development S	Site	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA				

Q4 Soundness Comment

I write to you on behalf of our client, Guy Boyer to make representations to Bath and North East Somerset Council's (BaNES) Draft Placemaking Plan Pre-Submission Version. Our client is a land owner in the village of Chew Magna, and has an interest in land at Chew Magna Manor.

Having most recently been used by Sisters of the Order of Our Lady of the Missions as a convent and boarding school, the site is now derelict and our client has ambitions to bring it back into an active use. We previously made representation to promote the site in the BaNES Placemaking Plan Launch Document (July 2013). The ownership of the site has since changed and we write again with the aim of ensuring that this policy document takes account of the development potential of this site and its ability to meet the development needs at Chew Magna.

A pre-application enquiry was submitted to BaNES in July 2012 (ref. 12/02273/PREAPP), upon which comment was received by both BaNES Officers and Historic England (known as English Heritage at the time).

Site and Context

The site comprises land on either side of Dark Lane, Chew Magna and includes the grounds of the former Chew Magna Manor (excluding the Manor House itself) and former school, and the former school outdoor activities area which is made up of hard standing (former tennis courts) and grassed area (former sports field). The grounds of the Manor House school and former outdoor activities area (which will be collectively referred to as 'the site') are both located in the village of Chew Magna. A site location plan has been enclosed which shows the extent of the area under discussion (Attachment 1).

The primary point of access is from the junction of Dark Lane and Winford Road to the south, the latter of which forms one of the main highways through the village. The grounds of the Manor House and former school activity area are

11 May 2016 Page 47 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

separated by Dark Lane, which joins Battle Lane to the north.

The grounds of the Manor House, which is a Grade II* listed 17th building, are occupied by a number of buildings. These other buildings comprise a range of 20th century structures associated with the former school use, including a range of timber buildings, swimming pool and a 2-3 storey classroom and dormitory block. The Winford Brook runs to the north of the site, and its course partially runs through the grounds of Manor House.

The school buildings, structures and playing fields are derelict, unsightly and in poor condition, negatively impacting on the setting of the listed Manor House which is currently undergoing refurbishment works

The land to the west of Dark Lane previously served as the tennis courts and playing field for the school. Both still remain on site, though have fallen into disrepair and dereliction since the school closed. The playing fields and tennis courts are bordered to the north and west by housing as well as further housing to the south of Winford Road.

Chew Magna Policy Context

Since the BaNES Placemaking Plan Launch Document (July 2013) the Council adopted their Core Strategy (July 2014), this is Part 1 of the Local Plan.

Chew Magna is described in the Draft Placemaking Plan as follows:

"The Chew Valley is to the West of the District, and has strong links to Bristol. Key villages are Chew Magna, Chew Stoke and Pensford which are washed over by the Green Belt. These Green Belt villages are at the junctions to several routes providing good access to Bristol in particular. Chew Magna acts as a local service hub to the surrounding villages and hosts a range of facilities. "

The village is clearly an important hub and provides services to the surrounding area; a similar description is also included in the adopted Core Strategy. Development in such a location is promoted by Policy DW1 d. of the Core Strategy.

As the Village of Chew Magna is washed over by the Bristol and Bath Green belt, it is subject to both national and local Green belt policies for any development proposals. The site also borders the Settlement Boundary for the village. This Settlement Boundary has been drawn tightly round the village and is divided into an east and a west section, according to the Adopted Proposals Map 6 (Attachment 2). This division of the settlement boundary is illogical as there is clearly development between the two sections of the settlement.

Excluding a substantial amount of built form around the periphery of the settlement boundary creates an unusual gap between the core of the village and the developed west further along Windford Road. This area is suitable for development without affecting the openness of the Green Belt and there is no distinct identity separating the west section of the village from the east so there is no issue of coalescence.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also lends weight to construction on previously developed sites in the Green Belt at paragraph 89, the exact wording is:

"limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development."

Policy CP8 of the BaNES Cores Strategy (2014) clearly states that it will protect the openness of the Green Belt 'in accordance with national planning policy'. Therefore paragraph 89 of the NPPF should be referred to when considering this site.

In addition, while the Core Strategy seeks to restrict any form of development in the Green Belt and therefore does not generally allow for new residential development in villages within the Green Belt, it also highlights that Chew Magna is a key village which 'acts as a local service hub to the surrounding villages and hosts a range of facilities (para 5.10). Therefore in terms of existing services and facilities,

Chew Magna is a sustainable and appropriate location to accommodate limited new residential development. Furthermore there needs to be a balance between the preservation of the Green Belt and ensuring the future economic and social sustainability of a settlement, particularly in an area which has an acute need for new housing including affordable housing (Core Strategy para 5.12, SHMA 2013 Draft Update). A review of the latest Census data also indicates that the proportion of young people and young families 25 to 44 year olds only constitute 9% of the villages total

11 Mav 2016 Page 48 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

population) against a significantly higher proportion of people aged 60 and over (36%). Without the provision of new market and affordable homes, the village's potential to attract a younger population which will support local services and facilities and contribute to the local economy is restricted.

Potential for Development When considering sites in Chew Magna to potentially accommodate new housing the site immediately presents itself as an apt opportunity to accommodate homes within the existing developed area of the Village.

The site is previously developed land, falling within the main developed area of Chew Magna (if not defined as such by the current Settlement Boundary), and would clearly be preferential to any development upon Greenfield sites that would encroach further into the Green Belt. The principle of development on the site has therefore already been established. In this regard, the site also benefits from relative visual containment, with only limited visibility between the site and the surrounding countryside. This will aid in minimising any impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.

Furthermore, there will be a palpable enhancement to the Conservation Area by bringing this redundant and steadily decaying site back into use, and an appropriate design could certainly ensure that this is achieved with sensitivity and deference to the local character. In particular, the removal of the derelict school buildings and sensitive development of the site will hugely improve the setting of the Grade II* listed Manor House resulting in clear conservation gain.

Our client has previously considered the development potential of the site, and it has been determined that the site could accommodate approximately 15 dwellings ranging in types and sizes including a proportion of affordable homes (subject to viability).

Development appraisals undertaken upon the site have underscored that this development must be delivered as majority market-housing in order to be a viable proposal.

It is therefore critical that the Placemaking Plan takes account of the development potential of the site, and to recognise this through a redrawing of the Settlement Boundary and the formal allocation of this currently derelict site for residential development.

Conclusions Our client's site is a redundant, previously developed site which, in its current state, is having a harmful impact upon the Conservation Area and setting of the Grade II* listed Manor House. While this is a prime location in the folds of the developed area of Chew Magna, current policy in the form of the Green Belt and restrictive settlement boundary current prevents a policy-compliant scheme from coming forward to allow the much needed sensitive redevelopment of the site.

Chew Magna is identified in both the adopted Core Strategy and Draft Placemaking Plan as providing a range of services. It is a sustainable, well connected location which could deliver much needed homes in BaNES, while increasing the viability of local business in Chew Magna, development here is in accordance with Policy DW1 of the Core Strategy. The site also conforms to CP8 as it meets the criteria of development in the Green Belt, as set out by the NPPF.

We therefore urge the local planning authority to review the current constraints upon development at this site in order to facilitate its necessary redevelopment. As a minimum, the site should be incorporated into the Settlement Boundary and allocated for residential development

and anotated for residential development
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Respondent Number: 7124 Comment Number: 1

Name: Organisation: Austen Smith

Agent Name: Tom Rocke Associates

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?

11 Mav 2016 Page 49 of 956

No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA	

Q4 Soundness Comment

The following comments were made on behalf of the current representor in response to the Placemaking Plan Options Consultation:

Timsbury is a sustainable settlement that has a good range of community facilities and public transport services to the City of Bath. It is one of the largest of the RA1 villages in closest proximity to Bath, but with the advantage that it is at the outer limit of the Green Belt, and land to the south of the village is not constrained by the designation. Timsbury therefore offers a significant opportunity for accommodating needs for development that cannot be met in Bath, and for which sites must be found beyond the Green Belt.

A quantum of residential development approximating to 50 dwellings is suggested in the PMP. However, this figure would seem to be conservative bearing in mind the facilities that the village can offer, its proximity to Bath with sustainable transport links to it, and its comparative freedom from planning policy and environmental constraints, particularly to the south of the village.

The PMP identifies three options for development, one of which is a brownfield site close to the centre of the village and is therefore preferred by both the Parish Council and the local planning authority. The PMP canvasses the suggestion that the balance of the housing requirement be provided on one of two sites, one of which is the land at Loves Hill that is owned by my client.

My client's site is an entirely suitable site for development, having no environmental constraints being outside the conservation area and not in a sensitive landscape area. It is well-contained between the existing Southlands Drive estate development to the east, and existing development to the west. The Loves Hill frontage to the west of the site is already occupied by dwellings, and therefore the site would not extend development beyond a clear existing limit of built form into open countryside. It would replicate the existing pattern of development comprising Southlands Drive which occupies the south-facing land together with land on the crest of the hill.

The Council suggests that only part of the site would be developed and the remainder provides an opportunity for open space. However, the PMP makes separate provision for Green Space and there is no requirement for additional provision in this location. Moreover, it would be a profligate use of land that is suitable for development which, if not required during the current plan period, will provide for a further phase to meet inevitable future requirements upon Plan review. Given the constraints on development land in the district, owing to its extensive coverage by Green Belt and other environmental designations, the requirement for future development land in sustainable village locations on the outer edge of the Green Belt with good public transport services to the City, is an inevitability.

Emerging Policy Approach: SR13 is therefore supported in principle. However, the capacity of about 25 dwellings on a site that extends to 2.1 hectares would seem to be a profligate use of land. The site has capacity for 50-60 dwellings. If the full capacity is not required during the current plan period, then a phasing arrangement can be considered to allow for further development to come forward upon review of the housing requirement, or the Council being unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Given the constraints elsewhere in the district, it is inevitable that further housing land at Timsbury will be required in

due course in accordance with a sustainable development strategy. Further development will also contribute to sustaining the viability of existing community facilities and bus services to Bath and other destinations.

The alternative option at Lansdown Cresent is much less contained in visual and landscape terms. It would extend a

11 Mav 2016 Page 50 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

wedge of development into open countryside with expansive views towards Farmborough Common. The flat terrain would provide little in the way of topographical boundaries or containment of the site, particularly to the north and east. The fact that the site was identified as a Visually Important Green Space during the preparation of the Adopted Local Plan, and the presence of a viewing plinth adjacent to the site, endorses its comparative environmental sensitivity. It is also understood that the landowner is only willing to make part of the site available, which would provide little in the way of future expansion land.

Summary

Emerging Policy Approach: SR13 is supported to the extent that it identifies land to the north of Loves Hill as a residential development option. However, the capacity should be increased to approximately 60 dwellings. The requirement for development to be 'conservation-led' is unnecessary bearing in mind that the site is not within a Conservation Area, and there is no need for land north of the site to be maintained as a green space bearing in mind the Local Green Space options proposed elsewhere in the village. To require additional green space beyond the requirements to which the community gives rise would be a profligate use of suitable

development land that is required to meet housing requirements during the plan period, and possibly those arising from a future review of the plan.

Subject to an appropriate policy approach to the site, I can confirm that the owner is willing to make the site available for development, and to work with the Council towards an appropriate development framework for it.

Objection is now raised to the failure to respond to this suggestion and to allocate land identified on the Plan at Annex 1 (Site SR13) for housing development. For reasons set out above it is a more sustainable development option in environmental terms than the site north of Lansdown Crescent (Site SR15 on the Plan at Annex 1) that the Council is continuing to pursue through Policy SR15 of the draft Plan. It is contained between existing development, and does not form part of an expansive landscape with distant views to important landscape features such as Farmborough Common. Moreover, the site is available, and has the capacity to deliver a greater quantum of development that is more appropriate to the village and necessary to deliver the objectively assessed housing needs for the District.

Failure to allocate the subject land, and to allow for suitable development opportunities at sustainable settlements, means that the Plan has not been 'positively prepared', nor is it 'effective' or 'consistent with national policy' that seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

Q5 Change Requested

Emerging Policy Approach: SR13 is supported to the extent that it identifies land to the north of Loves Hill as a residential development option. However, the capacity should be increased to approximately 60 dwellings. Amend Policy SR15 to delete land east of St Mary's Primary School and north of Lansdown Crescent and replace it with land north of Loves Hill as identified on the Plan at Annex 1 to these representations (Site SR13).

Does the Respondent w	ish to part	ticipate at the	Examination (ticked if v	/es)?

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

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 16

Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 51 of 956

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: SRA
Q4 Soundness Comment
High Littleton & Halatrow
High Littleton is an RA1 Settlement and Hallatrow an RA2 Settlement which between them have been identified to provide a minimum of 65 dwellings.
It is unacceptable for the Placemaking Plan to identify a constraint to development in the form of the village school and not provide a plan for overcoming this constraint.
If it is impossible that the existing school to grow its capacity then it should be accepted that over time children from future development in the settlement will displace the children being brought in form outlying settlements and other provision planned for these.
Further a suitable site to provide for the future housing requirements of the settlements has been identified on the South East side of High Littleton and benefits from a robust evidence base in respect of its suitability.
Land South of the A39 High Littleton
A planning application 14.00038/OUT was made on the 06/01/14 this site for approximately 71 dwellings. The application was supported with a full set of technical evidence and accompanied by a draft master plan which was considered by the Planning Authority and refused.
The reasons given for refusal can be overcome and indeed the application was to be subject to appeal but this was withdrawn by the applicant following a decision relating to other sites within BANES which disaggregated the housing land supply. This appeal decision has subsequently been quashed.
We recommend that this land be allocated for development up to 71 dwellings, that Diagrams 2 & 9 (Vol. 4 Somer Valley) be rebased to an accurate map and this land excluded from Landscape Setting & Green Setting respectively.
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?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.
Respondent Number: 7133 Comment Number: 5 Name: Mrs E Russell Organisation: Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning Further Information available in the original comment? No. Attachments cent with the comment?

11 May 2016 Page 52 of 956

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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA
Q4 Soundness Comment
Land south of Loves Hill, Timsbury (identified as Tim 2 in the B&NES SHLAA) provides a suitable, available and achievable alternative site for housing provision in the village. Comparing the evidence, the B&NES SHLAA assesses this alternative site as having an impact on landscape character which overall would be low. The SHLAA exercise carried out by the Parish Council concluded that the Tim 2 site is a potential allocation for development subject to on- or off-site mitigation. The site south of Loves Hill has the further advantage of delivering housing on a greater but modest scale, with a proportionate increase in the delivery of affordable homes in a District where affordable housing need is 'high'.
Q5 Change Requested
Land south of Loves Hill, Timsbury (Tim 2) constitutes a suitable and available sustainable housing development site, which is capable of making a positive contribution to housing delivery both in the village and the wider Rural Areas policy area of the District.
The site is the subject of a planning application for 45 dwellings, including the provision of 18 affordable homes to meet local housing needs (planning reference 15/04980/OUT). The supporting documentation demonstrates a technically sound, sustainable development proposal, whose impacts can be mitigated. This site should be allocated for housing either as an alternative to or in addition to the Policy SR15 site to ensure that the draft Plan is positively prepared in terms of meeting objectively assessed housing need. The planning application documents can be made available as necessary, but for ease of reference a site location plan (drawing CL78-2 Rev B) is attached to these representations.
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 enable us to explain to the Inspector the land south of Loves Hill site and its scheme and sustainability credentials in more detail.
We wish to advise that at this stage we would like to participate at the oral stage of the Examination to enable us to explain to the Inspector the land south of Loves Hill site and its scheme and sustainability credentials in more detail.
Respondent Number: 7222 Comment Number: 1
Name: Phil Rigg Organisation: Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited
Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited 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

11 May 2016 Page 53 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA

Q4 Soundness Comment

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 PlanningSphere has been instructed to make representations to the emerging Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) Placemaking Plan on behalf of owners of land at Bridge Place Farm, Camerton, BA2 OPS. This representation is submitted to BANES consultation on its Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission Version) in accordance with the consultation timetable and builds upon our previous representation submitted to the Council in January 2015, in respect of its consultation on the Place Making Plan Options Draft.
- 1.2 The representations should also be read with the following enclosed documentation:
- Site Location Plan.
- Annotated Photographs
- Environment Agency Flood Map
- 1.3 The 0.54ha site is located in the village of Camerton off of Camerton Hill to the east of the residential development known as The Daglands and to the south of the Cam Brook and Bridge Place Road. The site comprises a parcel of grazing land situated between a public footpath and track to the north and the Cam Brook to the south. Bridge Place Farm and associated outbuildings and ménage lie to the south east of the site.
- 1.4 The site is being promoted for a self-build/custom-build scheme for up to 4-5 units.
- 1.5 It is proposed that Camerton's settlement boundary is redrawn to include the whole site and/or the site is allocated for small-scale residential development in the Placemaking Plan.
- 1.6 We reserve the right to submit further representations and supporting evidence in response to subsequent stages of the development plan-making process.
- 2.0 Relevant background information
- 2.1 The land at Bridge Place Farm, Camerton is being promoted for up to 4-5 selfbuild/custom-build plots for people who wish build their own homes, or commission a builder to do so on their behalf.
- 2.2 The self-build / custom-build model of development differs from the traditional 'top-down' model operated by volume house builders. The custom-build philosophy that underpins the site promotion seeks to offer customer involvement and choice, to engender a strong sense of belonging and ownership and could also apply to the proposed affordable units.
- 2.3 The Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic planning framework provided in the Council's Core Strategy which was formally adopted by BANES in July 2014 and will deliver the detailed housing and employment requirements established in the Core Strategy and its strategic objectives. By allocating the site at Camerton for housing, this contributes to meeting the strategic objectives set out in the Core Strategy, particularly with respect to meeting housing needs in the District. Additional housing in this location will also support existing rural services and facilities.

- 4.0 Suitability of Land at Camerton for Development
- 4.1 The land at Bridge Place Farm, Camerton is identified in the accompanying Site Location Plan. It is proposed that the

11 Mav 2016 Page 54 of 956

site could comfortably support between 4-5 self-build/custombuild dwellings on the southern part of the site.

Transport and Access

- 4.2 The site is accessed off Camerton Hill via an existing priority junction. The landowner controls land either side of the existing access which would enable the remodeling of the existing access bellmouth to achieve 2.4 x 43m visibility splays in each direction. There is also an opportunity to provide footways. The site is also the subject of a live planning application (Ref. 15/05003/FUL) for a new proposed vehicular access at Bridge Place Farm which would help to facilitate the self-build scheme being promoted at the site.
- 4.3 The site lies centrally within Camerton in close proximity to the primary school. There is also bus access to Bath, which is approximately 10km from Camerton.
- 4.4 There is an existing public footpath that runs around the site that could be retained in situ as part of any development proposal.

Utilities and Services

4.5 The site benefits from full mains utilities including foul drainage, gas, electricity and telecoms.

Flood Risk

4.6 The Environment Agency Indicative Flood Map indicates that only a relatively small area of the northern part of the site directly adjacent to the Cam Brook is within Flood Zone 3 and therefore not suitable for development. There is sufficient land available for up to 4-5 dwellings in the remainder of the site which is not affected by any flood risk constraints.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 4.7 The application site is grazed and managed, and there are no known protected species present. The site is open with tree root protection zones only affecting part of the site boundary.
- 4.8 The Cam Brook and surrounding vegetation may function as a bat commuting corridor. This will be established by an ecology walkover survey in due course, however, on the basis of an initial site inspection the site is relatively unconstrained.

Landscape.

4.9 The Bath / Bristol Green Belt terminates to the north of the Cam Brook. The site is not subject to any landscape or other site specific designations. The site lies within the Cam Brook valley floor and is well contained in landscape terms. Development could be absorbed into the wider landscape, subject to appropriate design and landscaping mitigation.

5.0 Conclusions

5.1 In order to continue to demonstrate a five year land supply and achieve delivery of the overall housing numbers set out in the Core Strategy there must be a step change in housing delivery in the authority area. Whilst BANES has made some limited efforts through its Infrastructure Delivery Programme to achieve this, we contend that they have not made sufficient progress in proactively addressing many of the planning and lead in time issues that apply to sites identified in the housing trajectory and the draft Placemaking Plan. This challenge is further exacerbated by the Council's reliance on delivery of a significant number of sites on previously developed land or that suffer from other constraints. Furthermore, BANES' assumptions on the delivery of sites with the benefit of planning permission are also overly optimistic and BANES is also overly reliant on development through the volume housing building model.

11 Mav 2016 Page 55 of 956

- 5.2 Given this BANES needs to have additional flexibility built into its Placemaking Plan and other delivery documents. However, the approach taken in the Placemaking Plan Options Document particularly for locations in the Somer Valley is both highly overly optimistic, not grounded in a clear understanding of the constraints and difficulties of taking sites forward in the current market and is highly inflexible given its reluctance to identify new greenfield sites that could contribute to housing in sustainable locations. We therefore consider that the Placemaking Plan should identify a range of additional sites in the Somer Valley, including its rural areas, to give the Plan the necessary degree of flexibility that is required to conform with Core Strategy objectives, taking into account the additional employment opportunities that the new Enterprise Zone will offer.
- 5.3 The land is at Bridge Place Farm, Camerton is capable of fulfilling this need for flexibility being an unconstrained site that offers an innovative opportunity that can be delivered quickly and avoids the delivery constraints of the standard house building model as well as meeting the sustainability requirements of the NPPF. The custom build philosophy, that underpins the promotion of this site, seeks to offer customer involvement and choice, and to engender a strong sense of belonging and ownership.
- 5.4 We therefore respectfully request that Camerton's settlement boundary is redrawn to include the whole application site and/or the site is allocated for residential development in the Placemaking Plan. The site also presents an opportunity for the Council to help meet the requirement set out in paragraph 50 of the NPPF to provide sites for people who wish to build their own homes in a sustainable location.

n	5	Change	Ren	uested
u		Change	IVE	uesteu

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?

Due to the complexity of these issues and the need to test evidence, we wish to participate at the oral examination.

Respondent Number: 7222 Comment Number:	r: 4
Name: Phil Rigg	Organisation:
Agent Name: Claire Durbin	Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited
Further Information available in the original comment?	nt? No Attachments sent with the comment? N
Does the respondent consider the document is legally of	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	d? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	an 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: SRA	

Q4 Soundness Comment

Paragraph 61 of the Draft Placemaking Plan states that Camerton village meets the Core strategy criteria of a RA2 settlement. There are no proposed site allocations within Camerton due to landscape, highways and conservation issues that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. During the Placemaking Plan period development could come forward within the housing development boundary. Any potential site would be considered on its individual merits against national and local planning policy.

We consider that this is overly restrictive as the allocation of the site at Bridge Place Farm for self-build units would provide an innovative and flexible solution for meeting diverse housing needs both in the Somer Valley and the wider

11 Mav 2016 Page 56 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

district. This approach has strong policy backing through the Housing and Planning Bill and paragraph 50 of the NPPF and would further support the NPPF's commitment to sustainable development particularly with respect to the "social" role contained in its definition of sustainable development since the custom build philosophy engenders a strong sense of belonging and ownership, which will help to embed such sustainability goals, differing from the traditional 'top-down' model operated by volume house builders.

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?
Due to the complexity of these issues and the need to test evidence, we wish to participate at the oral examination.
Respondent Number: 4808 Comment Number: 1
Name: Mr and Mrs Currell Organisation:
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SR6
Q4 Soundness Comment
As presently proposed, two sites are proposed to be allocated for residential development in East Harptree with a combined capacity of about 20 dwellings. One of those sites (Site SR6) is currently subject to an, as yet, undetermined planning application (ref: 14/05836/FUL) for 8 no.dwellings. This application was recommended for approval by the council's Development Management Committee on 26 August 2015, subject to conditions and subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement. To date, that agreement has not been completed. It is known that the Parish Council did not support the planning application on the grounds that the proposed development would be wholly out of keeping with surrounding properties and the village as a whole.
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?
To examine alternative sites.
Respondent Number: 6432 Comment Number: 1
Name: Ms Claire Frost and Mr Nick Burroughes Organisation:
Agent Name: Meghan Rossiter Agent Organisation: Terlow King Planning
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 Mav 2016 Page 57 of 956

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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SR6
Q4 Soundness Comment
We support the proposed allocation of my client's land (SR6) as one of two residential development allocations at East Harptree. The site's allocation is fully in accordance with national planning policy and the adopted policies of the Core Strategy. As demonstrated by the Council's resolution to grant permission in August 2015 for application ref. 14/05836/FUL, this site is available and deliverable.
Q5 Change Requested
In respect of the policy requirements and principles we ask that point 10 is amended, as below, to reflect the ecological assessment findings submitted to the Council as part of the approved planning application. Those assessments concluded that the loss of the subsidiary sett was acceptable. 10. Any development on this site must respond appropriately to any badgers present on-site, based on an ecological assessment.
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?
with does the Respondent reer it is necessary to participate at the Examination.
Respondent Number: 7121 Comment Number: 3
Respondent Number: 7121 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry
Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry
Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited
Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
Name: Agent Name: Claire Durbin Further Information available in the original comment? Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Name: Agent Name: Claire Durbin Further Information available in the original comment? Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No
Name: Agent Name: Claire Durbin Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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):
Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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 □
Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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
Name: Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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: LGB55

11 May 2016 Page 58 of 956

The land in our clients' ownership, which extends to circa 03ha, has been undeveloped and from records supplied by the previous owner of the site, we have deduced that it was used for a maximum of 12 No. private allotments during the

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

period 1971-1999. At the time of our client's acquisition of the site in 2001 the number private allotments reduced to 2 No. users and the site was vacated shortly thereafter. The former site did not have a water supply and nor did it benefit from a vehicular access suitable for allotment use. The site is now overgrown with scrub and self-seeded trees and fulfils no beneficial purpose.

Land owned by the Council

The adjacent Council owned land, which is subject to the proposed Local Green Space allocation, comprises a small number of allotments which are in partial use with a number of vacant and unused plots. As with the land in Messrs Betts and Perry's ownership the Council allotments do not benefit from a water supply, ancillary storage buildings nor a suitable vehicular access. The remaining Council owned land in the area we have identified as a potential development site is public open space that abuts Ringwood Road to the east and the Council allotment site to the west.

Planning history

comprehensive redevelopment planning application proposal was progressed by Curo who had a subject to planning agreement with our clients. The application site comprised land owned by our clients and adjacent land owned by the Council, with vehicular access facilitated over land formerly in Curo's control. The details of the application are summarised as follows:

ReferenceDescriptionjDecision

13/03835/FUL PINS Ref: 2218830Erection of 11 houses and 10 flatsRefused 20 January 2014 Dismissed at appeal 22 September 2014

The dismissed appeal proposal by Curo was in our view poorly conceived and constituted over-development of the site, and the refusal was justified in planning terms. However, we have advised our clients that it would be possible, with the inclusion of the adjacent Council owned land, to formulate a more appropriate and less dense scheme of development that would be acceptable in planning terms.

We understand that the Council owned part of the proposed allocation site which was historically subject to WW2 bomb damage, with rubble from damaged buildings being back filled into the site. Although the Council owned part of the site was previously included within the Council's statutory allotment site it is understood that this land was never used for cultivation because of soil pollution concerns.

A Site Investigation Report prepared by JPB dated April 2013 was included in the aforementioned dismissed appeal application submission. This report confirms the contamination potential of the prospective allotment site. We further note that at the recent appeal the Council stated that the cost of decontamination would be 'excessive' for allotment provision.

We also note that demand for new allotments has declined. A report from 2014 states that over the period 2010-2014 demand for new allotments in Bath has reduced from 600 to 193, and that there are currently vacant plots at existing allotment sites at Monksdale Road and Moorfields Road (see minutes from Allotment Forum, 3rd June 2014).

We are concerned that the Council do not have the capital resources to decontaminate their allotment land, and put in the necessary infrastructure to enable their allotments to be beneficially used with the appropriate water and vehicular access infrastructure. Our suggested mixed-use proposal would, through the provision of housing enable the whole site to be decontaminated as part of a mixed-use scheme comprising housing, allotments, open space and the necessary supporting infrastructure as part of a comprehensive scheme.

The Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic planning framework provided in the Council's Core Strategy which was formally adopted by BANES in July 2014 and will deliver the detailed housing and employment requirements established in the Core Strategy and its strategic objectives. By allocating the site at Lansdown View for housing, this contributes to meeting the strategic objectives set out in the Core Strategy, particularly with respect to meeting housing needs in Bath which has not been delivered at the expected rate.

11 Mav 2016 Page 59 of 956

Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

Respondent Number: 270 Comment Num	ber: 3			
Name: Simon Tofts	ne: Simon Tofts Organisation: Blue Cedar Homes			
gent Name: Des Dunlop Agent Organisation: D2 Planning Ltd				
Further Information available in the original comm	ent? No	Attachments sent with th	e comment? No	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \ \Box$				
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 Cor	sisten 🗸 Not Effectiv	e 🗸	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Alternative Development Site				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR16				

Q4 Soundness Comment

East Harptree is identified as a key service settlement. This designation is due in part to the fact that the village shop is run on a voluntary basis and has irregular opening hours which means that it does not fulfil the function of a convenience shop able to meet daily shopping needs. In such circumstances, the NPPF is clear that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and property to bring a positive approach to sustainable new development. Paragraph 28 of the NPPF states (fourth bullet) that rural development should: -

promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

Clearly, if additional development were proposed in the village it would support the village shop to ensure its long term future with regular opening hours and thus enable it to meet everyday convenience needs. Such an approach would result in a sustainable form of development. The quantum of development proposed in East Harptree will not achieve this objective and accordingly additional development should be identified.

Objections are therefore lodged to the non allocation for residential purposes of land at Ashwood, Church Lane, East Harptree. These objections should also be read in conjunction with our objections to Policy GR1 relating to the designation of part of the site on Local Green Space. The site is located within the development boundary relating to East Harptree as defined in the adopted Local Plan. In principle residential development is acceptable and would be of a scale appropriate to the size of East Harptree. The development would also assist in promoting the self sufficiency of the settlement in terms of providing more demand for local facilities e.g. the village shop. Part of the site is also identified for the primary school extension. A residential allocation on the remaining part of the site would enable the primary school to expand if required. The land would be made available for that to happen. The non allocation of the land will not enable the primary school to expand. The site is identified as being suitable within the SHLAA which states: -

East Harptree is identified as being within the scope of Policy RA2 of the submission Core Strategy which would normally allow residential development within the HDB but not adjoining it. Part of site allocated for school extension. The housing potential of the remaining of the site is about 10.

Based on the above the site is currently considered suitable for development under existing LP policies and the submission Core Strategy.

11 Mav 2016 Page 60 of 956

The site is suitable for development and can be delivered immediately after planning permission is granted. The objectors have carried out all the necessary technical and environmental surveys. There are no access constraints and the site can be adequately drained. Furthermore, there are no issues of ecological importance on the site despite the Plan making comments to the contrary. Indeed development could enhance ecological interest on the site. In all there are no constraints to residential development coming forward on the site. It is sustainable, suitable and deliverable.

As the site lies within the settlement limits, it is therefore in a sustainable location. Accordingly, such sites should be identified for development to protect sites outside defined settlement limits coming forward.

Q5 Change Requested

Allocate the site for residential development including potential primary school expansion. Deallocate the proposed Local Green Space Designation.

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 issues are complex and need to be the subject of debate as part of the oral Examination.

11 Mav 2016 Page 61 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 0, Whole Plan Part: Habitat Regulations Assessment

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

_	anisation: Natural England nt Organisation: No Attachments sent with the comment? No					
Does the respondent consider the document is legally composes the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is used to the Positively Prepared Not Justified						
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Habitat Regulations Assessment The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment We have considered the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) prepared in support of the presubmission version of the placemaking Plan. In our view the HRA provides an appropriately detailed and systematic assessment of the Placemaking Plan in terms of its likely effects on European Sites within and beyond the plan area. We are satisfied that the screening process has demonstrated that the Placemaking Plan will not result in significant effects on European Sites, including the Chew Valley Lake Special Protection Area (SPA), the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bats Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC which are the Natura 2000 sites of						
most relevance to the plan. Q5 Change Requested	set and Mendip Bats SAC Which are the Natura 2000 Sites of					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination	(ticked if yes)? \Box					

11 May 2016 Page 62 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 0, Whole Plan Part: Sustainability Appraisal

Respondent Number: 95 Comment Number	: 6
Name:	Organisation: The Coal Authority
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment	
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 Pla	n 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 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Sustainability Appraisal
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Comment – The Coal Authority is pleased to see that Ta Sustainability Appraisal includes testing against the defi	ble 8 in the documents identifies that Objective 9 of the ned Development High Risk Area and Surface Coal Resource plans ag legacy issues have been considered as part of the site selection cated Sites Pro-forma's.
Q5 Change Requested	
	ation (ticked if ves)?
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	
Q5 Change Requested Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number	pate at the Examination? : 9
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name:	erate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name:	oate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation:
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name:	oate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation:
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name:	oate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	oate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	oate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinate Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate Respondent Number: Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment: Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Platent Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate Respondent Number: Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment: Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound. If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plath Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan. The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Per	organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective , Sustainability Appraisal

11 May 2016 Page 63 of 956

well placed to provide comments on documents such as the Bath Placemaking Plan.
All the comments are on Volume 1 and the Sustainability Appraisal. In all cases we would wish to appear at the Examination in order to protect the commercial interests of Persimmon Homes Severn Valley.
We are disappointed and concerned about the standard, contents and lack of clarity of the Bath Placemaking Plan, which contains a number of both significant and more minor errors. These are set out below,
1. The Plan is not Legally Compliant and is Unsound Persimmon Homes Severn Valley consider the Bath Placemaking Plan is not legally compliant for the following reasons:
The Sustainability Appraisal is not Legally Compliant
The appraisal of the options in the SA is only set out in summary format in Table 9. In addition what is set out is unsatisfactory. Each policy is assessed against two options, including the policy or not including the policy and largely relying on NPPF. The two options are assessed for the first five policies but thereafter option two is not always assessed. In any event the purpose of a Sustainability Appraisal is not to compare a policy position against reliance on the NPPF and it should be to assess whether the policies are sustainable. Table 10 merely summaries the conclusions contained in Table 9.
In addition we note that whilst Stage A was carried out with advice from external consultants the appraisals were undertaken internally within the Planning Policy Team. Essentially this means that the Planning Policy Team are both judge and jury in setting the policies and then assessing their sustainability. We therefore consider the SA is not fit for purpose and not legally compliant.

It is also clear that the Sustainability Appraisal does not comply with the Council's own notes set out for the guidance of those making comments. This says 'Sustainability Appraisal is a tool for appraising policies to ensure they reflect social, environmental, and economic factors.' The assessment in Tables 9 and 10 do not clearly assess each policy against social, environmental and economic factors. Indeed this is more appropriately done in tabular form rather than relying on a written explanation as in this case.

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

Q5 Change Requested

Respondent Number: 7150 Comment Num	nber: 2						
Name: James Proyer Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd							
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:							
Further Information available in the original comm	ment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No		
Does the respondent consider the document is le	ound?						
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemakin	g Plan is t	ınsouna, ıs	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):			
			isten 🗸	Not Effective			

11 May 2016 Page 64 of 956

\sim	1	C ~ .	ına	lnacc	Cam	ment
	4	201	1110	111677	COIII	mem

The Sustainability Appraisal presented in this consultation is considered to be insufficient. The appraisal serves only to show whether or not introducing a policy would have a positive effect, and does not assist in the formulation of policies or comparison of potential site options.

or comparison of potential site options.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 65 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Comment Number: 11

Volume: 0, Whole Plan Part: Whole Plan general

93

with the planning system to deliver sustainable development.

Respondent Number:

Name: Sean Walsh	Organisa	ation: H	lighways A	gency		
Agent Name:						
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No)	Attachme	ents sent with the	e comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliar	ıt? (Tick	if indicate	d 'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	1?					
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsoc	ınd, is it	because i	is (ticked where	indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	No	t Consis	ten 🗌	Not Effective	e 🗆	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan	, Whole	Plan ger	neral			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Thank you for providing Highways England with the opp	ortunity t	o comm	nent on the	Draft Placemak	ing Flan consul	tation.
Highways England is responsible for operating, maintain	ning and ir	nprovin	g the Strat	egic Road Netwo	ork (SRN) in Eng	gland.
We engage with communities, local authorities and the			•		development	and
facilitate economic growth whilst safeguarding the prim	nary functi	on and	purpose o	the SRN.		
In BANES the SRN runs generally north to south close to		•				1
comprises the A46 which links into the M4 at junction 1						
southwards from Bathampton to Beckhampton. The SR			_	•	-	ts
between the A46 at Batheaston grade separated junction including A4 London Road, Cleveland Bridge, and A36 W			•	~		hat
the comments in this consultation response have been		i Nodu.	it is on the	Dadis of these re	sponsibilities t	nat

DfT Circular 02/2013 - The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development, sets out how we will engage with the planning system to deliver sustainable development. Highways England recognises that prosperity depends on our roads, so aims to support growth and facilitate development, based on an understanding of traffic conditions and behaviour, to manage the effects of development and ensure road safety. In order to constructively engage in the local plan-making process we require a robust evidence-base so that sound advice can be given to local planning authorities in relation to the appropriateness of proposed development in relation to the SRN and the strategic highway and transport solutions that may be required to support potential site allocations.

Highways England is keen to ensure that policy takes account of the need for transport and land use planning to be closely integrated. In this respect, your attention is drawn to DfT Circular 02/2013 which sets out how we will engage

Paragraph 12 of Circular 02/2013 states that 'The preparation and delivery of Local Plans provides an opportunity to identify and support a pattern of development that minimises trip generation at source and encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport, minimises journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities, and promotes accessibility for all. This can contribute to environmental objectives and also reduce the cost to the economy arising from the environmental, business and social impacts associated with traffic generation and congestion.'

11 Mav 2016 Page 66 of 956

Paragraph 18 states that 'Capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated strategic infrastructure needs. Enhancements should not normally be considered as fresh proposals at the planning application stage. The Highways Agency (now Highways England) will work with strategic delivery bodies to identify infrastructure and access needs at the earliest possible opportunity in order to assess suitability, viability and deliverability of such proposals, including the identification of potential funding arrangements.'

Responses to Local Plan consultations, of which the Placemaking Plan is part, are also guided by other pertinent policy and guidance, namely the NPPF and the 'Highways Agency and the Local Plan Process' protocol - now applicable to Highways England.

We understand that the Placemaking Plan complements the adopted Core Strategy by providing a set of detailed planning policies and site allocations for BANES. We have previously commented on the Placemaking Plan through its emergence, and we understand that at this stage we are only commenting on whether the Plan is legally compliant and whether it is sound - for our purposes this means is it justified and consistent with national policy. The Draft Placemaking Plan and the Core Strategy are combined for clarity, so as the Core Strategy is already adopted we appreciate we are only able to comment on the highlighted sections of the document.

Highways England welcomes the consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan relating to the soundness of the document. Our main concerns relate to development in the Bath area, and it is at this stage during the Plan making process in accordance with Paragraph 18 Circular 02/2013 that specific infrastructure to mitigate impacts on the SRN need to be identified.

Highways England are happy to assist in this process to inform the IDP. Highways England reiterates that the comments in this response do not prejudice any future responses on site specific matters and would request that we continue to be consulted at an early stage as development proposals for further specific sites are evolving. We look forward to continued close working to deliver growth, sustainable development and an efficient and sustainable local and strategic transport network.

Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?						
Respondent Number: 95 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: The Coal Authority 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 Consisten Not Effective						
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						

11 Mav 2016 Page 67 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

Background on The Coal Authority

The Coal Authority is a Non-Departmental Public Body sponsored by the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to: undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues; and provide information on coal mining.

The main areas of planning interest to the Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to:

- the safeguarding of coal in accordance with the advice contained in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England;
- -the establishment of a suitable policy framework for energy minerals including hydrocarbons in accordance with the advice contained in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England; and -ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduces the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England.

Background on Coal Mining Issues in Bath and North East Somerset

Surface Coal Resources and Prior Extraction

As you will be aware, Bath and North East Somerset contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover an area amounting up to 25% of the District area.

The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process.

Coal Mining Legacy

As you will also be aware, Bath and North East Somerset has been subjected to significant historic coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities.

Within the Bath and North East Somerset there are approximately 570 recorded mine entries and around 62 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority which has required an emergency response. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards.

Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.

As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.

CONCLUSION

The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these comments. We are, of course, willing to discuss the comments made above in further detail if desired and would be happy to negotiate alternative suitable wording to address any of our concerns. The Coal Authority also wishes to continue to be consulted both informally if required and formally on future stages. The Coal Authority would be happy to enter into discussions ahead of any examination hearing process to try and reach a negotiated position if this were considered helpful.

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 68 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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: 1 Name: Organisation: Dunkerton Parish Council 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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Overall, Dunkerton Parish Council regard the Placemaking document set as a comprehensive and impressive set of complex and inter-related planning documents that are well written and support all the aims of Placemaking.				
Therefore Dunkerton Parish Council give our continued support for the Placemaking process and our general satisfaction with the coverage and clarity of the associated evidence base and analyses.				
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?				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32 Name: John Webb Organisation:				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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')				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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?				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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):				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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?				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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):				
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 32 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective				

11 May 2016 Page 69 of 956

2. Notwithstanding the outcome of 1 above ownership and management of the river is fundamental to its well being and its integration into the Plan for the area. 2. Notwithstanding the outcome of 1 above ownership and management of the river is fundamental to its well being and its integration into the Plan for the area. 2. Much of what has caused the current sad state of the river is because no one seems to want to do anything about it. If nothing else the Council is a significant Riparian Owner and has a vested interest in correcting the sad state of affairs that currently exist. It is accepted that other bodies both have a vested interest and therefore a part to play. These include the Environment Agency in terms of flood control risk which includes dredging and the Canal and River Trust who have the avaigation rights from the canal junction at Vidicombe to Hanham Lock as well as the responsibility for the "Lock Cuts" and the lock structures themselves. South Gloucestershire Council will also have an interest in respect of the North Bank upstream of Hanham. 1. It is my understanding that this "gap in responsibility" has already been recognised by B&NES, this by the formation of the Strategic River Group (SRG) who have representatives of the interested parties as part of their group. I would suggest that this situation is important enough to be recognised formally within the current Place-making documentation. Finally the river as an entity needs not only capital expenditure devoted to it which is something that is covered on the assets discussed in the documents but also not insignificant ongoing management and maintenance costs. These need to be recognised and budgeted for. 2. Change Requested 2. Does the Respondent Wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? 2. Why does the Respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') 2. Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') 2. Does the respondent consider the Draft P	
And its integration into the Plan for the area. Much of what has caused the current sad state of the river is because no one seems to want to do anything about it. If nothing else the Council is a significant Riparian Owner and has a vested interest in correcting the sad state of affairs that currently exist. It is accepted that other bodies both have a vested interest in correcting the sad state of affairs that currently exist. It is accepted that other bodies both have a vested interest and therefore a part to play. These include the Environment Agency in terms of flood control risk which includes dredging and the Canal and River Trust who have the navigation rights from the canal junction at Widcombe to Hanham Lock as well as the responsibility for the "Lock Cuts" and the lock structures themselves. South Gloucestershire Council will also have an interest in respect of the North Bank upstream of Hanham. It is my understanding that this "gap in responsibility" has already been recognised by B&NES, this by the formation of the Strategic River Group (SRG) who have representatives of the interested parties as part of their group. I would suggest that this situation is important enough to be recognised formally within the current Place-making documentation. Finally the river as an entity needs not only capital expenditure devoted to it which is something that is covered on the assets discussed in the documents but also not insignificant ongoing management and maintenance costs. These need to be recognised and budgeted for. 25 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? Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Home Builders Federation Agent Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation Agent Organisation: No Attachments sent with the comment? No Does the respondent considers	1. Is not our river an important enough asset that it warrants being given a "Place" in its own right and
nothing else the Council is a significant Riparian Owner and has a vested interest in correcting the sad state of affairs that currently exist. It is accepted that other bodies both have a vested interest and therefore a part to play. These include the Environment Agency in terms of flood control risk which includes dredging and the Canal and River Trust who have the navigation rights from the canal junction at Widcombe to Hanham Lock as well as the responsibility for the "Lock Cuts" and the lock structures themselves. South Gloucestershire Council will also have an interest in respect of the North Bank upstream of Hanham. It is my understanding that this "gap in responsibility" has already been recognised by B&NES, this by the formation of the Strategic River Group (SRG) who have representatives of the interested parties as part of their group. I would suggest that this situation is important enough to be recognised formally within the current Place-making documentation. Finally the river as an entity needs not only capital expenditure devoted to it which is something that is covered on the assets discussed in the documents but also not insignificant ongoing management and maintenance costs. These need to be recognised and budgeted for. Cost Change Requested Coes 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: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Justified Not Consisten Not Effective Not Effective Not Effective Not P	
the Strategic River Group (SRG) who have representatives of the interested parties as part of their group. I would suggest that this situation is important enough to be recognised formally within the current Place-making documentation. Finally the river as an entity needs not only capital expenditure devoted to it which is something that is covered on the assets discussed in the documents but also not insignificant ongoing management and maintenance costs. These need to be recognised and budgeted for. 25 Change Requested 26 Change Requested 27 Comment Number: 10 28 Name: Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? 29 Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: 24 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	nothing else the Council is a significant Riparian Owner and has a vested interest in correcting the sad state of affairs that currently exist. It is accepted that other bodies both have a vested interest and therefore a part to play. These include the Environment Agency in terms of flood control risk which includes dredging and the Canal and River Trust who have the navigation rights from the canal junction at Widcombe to Hanham Lock as well as the responsibility for the "Lock Cuts" and the lock structures themselves. South Gloucestershire Council will also have an interest in respect of the North
assets discussed in the documents but also not insignificant ongoing management and maintenance costs. These need to be recognised and budgeted for. 25 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? Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: 24 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	the Strategic River Group (SRG) who have representatives of the interested parties as part of their group. I would suggest
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: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	assets discussed in the documents but also not insignificant ongoing management and maintenance costs. These need to
Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	Q5 Change Requested
Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if ves)? \Box
Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 10 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: 24 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	
Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	with does the Respondent reel it is necessary to participate at the Examination:
Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination	Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 10
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan, Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? 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 , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	Does the respondent consider the document is sound?
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not Effective
The Council may also wish to take into account of any future changes arising from the current consultation on the definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	
definition of affordable housing and starter homes before submission of the Planmaking Plan for examination Q5 Change Requested	Q4 Soundness Comment
_	,
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$	Q5 Change Requested

11 May 2016 Page 70 of 956

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

Name: Mark Willitts Organisation: Environment Agency
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') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Viability The National Planning Policy Framework advises that the pursuance of sustainable development requires careful consideration of relevant viability issues, including costs, to ensure plans are deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to a level of constraints, obligations and policy burdens that compromise their ability to be developed viably. Accordingly, any requisite costs associated with specific developments i.e. Brownfield remediation, flood risk management infrastructure etc, must be carefully considered to ensure the deliverability of proposed allocations.
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?
Respondent Number: 245 Comment Number: 7
Name: Mark Willitts Organisation: Environment Agency
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the vernandent consider the decument is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated lyes!)
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Flood Risk Management

11 May 2016 Page 71 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Notwithstanding the aforementioned references to the flood risk sequential approach and climate change provisions, the Agency is of the opinion that the plan and supporting documentation would benefit from specific reference to the requirements of the NPPF and associated guidance in respect of flood emergency response and evacuation arrangements. National guidance advises planning authorities to consult with their emergency planning officers as early as possible during the preparation of Local Plans, in respect of this matter.

Flood warning and evacuation plans will need to take account of the likely impacts of climate change, e.g. increased water depths and the impact on how people can be evacuated. In consultation with the authority's emergency planning staff, the local planning authority will need to ensure that evacuation plans are suitable through appropriate planning conditions or planning agreements. Accordingly, specific advisory text within the plan would serve to highlight this key requirement, where applicable.

It must be noted that the emergency services are unlikely to regard developments that increase the scale of any rescue that might be required as being safe. Even with defences in place, if the probability of inundation is high, safe access and egress should be maintained for the lifetime of the development. The practicality of safe evacuation from an area will depend on:

The type of flood risk present, and the extent to which advance warning can be given in a flood event; the number of people that would require evacuation from the area potentially at risk; the adequacy of both evacuation routes and identified places that people could be evacuated to (and taking into account the length of time that the evacuation may need to last), and; sufficiently detailed and up to date evacuation plans being in place for the locality that address these and related issues

Q5 Change Requested

· • •	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 274 Comment Number: 1 Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above Local Plan Placemaking document.	

11 Mav 2016 Page 72 of 956

In terms of the economic value of sport, Sport England has developed a tool that can demonstrate how sport benefits

The model produces area based estimates on sports' contribution to the local economy in the form of a business output gross value added (GVA) and jobs plus wider benefits like health. Using the weblink above you can register to use the

the local economy http://www.sportengland.org/research/benefits-of-sport/economic-value-of-sport/

tool and access the guidance notes including FAQs.

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Summary for BaNES (see the attached pdf), using level 1 basic snapshot of the tool:

- •Total Direct Economic Value for Sport £50.5 million
- •Of which Participation in Sport £39.0 million
- •The wider economic value to health is £89.2 million although not directly linked to total direct value of sport. Please refer to the FAQs on the website.

Sport England has an established role within the planning system which includes providing advice and guidance on all relevant areas of national, regional and local policy as well as supporting local authorities in developing the evidence base for sport. The Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear about the role that sport plays in delivering sustainable communities through promoting health and well-being. As such, Sport England wishes to see local planning policies that seek to protect, enhance and provide for sports facilities based on robust and up-to-date assessments of need in accordance with paragraphs 73 and 74 pf the NPPF.

Sound policy can only be developed in the context of objectively assessed needs, in turn used to inform the development of a strategy for sport and recreation. Policies which protect, enhance and provide for sports facilities should reflect this work, and be the basis for consistent application through development management. Sport England is not overly prescriptive on the precise form and wording of policies, but advises that a stronger plan will result from attention to taking a clearly justified and positive approach to planning for sport. In this way, planning authorities will be able to demonstrate that their plan has been positively prepared (based on objectively assessed needs in accordance with paragraph 73 of the NPPF), is consistent with national policy (reflecting the NPPF), is justified (having considered alternatives) and effective (being deliverable). Without such attention there is a risk that a local plan or other policy document could be considered 'unsound'.

For more information on how to forward planning for sport please see: Sport England's Planning for Sport Forward Planning Guidance - http://www.sportengland.org/media/351266/planning-for-sport-forward-planning-guide-july-2014-pdf

Additionally, please note that Sport England along with Public Health England have recently launched the new Active Design Guidance, October 2015. It may therefore be useful to provide a cross-reference (and perhaps a hyperlink) to www.sportengland.org/activedesign. Sport England believes that being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone's life pattern. As such, Sport England would expect to see the principles on Active Design embedded in any subsequent Local Plan policy.

Lastly, as you may be aware, Sport England will oppose development resulting in the loss of playing field land or formal built sports facilities unless its loss is justified by a robust and up-to-date assessments of need. Any loss of sports provision should be incorporated into formal policy such that it may be considered through the policy making process and scrutinised at Examination in Public. As such, should any policy seek to allocate any existing playing field land or formal built sports facilities for redevelopment, we would strongly urge the Council to discuss this directly with Sport England.

Q5 Change Requested

Incomplete and non-adopted evidence base for sport and recreation.

The Playing Pitch Strategy remains 'emerging' after slow progress. It needs to be completed and signed off by the Steering Group and adopted by the Council.

We are also working with the Council on the production of a Built (sports) Facilities Strategy. It will need to address displaced user requirements. This work is currently 'draft'. The emerging work is not ANOG compliant, it has followed guidance published by Sport England http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/. We would strongly recommend that B&NES use ANOG next time (by June 2018) in order to produce a LA wide assessment and develop a subsequent area wide strategy from.

The completion of this evidence base work is imperative to meet local community and recreational needs and future

11 Mav 2016 Page 73 of 956

needs to underpin Local Plan policy and inform new provision to be secured by planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 274 Comment Number: 5
Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Evidence Base
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in March 2012 (replacing PPS12 & PPG17) states:
Paragraph 73 – Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on up-to-date assessment of the needs for open space, sport and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required.
Sport England's view is that, in order to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (formerly PPS12 and PPG17), this should include a strategy (supply and demand analysis with qualitative issues included) covering the need for indoor and outdoor sports facilities, including playing pitches.

Q5 Change Requested

Incomplete and non-adopted evidence base for sport and recreation.

The Playing Pitch Strategy remains 'emerging' after slow progress. It needs to be completed and signed off by the Steering Group and adopted by the Council.

We are also working with the Council on the production of a Built (sports) Facilities Strategy. It will need to address displaced user requirements. This work is currently 'draft'. The emerging work is not ANOG compliant, it has followed guidance published by Sport England http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/. We would strongly recommend that B&NES use ANOG next time (by June 2018) in order to produce a LA wide assessment and develop a subsequent area wide strategy from.

The completion of this evidence base work is imperative to meet local community and recreational needs and future needs to underpin Local Plan policy and inform new provision to be secured by planning obligations and the Community

11 Mav 2016 Page 74 of 956

Infrastructure Levy.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number: 1
Name: Rohan Torkildsen Organisation: Historic England
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Our relatively modest observations seek to clarify or confirm certain points and supplement specific components of the document to improve its clarity, consistency and subsequent effectiveness in the delivery of sustainable development. We would be happy to discuss any of these matters, or issues arising further if that would be useful.
Historic England recognise the significant merits of this impressive Plan that demonstrates a thorough and robust positive strategy for the conservation of the District's historic environment, and the great care and attention taken in seeking to sustain the OUV of the Bath WHS.
It is apparent an informed understanding and consideration of the significance of the District's cultural heritage has shaped the Plan and will inform its future implementation.
The positive and on-going dialogue with Officers of BANES Council during the preparation of the Plan has been very much appreciated and we look forward to the continuation of this constructive working relationship.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 281 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: Natural England
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Surther Information available in the original comment? No. Attachments cent with the comment?
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 75 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
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.
We have reviewed all volumes of the Placemaking Plan (Pre-submission version) and consider that it is acceptable in Environmental terms. It contains a number of proposed policies that we welcome, in particular those which seek to safeguard the biodiversity value of the river Avon through Bath and to control lighting, whilst acknowledging the need for sustainable development. In so far as it relates to those areas upon which Natural England is qualified to comment, we consider the Placemaking Plan to be generally legally compliant, sound and in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey 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 , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
It is stated in the explanatory note at the front of Volume 1 that: "The Placemaking Plan is presented in six volumes (as listed below) and plan users should ensure they refer to all relevant policies in relation to proposals." It is relevant to consider this statement – and the draft plan overall – against national policy that: "Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development" (NPPF para 151). Also relevant is the government's planning guidance that: "Local Plans should be as focused, concise and accessible as possible." (NPPG paragraph 10).

11 Mav 2016 Page 76 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Officers of the Council are to be commended on completing the draft Placemaking Plan for the large, varied and complex authority of Bath and Somerset. However, the current draft is very long (nearly 700 pages in 6 volumes – Volume 1 alone being nearly 250 pages long – and it is a rather technical document that could provide a basis for much technical debate in connection with development proposals. This form of draft plan raises a number of important broad questions:

- 1) How accessible is the document to the general public and interested parties? If it is substantially inaccessible it will not be possible for individuals to make plan-based representations on development proposals.
- 2) How accessible is the document to developers, individuals and organizations considering making development proposals?
- 3) Is it reasonable with such a large and complex document to expect users to "ensure they refer to all relevant policies in relation to proposals"?
- 4) If too complex and onerous, will it frustrate development rather than achieving sustainable development?
- 5) Is it possible to create a more concise and focused document from the present draft whilst retaining the necessary controls and encouraging development? What is the essential content of the document?
- 6) Can the plan be promoted in ways to make it more accessible? Can the plan concepts become shared widely by the community?

25	Chan	ge F	Reau	ested
ح	0	. ים		Cocca

A very heavy edit of the draft plan to create a document "as focused, concise and accessible as possible" (in the words of the NPPG) can make it much more effective in achieving sustainable development – the key NPPF goal.

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

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

Respondent Number: 1052 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: Cameley Parish Council
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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan, Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Cameley Parish Council discussed the Placemaking Plan and considered it to be out of date and that they would make no further comment.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 Mav 2016 Page 77 of 956

Name: Organisation: Compton Dando Parish Council Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Agent Name: Agent Organication:	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Compton Dando Parish Council considers the Placemaking Plan to be sound.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number: 12	
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation:	
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Agent organisation.	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? I	No
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	No
	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ✓	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No	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):	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 ✓	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 , Whole Plan general	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 , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	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 , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment	No

11 May 2016 Page 78 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The length and complexity pose a great difficulty in achieving sound community engagement. A team of officers, consultants and others have spend years preparing the Plan and present 662 pages supported by 10 pages of reference titles with many thousands of pages of evidence "indeed a mammoth undertaking. To expect effective consultation from citizens in six weeks using their own time is unsound. It will particularly introduce an age bias, favouring those with spare time and with the experience of the local plan process over the younger generation whose futures will be more influenced by the Plan policies but whose commitment to a place may not yet be formed as they consolidate their education, employment and social lives.

The Economist's special report 'Generation Uphil' on the young, 23rd January 2016, points out, 'More subtly, onerous planning rules in almost all countries block the construction of new homes in the cities where young people most want to live. Property owners, who tend to be older, favour these rules because they make their homes more valuable. (Christian Hilber and Wouter Vermeulen estimate that they double the cost of property in Britain, for example. Lloyds Bank affordability index, published March 2014, ranked Bath as the 4th least affordable city, with house prices at 8.05 times average earnings. This District's antipathy to HMOs is an example of parochial politicisation: objectively, HMOs offer among the most efficient dwellings there would be no housing shortage if all properties were occupied to the same density. HMOs allow those in higher education access to university, the "factories of the mind' and creators of the nation's next exports.

The repetitive nature of the Plan has given rise to the authors desire to lighten the read by expressing similar themes in different ways, but this introduces the risk of difficulty of interpretation in the future. Some of the phraseology and language lacks clarity (for example in the Core Strategy, Volume 2 Policy B1.4a at the margin of delivery has several tightly defined economic, financial, political and linguistic meanings yet the application of the word in the policy is unclear.) The NPPF has led the way in recognising and avoiding the difficulty of policy which is unnecessarily lengthy.

The Council has allowed itself the right to amend the Core Strategy where the evidence has changed (for example to follow the government's change of heart on allowable solutions post enactment of the Infrastructure Act 2015) and where the Placemaking Plan has presented a conflict (for example the deletion of the Core Strategy narrative on Bathuniversities, Section 2f, 2.36 to 2.41). Citizens should equally be allowed to comment on the soundness of the Core Strategy where it is plainly in conflict with the evidence or where the outworking of the Core Strategy in the Placemaking Plan leads to policy which fails the NPPF Plan tests.

Q5 Change Requested

This first consultation on the whole document will have energised the most willing and committed to engage in the Plan making process and will generate much important comment.

The Council should assimilate the comments and refine the plan to remove unnecessary repetition, inconsistent and unintelligible language. To assist the next phase, the narrative sections should ensure that the evidence is summarised more effectively as well as presenting the Council's justification for proposing the particular policies. The document should be subjected to a rigorous sense check such as the Plain English Campaign Chrystal Mark. The Council should allow a limited challenge to the Core Strategy where it is clear that the evidence has changed, been misinterpreted or where the pursuant Placemaking Plan policy is clearly unsound. The Council should make provision for a second consultation and seek specifically to engage with hard-to-reach cohorts, such as the young.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

Respondent Number: 64	26 Comment Number:	1		
Name:	C	Organisation:	Persimmon Homes Severn Valley	
Agent Name:	Д	Agent Organis	sation:	
Further Information availab	e in the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 Mav 2016 Page 79 of 956

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):
if the respondent considers the Draft Flacemaking Flam 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 , Whole Plan general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The following comments are submitted on behalf of Persimmon Homes Severn Valley (PHSV). PHSV regularly comment on planning documents within its operating area and appear at examinations. We are therefore well placed to provide comments on documents such as the Bath Placemaking Plan.
All the comments are on Volume 1 and the Sustainability Appraisal. In all cases we would wish to appear at the Examination in order to protect the commercial interests of Persimmon Homes Severn Valley.
We are disappointed and concerned about the standard, contents and lack of clarity of the Bath Placemaking Plan, which contains a number of both significant and more minor errors. These are set out below,
1.The Plan is not Legally Compliant and is Unsound Persimmon Homes Severn Valley consider the Bath Placemaking Plan is not legally compliant for the following reasons:

(i) Local Development Scheme

The Local Development Scheme (LDS) is at least confused. The website says the LDS was reviewed and came into effect in December 2015. The LDS timetable identifies three plans:

- -Placemaking Plan DPD;
- -Core Strategy Partial Review DPD;
- -Core Strategy Review DPD.

However the supporting profiles only provide details of two DPDs:

- -Core Strategy DPD Review;
- -Placemaking Plan DPD

Nowhere does the LDS identify the current DPD which is a combined Core Strategy and Placemaking DPD. It is not clear whether the current consultation document is the first stage of the Placemaking DPD or the Core Strategy DPD Review. The LDS Core Strategy DPD Review Document Profile says 'currently the Core Strategy constitute part 1 of the Local Plan but it will be incorporated with the Placemaking Plan in due course to form a single Local Plan' (our emphasis). This confirms the current consultation document is not included in the LDS. Furthermore the website introducing the Placemaking Plan says: 'Whilst the Council's adopted Core Strategy sets out the broad strategic approach to the level and location of new development throughout Bath and North East Somerset the Council's Placemaking Plan focuses more on the specifics, including detailed design principles and development aspirations and updating the planning policies used in determining planning applications'.

It further says:

'The Core Strategy and the Placemaking Plan are complementary planning policy documents, and should be read as one'. This clearly sets out the Placemaking Plan and the Core Strategy as separate documents rather than a combined plan. This suggests the current consultation document is an amalgamation of two separate documents, rather than being written as a single new document. In our view this has not worked and has resulted in a disjointed document. In addition to other issues raised in our response, there is overlap between adopted Core Strategy Policies and emerging Placemaking Policies. For example CP6 includes guidance on historic environment, landscape and nature conservation which is also covered in HE1 (Historic Environment), NE2 (Conserving and enhancing the landscape and landscape

11 Mav 2016 Page 80 of 956

character) and in the nature conservation policy. A new document embracing Core Strategy and Placemaking Policies in a single document should have avoided overlap and repetition, or at a very minimum should have included proper cross referencing between Core Strategy and Development Policies.

We consider this position is confusing and results in the plan not being legally compliant and also unsound because this lack of clarity means it is neither justified nor effective.

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 8
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☑
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy DW1: District-Wide Spatial Strategy
We have 2 comments on Policy DW1. Firstly the last paragraph of the policy says the first review will be timed to coordinate with the review of the West of England Core Strategies around 2016. That is clearly wrong and even though this

We have 2 comments on Policy DW1. Firstly the last paragraph of the policy says the first review will be timed to coordinate with the review of the West of England Core Strategies around 2016. That is clearly wrong and even though this
is a Core Strategy Policy, as we have set out in general comments, other Core Strategy Policies have been amended and
this policy should have been amended too. At the very least the text or the policy should be amended to accord with the
BANES LDS timetable which includes three documents, this Placemaking Plan proposed for adoption in December 2016,
a Core Strategy Partial Review DPD for adoption in March 2018 and a Core Strategy Full Review DPD for submission in
November 2019. It would have been helpful for the Placemaking flan to set out this position and provide some clarity
about the relationship between the three reviews. Then given that the consultation on the Issues and Options for the
emerging Joint Spatial Plan was published before the BANES Placemaking Plan it is unhelpful that the Placemaking Plan
does not make reference to the emerging JSP and its relationship with the three plans identified in the LDS. The Council
will be aware that the development industry is concerned about the evidence base for the JSP which includes separate
SHMAs for the West of England and BANES. This lack of recognition of the JSP within the Placemaking Plan only adds to
our concerns about the Strategic Plan for the West of England.

Secondly, we consider that prioritising the use of brownfield opportunities in order to limit development of greenfield sites is contrary to National Policy. The Core Planning Principles relating to brownfield land in paragraph 17 of the National Policy Planning Framework is to 'encourage effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value. The emphasis in Policy DW1 should be on encouraging effective use of brownfield land. Whilst paragraph 111 of the NPPF says that 'Local Planning Authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land', again there is no reference to prioritising the use of brownfield land. Equally there is no requirement in National Policy to minimise the

11 Mav 2016 Page 81 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made Collinells received (iii Flati Order)
use of greenfield land. The policy should be simplified and reworded to say 'encouraging the use of brownfield opportunities for new development'.
The plan is unsound because this policy is not justified, effective and is contrary to the National Policy.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 10
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The following comments are submitted on behalf of Persimmon Homes Severn Valley (PHSV). PHSV regularly comment on planning documents within its operating area and appear at examinations. We are therefore well placed to provide comments on documents such as the Bath Placemaking Plan.
All the comments are on Volume 1 and the Sustainability Appraisal. In all cases we would wish to appear at the Examination in order to protect the commercial interests of Persimmon Homes Severn Valley.
We are disappointed and concerned about the standard, contents and lack of clarity of the Bath Placemaking Plan, which contains a number of both significant and more minor errors. These are set out below,
1.The Plan is not Legally Compliant and is Unsound Persimmon Homes Severn Valley consider the Bath Placemaking Plan is not legally compliant for the following reasons:
Duty to Co-Operate The documents published with the DPD and the evidence base do not include a duty to co-operate statement of compliance. Whilst the duty to co-operate has been separately addressed in relation to the preparation of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan, there is nothing to demonstrate how the Bath Placemaking Plan has been brought forward with adjoining Authorities. Therefore for this reason the Bath Placemaking Plan is also not legally compliant and is unsound because there is no evidence of any joint working.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

11 May 2016 Page 82 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 11
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
No Notification of Changes
In preparing these comments we picked up from the BANES website that changes were introduced after the publication of the Pre-submission Documents. Notably on the 11th January a new volume 6 was produced and on 21st January hyper-links were added. We also note that the versions of the document we downloaded when it was first published is different to that which now appears on the website. In particular the illustration on page 215 under Transport Infrastructure is different. Whilst that might only be a minor change it gives no confidence that there may be other changes within in the document which are more significant. When changes were introduced we consider the Council should have made a greater effort to publicise these changes or extend the consultation period accordingly.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Description of the Control of the Co
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 12 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 83 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
Major Drafting Errors An example of a major drafting error is Policy ST8 where clearly part of the policy is missing.
Minor Drafting Errors There are a number of minor typographical and drafting errors throughout the document which need to be corrected.
Index of Policies The plan contains over 100 policies which are not numbered in the same sequential order as in the Core Strategy. Therefore it would have aided the ability to cross-reference by including an index of policies at the front of the plan. As this is a pre-submission draft plan it is important that it should be correct. We therefore consider that all the errors should be corrected. As a very minimum the Council should produce a schedule of amendments and ideally allow consultation on that. Alternatively the Council should re-draft the plan and redo the consultation.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 13 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Negatively Worded Policies
The following comments relate to Policies NE3, NECS1, PCS2, PCS3, PCS4, PCS5, PCS6, PCS7, PCS7A, PCS8, H5, LCR1, LCR1A, LCR5, LCR6, LCR8, RE5, RE6, ST2, ST2A, ST3 and M3. All these policies contain negative obligations, typically development 'will only be permitted' or 'will not be permitted'. The policies should be rephrased to contain positive

obligations which then places the onus on the applicant to justify their approach. In addition, National Guidance is that Planning Policies should avoid negatively worded requirements for the following reasons:

- 1. Paragraphs 14 and 15 of the NPPF indicate that Local Plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 2.NPPG advises that policies should set out 'how the presumption will be applied locally' (ID12-011);
- 3.NPPG further advises that 'a Local Plan is an opportunity for a Local Planning Authority to set out a positive vision for the area' (ID12-018);
- 4. The Planning Advisory Service Good Plan-Making Guide sets out key principles for the successful plan-making and principle 9 says 'avoid negative thou shalt not type development control policies and embrace a yes, unless approach to drafted policies. The policies should be aimed at promoting the strategy that the authority is seeking to implement.

11 May 2016 Page 84 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Negative policies reinforce the reactive development control mindset rather than the positive development management approach suitable fora genuinely plan-led planning system'.

5. In addition the negatively worded policies are at odds with policy SD1 presumption in favour of sustainable development, which says 'when considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that

will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which will mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic social and environmental conditions in the area'. All the above policies should be amended to reflect this approach and applied consistency throughout the plans. Indeed there are many policies that do contain positive obligations like for example ST7 and MI so wording such as 'development will be permitted providing the following provisions are met' should be used in all of the above policies or like RA2 'development will be acceptable where
The plan is unsound because these policies are contrary to National Policy and not positively worded.
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?
Respondent Number: 6820 Comment Number: 1
Name: Clive Honeychurch Organisation:
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
I would suggest that the Banes Placemaking plan is not "legally compliant" unless the following two criticisms can be shown to be baseless:
1. The consultation process has been very poorly publicised and hence feed back from the general public limited. In my opinion probably less than 5% of affected residents are even aware that there is a Placemaking Plan and consultation. Have Banes planners carried out a survey to establish the degree of knowledge of the consultation in the community?
2. The documents are full of meaningless gobbledegook and generalisations. Anyone reading the documentation has to wade through huge volumes of vague and unnecessary, aspirational rhetoric. The reader has to work very hard to ascertain any idea of specific objectives and proposals. There is a danger that proposals can reach a point of no return before members of the public become aware of things to which they have serious objections.
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? 11 May 2016

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 8
Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Duty to Co-operate - 81. The West of England JSP runs from 2016 to 2026, the Authorities have already published a SHMA which excludes
BANES. The figures generated from this are seen by many stakeholders as being light.
BANES should immediately review its own evidence base on Housing needs and consider an interim increase on the
housing numbers within the Core Strategy to accommodate the earliest inclusion of additional housing within the planned delivery trajectory.
Q5 Change Requested The wording "within the HDB" should be removed.
The wording within the HBB should be removed.
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?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.
Respondent Number: 7148 Comment Number: 1
Name: Rob McGovern Organisation: Bristol City Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Q4 Soundiess Comment

11 May 2016 Page 86 of 956

comment.
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?
Respondent Number: 7150 Comment Number: 2 Name: James Proyer Organisation: Persimmon Homes (Wessex) 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 0 Whole Plan , Whole Plan general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The draft Placemaking Plan is primarily a Core Strategy review document, rather than a separate Site Allocations Plan. This is inconsistent with the Local Development Scheme. The draft Plan is presented as a 'tracked changes' version of the adopted Core Strategy. This makes for quite a confusing document and will be particularly difficult to comprehend if additional changes are made to the policies and supporting text following this consultation and subsequent examination. Conversely, the Housing Development Boundary (HDB) maps do not illustrate where amendments have been made to the settlement boundaries, so it is difficult to provide specific comments on any proposed amendments. A Duty to Cooperate Statement has not been prepared as part of the evidence base and so it is not possible to assess how neighbouring authorities have been engaged in the plan-making process.
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?
Respondent Number: 7222 Comment Number: 2 Name: Phil Rigg Organisation: Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 87 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box
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 , Whole Plan general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The role of the Placemaking Plan is outlined in the Introduction to the Pre-Submission Version. It is the Council's intention that the Placemaking Plan will complement the strategic planning framework provided in the Council's Core Strategy which was formally adopted by BANES in July 2014 and will deliver the housing and employment requirements established in the Core Strategy and its strategic objectives. The Council's Placemaking Plan focuses more on the specifics, including detailed design principles and development aspirations and updating the planning policies used in determining planning applications. It should be noted that for some locations the Placemaking Plan will be complemented by more detailed neighbourhood planning initiatives.
Specifically, the Placemaking Plan will: - allocate sites for development for housing, employment and other uses to help meet development needs identified in the Core Strategy; - Review and update the development management policies used in the determination of planning applications - facilitate the delivery of key development sites; - safeguard and enhance the quality and diversity of places in B&NES including the protection of valued assets and identifying opportunities for change; and - provide the opportunity to work together with local communities to review Housing Development Boundaries. The proposed site allocation at Camerton would help the Council meet a number of these specific goals for instance, in terms of allocating land for housing to help meet the housing needs of the district and it would also have a small but important role to play in terms of helping the Council meet its self-build obligations because of the self-build philosophy which underpins the promotion of this site, that seeks to offer customer involvement and choice, and to engender a strong sense of belonging and ownership, thereby meeting Draft Placemaking Plan Policy H4 Self-Build.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? ✓

11 May 2016 Page 88 of 956

Due to the complexity of these issues and the need to test evidence, we wish to participate at the oral examination.

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: District-wide general

Respondent Number:	148 Comment Num	nber: 1			
Name: Ian Bell		Organisation:	The Initiative in	Bath and North East Somer	set
Agent Name:		Agent Organisa	ation:		
Further Information availa	able in the original comm	nent? No	Attachments	sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the respondent consideration the respondent con	sider the document is so	und?	·		
Not Positively Prepared [☐ Not Justified ☐	Not Consi	isten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates The Site Reference (if appli		Vide ,District-wide រុ	general		
Q4 Soundness Comment					
	nd a desire to contribute	, -		of members who have a long ainable and successful econd	-

We welcome the creation of a strategic Placemaking Plan and the aspirations set out within it. In particular we strongly support the objective of economic growth and the acknowledgement that infrastructure, particularly transport, is an essential element when it comes to the siting of employment space.

Our members strongly agree that not enough homes have been built across the West of England and we note in Bath and North East Somerset that latest figures indicate the cost of housing compared to average incomes has now reached a ratio of almost 13:1 which is clearly unsustainable. It is bad for the people who want to live in the area and bad for businesses who struggle to attract properly skilled staff at a viable salary level.

Therefore we enthusiastically support the proposition that more homes are built that people can afford, are of the right type, mix and in locations that people and businesses need. We would also like to be assured that the evidence in the SHMA is up to date and a proper basis for decision making.

Rather than becoming overly bogged down with a concentration on the basic target number of homes, our members believe it is more important to understand the sort of homes people want. In other words how much demand will there be for high density urban apartments compared to lower density suburban houses with gardens? When it comes to the nature of housing development our members are very clear that home building should result in proper neighbourhoods with local services and good transport links. Excellent infrastructure must be a pre-requisite for all developments if the vision of this plan is to be realised. We would also urge that there is a requirement for high quality design and construction standards which will ensure the environment is improved over the long term.

Member are equally certain that priority should be given to brownfield urban areas and they are keen that in the first instance new development should be close to existing urban areas and existing transport infrastructure. However, this should not undermine the future supply of employment land for business growth within B&NES, which will underpin the future economic health of the city.

We recognise the consequence of this approach will mean there is insufficient space without impinging on the existing green belt. Reluctantly our members have concluded it will be necessary to take a flexible approach to the green belt in

11 Mav 2016 Page 89 of 956

order to deliver the desired outcome.
In addition to these general remarks members also expressed opinions on some specific elements which the Plan will be addressing.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 1
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, District-wide general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
We wish the Inspector to note that Bath Preservation Trust was consulted in relation to the Placemaking Plan, and we have been given the opportunity to make some amendments and changes at the consultative stage. On the whole therefore we are content that the Plan is largely sound, with the exceptions listed below, on which we are also submitting individual representations: -Transport policy (general) and East of Bath Park and Ride in particular -The deliverability of housing and student housing need; -The need to inform the detail of all site developments in Bath City Centre with historical site analysis given the complexity of the historic environment; -The need for a robust Building Heights SPD for Bath; and -The need for the whole of Bath's conservation area to be interpreted by a full suite of character area appraisal We will be seeking representation at the hearing on these items in order for the heritage amenity arguments to inform
the Inspector's decision-making. We have also attached a detailed set of supplementary representations seeking minor modifications for the Placemaking
Plan, on 'soundness' grounds.
Q5 Change Requested
Please see separate reps and uploaded table
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significat matters to raise on certain points of the

11 May 2016 Page 90 of 956

n	lacem	ankı	nσı	nlai	n
\mathbf{r}	acciii	aiiki	ואויי	pia	Ш

Name: Caroline Kay

Further Information available in the original comment?

Agent Name:

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 3 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , District-wide general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
We wish the Inspector to note that Bath Preservation Trust was consulted in relation to the Placemaking Plan, and we have been given the opportunity to make some amendments and changes at the consultative stage. On the whole therefore we are content that the Plan is largely sound, with the exceptions listed below, on which we are also submitting individual representations: -Transport policy (general) and East of Bath Park and Ride in particular -The deliverability of housing and student housing need; -The need to inform the detail of all site developments in Bath City Centre with historical site analysis given the complexity of the historic environment; -The need for a robust Building Heights SPD for Bath; and -The need for the whole of Bath's conservation area to be interpreted by a full suite of character area appraisals. We will be seeking representation at the hearing on these items in order for the heritage amenity arguments to inform the Inspector's decision-making. We have also attached a detailed set of supplementary representations seeking minor modifications for the Placemaking Plan, on 'soundness' grounds.
Q5 Change Requested
Please see separate reps and uploaded table
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to ahve significat matters to raise on certain points of the placemanking plan
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 23

11 May 2016 Page 91 of 956

Agent Organisation:

No

Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ✓
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	
	nn is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified □	Not Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	p., District-wide general
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Objective 5 meeting Housing needs A number of factors relating to housing needs are not n for affordable housing over and above likely market pro	natched with policies which will deliver it, particularly the need ovision and student housing
Objective 7 Economy and growth Objective suggests the increased attractiveness of publi	ic transport but does not indicate how this will be achieved.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if yes)? 🗹
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive s at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to he placemaking plan	submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared ave significant matters to raise on certain points of the
Respondent Number: 1166 Comment Number	·· 1
Respondent Number: 1166 Comment Number Name:	: 1 Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council
·	
Name:	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation:
Name: Agent Name:	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') Yes, with minor changes
Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') Yes, with minor changes In is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') Yes, with minor changes In is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') Yes, with minor changes In is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment "The parish council is in overall agreement with the object oncerned that any developments that load further comexisting problem of 'rat running' through the parish. The intending to facilitate traffic flow at the key pinch point	Organisation: Englishcombe Parish Council Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? Yes, with minor changes an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective e, District-wide general ectives and approach of the plan. However, the parish council is muter traffic onto the A367 or A39, will further escalate the e parish council would like to see how the authorities are is - specifically the Odd Down Park and Ride roundabout, but also it does not see the single lane road through Englishcombe village,

11 May 2016 Page 92 of 956

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: 1549 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Stanton Drew Parish Council 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , District-wide general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Stanton Drew Parish Council wishes to state that the BANES Placemaking Consultation must pay due regard to: - Neighbourhood Plans when determining development to enable the building of strong, vibrant, cohesive & healthy communities. - Ensuring that the best possible infrastructure should be planned & in place in a timely manner before commencement of housing development, where without sufficient and timely application of new road, school and public transport infrastructure would cause detrimental effects on residents and the wider community and would be deemed contrary to environmental policies. - Green Belt policies ensuring the openness of the Green Belt are maintained by targeting development on brownfield and derelict land - Prohibiting development on Grade 1 agricultural land. - Ensuring that reliable "superfast broadband", with a minimum download speed of 30 Mbps (in line with the Europe Commission's digital agenda for 2020) is available to all rural households and businesses as an imperative for business, future home working, education and healthcare.
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?
Respondent Number: 5169 Comment Number: 2
Name: David Laming Organisation: River Regeneration Trust
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Agent Organisation: Attachments cont with the comment? No. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10. 10
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 93 of 956

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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , District-wide general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Bath N E Somerset formed the Strategic River Group which is currently producing a WaterSpace Study for the water catchment area. This includes the River Avon passing through the BANES area. I suggest it is important to include the positive impact the River Avon Corridor has upon the future socio-economic sustainability of the BANES area. In particular, relating to flood, drought, alternative affordable homes and the role the River Avon Corridor will play in waste treatment and energy production.
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?
The future importance of the River Corridor particularly relating to the effect Climate Change will have upon the social wellbeing and safety of the B&NES infrastructure and population.

11 May 2016 Page 94 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 22

Respondent Number: 2919 Comment Number: 4
Name: Dr David Martin Organisation:
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 22 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The paragraph acknowledges that Bath is a small city with limited scope for more development. The plan sets out a set of unmet needs for housing, employment, retail, hotels and university expansion. But not all of these needs can be accommodated. The plan does not make completely clear what the priorities should be in allocating the available land use for these needs. Hence the plan is unsound because it does not provide an effective and deliverable approach to further development.
Q5 Change Requested
To make the plan sound, it should clarify the priorities in the city of Bath such that: housing and employment spaces are the first priority; retail and hotel developments are a lower priority; and the expansion of the universities for academic and student accommodation should be limited to on-campus development within the existing site boundaries without any further intrusion into the Green Belt and the Cotswold Area of Oustanding Natural Beauty. This latter point would not preclude university expansion for academic and student accommodation in other parts of Bath & North East Somerset.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 95 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 30

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 3 Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 30 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
4 Soundness Comment
dd final sentence – "Provision of an extension of the west section of the Norton Radstock Greenway beyond lorthmead Road must not be prevented by keeping the former railway track corridor free of development to the parish oundary and beyond to employment and retail sites at Old Mills.
25 Change Requested
ee Q4.
oes the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Vhy does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
s an interested Town Council within RANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 96 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 33

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 4
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 33
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Add to para 33 or 42: The town centre also comprises of a number of residential properties (flats and houses) which
themselves require parking provision and form part of the town centre's "functions". This component should be mentioned in paras 33 or 42. Take out "is termed as the Island which" and "in the town"
Q5 Change Requested
See Q4.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
As an interested Town Council within RANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 97 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 34

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 5 Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council	
G The second of	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 34 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Please note that the National Westminster Bank is the wrong name they are simply NatWest Bank and Greyhound not Grey Hound.	
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?	
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town	

11 May 2016 Page 98 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 36

	=
Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 6	
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 36 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	_
Suggest we add "and its residential environs" after "how the town".	
Q5 Change Requested	
See Q4.	_
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?	
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town	_

11 May 2016 Page 99 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 39

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 7
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 39 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Replace "Much of the Silver Street" with "Coal mining pits began in Welto as far back as the 1760s, wealth funding the Hollies Mansion House through to Victorian buildings such as the Town Hall and the half-timbered Alms Houses and even on to the likes of the 1960s Mansbrook House, built around the time of the demise of the mining industry".
Q5 Change Requested
See Q4.
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?
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 100 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 42

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 8	
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council	
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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Consisten \(\square\) Not Effective \(\square\)	
	_
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 42	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	-
1st sub para: add at end - The term The Island is used here to refer to a wider.	
4th sub para - Reword to say - "The Midsomer Norton Sports Centre, the Skate & Adventure Play Park, the Somer Centre	
and Midsomer Norton Town Park" - area than that commonly recognised in the town.	-
Q5 Change Requested	
See Q4.	
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?	
As an interested Town Council within RANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town	

11 May 2016 Page 101 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 44

Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: 1
Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 44
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
44. Limited Land available: "The Council has therefore had to prioritise land uses for the limited land available. It has agreed that it will plan to meet its housing numbers and employment floorspace in full, will strive towards meeting the projected growth in hotel demand, and will accept that there is a shortfall in meeting the retail capacity currently identified for the whole plan period. The aspirations of the Universities are unlikely to be realised under this approach"
This appears the right set of priorities but does not deal with the fundamental problem in the city of increased Multi-Occ housing demand from students, lack of student accommodation at both campuses. Not meeting university demand or controlling it will not address the problems already being experienced in the city.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$

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

11 May 2016 Page 102 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 46

There is significant concern that student housing needs will not be met.

Volume:

1, District Wide

Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 46 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **Q4 Soundness Comment** The growth aspirations and changing demographics of both universities in Bath mean that meeting the previously assessed need will not provide sufficient housing Q5 Change Requested The housing need should be recalculated with input from both universities following their declarations of growth aspirations to ensure that the Council meets the new total assessed need which will have increased. 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?

11 Mav 2016 Page 103 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 48

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 10 Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 48 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Suggest that the following be added as an update "Midsomer Norton Town Council and B&NES Council, are taking forward a joint project (which commenced at the beginning of 2016) to build on a retail study undertaken in 2013. The outcome will form part of wider discussions regarding regeneration and its future delivery".
Q5 Change Requested
See Q4.
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?
As an interested Town Council within RANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 104 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Housing Requirement & Supply

Respondent Number:	244	Comment Number: 1	-			
Name: Susan E Green		Org	ganisation:	Home Builde	ers Federation	
Agent Name:		Age	ent Organis	ation:		
Further Information avail	able in	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent con		ne document is legally com	npliant? (Tid	ck if indicated	d 'yes') 🗆	
If the respondent conside	ers the [Draft Placemaking Plan is (unsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Cons	sisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates	to: Vo	olume 1 District Wide, Ho	ousing Requ	uirement & S	upply	
The Site Reference (if appl	icable) i	is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on Bath & North East Somerset (BANES) Placemaking Plan Part 2 of the Local Plan. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC's, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. We would like to submit the following comments and in due course attend the Examination Hearings Sessions for the Placemaking Plan.

Strategic Planning, OAHN and Housing Requirement

Policy DW1 Bullet Point (a) states that the first review will be co-ordinated with the West of England Core Strategy reviews in around 2016. This statement is somewhat vague and unspecific. The Council should be more transparent about its proposals for the review of the adopted Core Strategy, the amalgamation of the Placemaking Plan and Core Strategy into one document and the relationship of the Local Plan with the West of England (WoE) Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) for 2016 - 2036. It is understood that a revised Local Development Framework proposes a partial review of the adopted Core Strategy to align with the preparation of the WoE JSP to be followed by a full review of the adopted Core Strategy at a later date.

Even though the Council is a partner authority of the WoE JSP there is no reference to the WoE JSP in the Placemaking Plan and its role as a high level planning policy framework for the sub-region. At this time the Council must be aware of the significant concerns of the development industry about the supporting evidence of the JSP in particular the calculation of OAHN on the basis of a Wider Bristol Housing Market Area comprising of North Somerset, South Gloucestershire and Bristol excluding BANES. If this supporting evidence remains unchanged there is a likelihood that an Inspector examining the JSP would determine that the JSP is unsound undermining its envisaged function as a basis for future plan making across the sub-region. This strategic matter must be resolved as soon as possible by the four neighbouring authorities and the WoE Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). These concerns have been submitted by the HBF to the WoE JSP Issues & Options consultation which ended on 29th January 2016.

It is obvious that new evidence of OAHN arising within BANES and Wider Bristol HMA indicate that the scale of development within BANES will change significantly before the end date of the adopted Core Strategy in 2029. With specific reference to OAHN for BANES the implications of student numbers and Houses in Multiple occupation as set out in the Bath document are unclear. The Council should provide further explanation.

11 Mav 2016 Page 105 of 956

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 2564 Comment Number: 2
Name: Simon Steele-Perkins Organisation: Strategic Land Partnerships
Agent Name: Joanna Lee Agent Organisation: Peter Brett Associates LLP
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 1 District Wide , Housing Requirement & Supply The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Relying on the housing numbers set out in the existing Core Strategy is inappropriate and will not provide for adequate market and affordable housing to be developed to meet the needs that exist. The West of England SHMA has recently been produced which focuses on the Bristol Housing Market Area. It identifies a full objectively assessed need for 85,000 dwellings between 2016 and 36 and 29,100 affordable dwellings (this is nearly 30,000 more than currently provided for in total in the present Core Strategies). Whilst this primarily covers the local authority areas of Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire, it is notable that there has been an uplift of 7.5% on the baseline projections. It is highly likely that these baseline household projections and hence uplift will also apply to BANES. The Core Strategy is due for review in 2016 and this will involve a review of housing numbers in the Bath Housing Market Area. This combined with the new West of England Joint Spatial Plan evidence renders the Core Strategy housing figures out of date. It is essential that the Placemaking plan recognises that the housing figures included within the Core Strategy are out of date and no longer represent an up to date objective assessment of need. Continuing with the plan in the knowledge that the Core Strategy is out of date, and will not meet the needs that exist is unsound. The Brownfield sites, within the Somer Valley cannot be relied upon to deliver housing in the quantum or time
anticipated. We are aware of serious technical and other constraints to a number of these sites. Without clear evidence of their deliverability they should not be relied upon.
We note that the Placemaking Plan is presented together with the Core Strategy policies and that RA1, an adopted Core Strategy policy, is proposed to change with no evidence provided to justify this. We are concerned that this is inappropriate and confuses the status of the two plans. If it is considered that the policies of the Core Strategy are out of date, which they clearly are, then the whole document should be reviewed, not just parts selected by the council without justification.
Q5 Change Requested

11 May 2016 Page 106 of 956

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 wish to attend the examination to present these arguments and ensure that the Inspector is aware of the current up to date position in relation to the school particularly in relation to the preferred site in Mendip and to provide detailed evidence in relation to delivery issues.

Respondent Number: 48	15 Comment Number:	1		
Name: Timothy Cantell	Or	rganisation: Bear F	lat Association (BFA)	
Agent Name:	Ag	gent Organisation:		
Further Information availab	le in the original comment?	No Atta	achments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consid		No s unsound, is it beca	ause it is (ticked where indicated):	
The representation relates to The Site Reference (if applica	: Volume 1 District Wide,F ble) is:	lousing Requireme	nt & Supply	

Q4 Soundness Comment

BFA considers the Placemaking Plan to be unsound because a) it is not positively prepared to meet the objectively assessed requirements for housing development in the most sustainable fashion, and b) it is not consistent with national policy which requires a plan to deliver sustainable development.

Volume 1 of the Placemaking Plan sets out objectives 1 and 7 for 'reducing the need to travel by achieving closer alignment of homes, jobs, infrastructure and services', and delivering well-connected places accessible by sustainable means of transport. The earlier Core Strategy identified a number of strategic sites along the River Avon extending westwards from the city centre and at former MoD sites including Foxhill / Mulberry Park south of Bear Flat on the edge of Bath. Volume 2 of the Placemaking Plan concerns the city of Bath, which is arguably the best-connected part of the local authority area with the most sustainable transport infrastructure and the closest alignment of homes, jobs, infrastructure and services. However, aside from the strategic allocations which were identified in the Core Strategy, there is negligible attention given here to specific small sites in the city which could help deliver the housing numbers. The only site across the Widcombe / Lyncombe / Bear Flat area is south of Englishcombe Lane (40 dwellings - Policy SB17). By contrast, Volume 4 Somer Valley and Volume 5 Rural Areas envisage many small sites being developed for between 10 and 200 dwellings each in peripheral and rural locations which are far from employment concentrations, frequent public transport services, retail and other community facilities. It is difficult to understand how housing development some 10-15 miles from the centre of Bath with poor public transport, walking or cycling accessibility satisfies Objective 1 'reducing the need to travel by achieving closer alignment of homes, jobs, infrastructure and services ...' or Objective 7 'deliver well connected places accessible by sustainable means of transport...'. The failure to identify more small sites within the city itself will lead to unsustainable dispersed development which is in conflict with the Placemaking Plan's stated objectives.

A consequence of the dispersal of new development to Somer Valley and the Rural Areas is likely to be more traffic on the radial roads into Bath. The implication for Bear Flat is increased traffic on Wellsway, Wells Road and Bloomfield Road, with additional pressure for on-street car parking spaces. This will raise levels of traffic congestion, road accidents, air pollution and noise having a negative effect on residential amenity and pedestrians' environment in the Bear Flat local shopping centre. There is concern that sustainable transport conditions in Bear Flat will not be realised i.e. the Plan (Policy ST5) will not be effective. The evidence data from annual reports on the Council website indicate that air pollution along Wells Road already exceeds air quality standards. Policy ST6 envisages expansion of the Odd Down Park and Ride, but we know at first hand that congestion continues to be severe at peak times even after the opening of the facility.

11 Mav 2016 Page 107 of 956

We do recommend that the Park and Ride buses should stop at Bear Flat to assist children and staff to and from Beechen Cliff and Hayesfield Schools.

The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) updated in April 2015 records a substantial shortfall in housing provision 2011-15 (only 1,588 dwellings rather than 2,888 dwellings delivered) and sets out some of the delays and difficulties associated with developing the Core Strategy's allocated large sites. The HELAA document also records the extent to which applications and appeals are being made for sites in the Rural Areas that are a long way from Bath city centre but are beyond Green Belt boundaries and the World Heritage Site where any development is likely to be refused. This transfer of pressure to rural areas reflects the absence of identified sites in Bath; it indicates that greater scrutiny of possible small sites in the built up area of Bath should have been undertaken before publishing the Placemaking Plan, i.e. there should have been more positive planning to promote infilling and intensification. A failure to identify enough sites for housing development in the city of Bath, combined with growth in the Universities' student numbers, will create pressure for more residential properties to be converted to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). The Article 4 Direction may not be able to cope. Paragraph 246 of Volume 2 describes this problem but does not put forward an effective solution.

Q5 Change Requested

BFA is not a NIMBY organisation. We did not object to the Mulberry Park brownfield site as its use for housing, well served by buses, makes planning sense. Equally, we will support sensible proposals for infilling and intensification in the suburbs of Bath. However, we do not see planning sense in substantially increasing housing to the south of the city. There is no rail service and road connections are inadequate for traffic at current levels such that buses are delayed with little scope for traffic management to alleviate this. We would encourage the Inspector to test a journey by car or by bus from the Somer Valley into Bath during the morning peak. At the very least, such housing needs to be matched by employment opportunities close by and the transport implications of schemes should be thoroughly assessed. Better still would be to shift the emphasis of housing further towards truly sustainable locations.

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

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Ex	amination?		
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number	r: 1			
Name:	Organisation	n: Linden Hom	es Strategic Land	
Agent Name: Pegasus Group	Agent Organ	nisation: Sarah	Hamilton-Foyn	
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified □	I? No an is unsound,		, ,	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	· , Housing Re	equirement & S	Supply	
Q4 Soundness Comment				

11 Mav 2016 Page 108 of 956

The Pre-Submission Placemaking Plan is presented as a single document which includes the adopted Core Strategy. It is understood that the consultation is limited to those changes / additional text and deletions highlighted within the

Pegasus Group has been instructed by Linden Limited (Linden Homes Strategic Land) to respond to the consultation on

the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking Plan in relation to land at Bath Old Road, Radstock.

combined consultation document and therefore we are only invited to comment on those parts that are the result of the Placemaking Plan preparation.

The Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic framework as set out in the adopted Core Strategy, providing policy detail for development as well as site allocations. In this context the proposals contained within the Placemaking Plan represent the delivery mechanism for the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy. The spatial strategy is established through Core Strategy Policy DW1, the Placemaking Plan does not propose any amendments to this policy.

The Placemaking Plan is set within the quantitative requirements of the adopted Core Strategy which identifies provision to increase the supply of housing by around 13,000 homes over the Plan period (2011-2029) (Adopted Policy DW1). It should be noted that the housing provisions of the adopted Core Strategy are not to be applied as a cap on housing development. In this regard the Core Strategy Inspector's Report confirmed that:

"Thus 13,000 might be too low, but this evidence alone is insufficient and too crude a tool to justify any specific higher figure. It does justify the need to make clear that the proposed provision in the plan is not a cap on housing development and that more than 13,000 can and should be permitted where consistent with other policies . . . Planning provision of around 13,000 would represent a reasonable, but not generous, response to market signals."

As the Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the Core Strategy, it is required that the housing requirement is maintained as a minimum, with sustainable development in excess of this figure being supported. This is supported although it will still only provide for the period until 2029. The longer-term development needs will therefore need to be addressed through a comprehensive review of the Core Strategy.

In complementing the strategic framework set out in the adopted Core Strategy the Placemaking Plan, where necessary identifies site specific allocations. Whilst this is accepted the Placemaking Plan, as well as the Core Strategy, must be seen in the wider strategic planning context. In this regard it is prudent to highlight the fact that Bath and North East Somerset is a partner authority "signed up" to the delivery of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). As such the wider sub-regional JSP will have an impact on the scale of future housing provision that will need to be accommodated within the B&NES district, either in response to needs arising from the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area or those identified as arising within the Bath and North East Somerset SHMA through an updated Strategy Housing Market Assessment, the preparation of which is seen as necessary to ensure soundness of the JSP.

The West of England JSP is being prepared for the period to 2036, i.e. beyond the Plan period of the adopted B&NES Core Strategy. Furthermore it is understood that the JSP will inform a partial review of the adopted B&NES Core Strategy. Separate representations have been made on behalf of Linden Limited (Linden Homes Strategic Land) in relation to concerns as to the soundness of the JSP. The concerns relate to the principle matter of concern which is that the JSP is not based upon a reassessment of the housing needs of Bath and North East Somerset.

It should be noted that Bath and North East Somerset Council recently agreed (17th December 2015) a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) which sets out the timescale of a Partial Review of the Core Strategy commencing this month, this is in conjunction with the preparation of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan. (It should be noted that the Inspector's report accepted that the review of the Core Strategy will be reviewed at around 5 year intervals, but it anticipated that the first review would be timed to co-ordinate with the review of the West of England Core Strategies, it would appear that what is actually taking place is only a partial review and not based on meeting the housing needs of B&NES as this requires a separate SHMA which was not necessarily what was envisaged by the Inspector at the time of the B&NES Examination).

The LDS anticipates that consultation will take place on the Options for the Partial Review later this year, in the autumn. The Council expect to adopt the Partial Review in 2018, work will then commence on the Full Review of the Core Strategy.

Consequently, it must therefore be recognised that the scale of development to be accommodated within B&NES will be subject to significant review in advance of the end date of the adopted Core Strategy. New evidence on Objectively

11 May 2016 Page 109 of 956

Assessed Need arising from within B&NES and the wider Bristol HMA will necessitate the identification and release of additional sites, and it is considered that this is very likely to include the further release of sites within and around settlements.

The Somer Valley provides one of the most sustainable locations for growth across Bath and North East Somerset, as it is not subject to the Green Belt, AONB or World Heritage Sites that restrict development across much of the area. It is therefore likely to receive a significant amount of development to meet the longer-term needs once these are established. Policies need to reflect this now, such that they are flexible (and not overly restrictive) to facilitate future delivery.

The Core Strategy identified a requirement for 2,470 homes from 2011 to 2029 in the Somer Valley. This is a component of the 13,000 homes for Bath and North East Somerset and so sustainable development in excess of this figure should be supported in accordance with the Inspectors conclusions. The benefits of exceeding this figure is greater where the longer-term needs are unknown and are not being planned for as is the case in Bath and North East Somerset.

The Placemaking Plan identifies that the majority of these 2,470 homes have either been built or are subject to planning permissions and therefore concludes that there is no need for further allocations within the Somer Valley. Indeed, the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (April 2015) identifies sites with a capacity for 2,467 homes in the Somer Valley. This however, relies upon all sites with planning permission being developed and includes an allowance for 209 dwellings on unpermitted sites. The delivery of these unpermitted sites cannot be relied upon and it is likely that a proportion of permitted sites will fail to deliver in any case. The effect of this is that there will be a need for further delivery in the Somer Valley (in addition to the small site windfall allowance), even when compared to the minimum housing requirements of the Core Strategy.

In summary, there is a need to facilitate further delivery in the Somer Valley to meet the longer-term development needs (which have yet to be determined and could indicate a need for significant additional growth); to provide in excess of the minimum housing requirement of the Core Strategy (in accordance with the Inspectors Report); and to ensure that even the minimum level can be achieved in the Somer Valley once realistic delivery assumptions are included. This strongly supports the need to ensure that policies are flexible (and not overly restrictive) to support future housing delivery given that the longer- term housing needs are as yet unknown.

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Evamination (ticked if yes)?						
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: 6414 Comment Number: 1						
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP						
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver						
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N						
Dear the common death and religion the decourse at in least 1, something at 2 (Tiple if in directed basel)						
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 Consisten Not Effective						
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Housing Requirement & Supply						
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						

11 May 2016 Page 110 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Pegasus Group isinstructed by Radstock Land LP to submit representations in response to the consultation on the draft Placemaking Plan (December 2015).

Our comments relate to land interests located within the Somer Valley and as such are representations are framed within this context. The Somer Valley area is home to 25% of the population of the district and covers the urban areas of Midsomer Norton, Westfield and Radstock as well as the villages of Peasedown St. John and Paulton. Previous representations to the Options Placemaking Plan were submitted on behalf of our client (Respondent ID: 6414) in December 2014.

The 2015 Draft Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic framework set out in the adopted Core Strategy (CS) and where necessary identifies site specific allocations. Whilst this is accepted the Placemaking Plan, as well as the CS, must be seen in the wider strategic planning context. In this regard it is prudent to highlight the fact that Bath and North East Somerset Council is a partner authority signed up to the delivery of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). Through a Memorandum of Understanding (March 2014) B&.NES along with Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils agreed to "work together to understand and plan strategically for the future development needs of the sub-region."

The Placemaking Plan is set within the quantitative requirements of the adopted CS which identifies provision to increase the supply of housing by around 13,000 homes over the Plan period (2011-2029) (Adopted Policy DW1). It should be noted that the housing provision of the adopted CS is not to be applied as a cap on housing development. In this regard the CS Inspector's Report confirmed that:

"Thus 13,000 might be too low, but this evidence alone is insufficient and too crude a tool to justify any specific higher figure. It does justify the need to make dear that the proposed provision in the plan is not a cap on housing development and that more than 13,000 can and should be permitted where consistent with other policies Planning provision of around 13,000 would represent a reasonable, but not generous, response to market signals."

The Placemaking Plan must therefore reflect the fact that the CS housing requirement is a minimum, with suitable and sustainable development opportunities in excess of this figure supported. Moreover, the wider sub-regional JSP will have an impact on the scale of future housing provision that will need to be accommodated within the B&NES district, either in response to needs arising from the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area (HMA) and/or those identified as arising within the B&NES HMA through an updated Strategy Housing Market Assessment, the preparation of which is seen a necessary to ensure soundness of the JSP.

The West of England JSP is being prepared for the period to 2036, i.e. beyond the Plan period of the adopted CS. Separate representations have been made on behalf of Radstock Land LP in relation to concerns as to the soundness of the JSP. These relate to the principle matter of concern which is that the JSP is not based upon a reassessment of the housing needs of Bath and North East Somerset.

It should also be recognised that B&NES Council recently published (December 2015) a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) which sets out the timescale of a Partial Review of the CS commencing this month, this is in conjunction with the preparation of the West of England JSP. The LDS anticipates that consultation will take place on the Options for the Partial Review later this year, in the autumn. The Council expect to adopt the Partial Review in 2018, work will then commence on the Full Review of the CS.

It must therefore be recognised that the scale of development to be accommodated within B&NES will be subject to significant review in advance of the end date of the adopted CS. New evidence on Objectively Assessed Need arising from within B&NES and the Wider Bristol HMA will necessitate the release of additional appropriate sites within and around settlements, including those within the Somer Valley.

The Somer Valley provides one of the most sustainable locations for growth across Bath and North East Somerset. The area is not constrained by Green Belt, AONB or World Heritage sites that would otherwise restrict development. As a consequence genuine opportunities exist within the Somer Valley, including at Midsomer North / Radstock to make an

11 Mav 2016 Page 111 of 956

important contribution to housing needs, both in terms of immediate 5 year housing land supply requirements, as well as responding to longer-term needs once these are established. Policies need to reflect this now, such that they are flexible and provide a positive policy framework to facilitate future delivery of appropriate sites.

The CS identifies a requirement for 2,470 homes from 2011 to 2029 in the Somer Valley as a component of the 13,000 (minimum) provision for the Bath and North East Somerset area. Therefore sustainable development in excess of this figure should be supported in accordance with the CS Inspector's conclusions. The benefits of exceeding this figure is greater where the longer-term needs are unknown and are not being planned for, as is the case in Bath and North East Somerset.

The Placemaking Plan identifies that the majority of the 2,470 homes for the Somer Valley have either been built or are subject to planning permissions. On that basis the Placemaking Plan concludes that there is no need for further allocations within the Somer Valley. The evidential basis for this conclusion is the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (April 2015) which identifies sites with a capacity for 2,647 homes in the Somer Valley.

The conclusions of the Placemaking Plan that no further allocations are necessary is reliant upon two main assumptions. The first being that the 2,470 requirement represents a cap on development which is clearly not the case and contrary to the CS Inspector's conclusions. Secondly, that all sites identified within the HELAA will deliver as projected. In this regard it should be noted that the HELAA capacity figures includes an allowance for 209 dwellings on unpermitted sites. We do not support this and delivery of such sites cannot be relied upon and it is likely that a proportion of permitted sites will fail to deliver as expected.

Moreover, in the context of the Somer Valley the Placemaking Plan is over-reliant upon the development of brownfield sites. Such sites are often more difficult to deliver both in terms of timescales but critically in terms of viability. High remediation costs can impact on the delivery of wider objectives set out in the CS including the delivery of affordable housing. Therefore, a mix of both greenfield and previously developed land is considered necessary to ensure that delivery can be forthcoming in a timely manner, without delays associated within complex land ownerships, contamination, demolition etc, whilst also making efficient use of land.

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

Q5 Change Requested

Q4 Soundness Comment

Respondent Number:	6415	Comment Number: 1				
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes						
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group						
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?				No		
·	nsider the	e document is sound? raft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is	s it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Cons	sisten 🗌	Not Effective	

Pegasus Group is instructed by Strongvox Homes to submit representations in response to the consultation on the draft

11 May 2016

Page 112 of 956

Placemaking Plan (December 2015).

Our comments relate to land interests located within the Somer Valley and as such are representations are framed within this context. The Somer Valley area is home to 25% of the population of the district and covers the urban areas of Midsomer Norton, Westfield and Radstock as well as the villages of Peasedown St. John and Paulton. Previous representations to the Options Placemaking Plan were submitted on behalf of our client (Respondent ID: 6415) in December 2014.

The 2015 Draft Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic framework set out in the adopted Core Strategy (CS) and where necessary identifies site specific allocations. Whilst this is accepted the Placemaking Plan, as well as the CS, must be seen in the wider strategic planning context. In this regard it is prudent to highlight the fact that Bath and North East Somerset Council is a partner authority signed up to the delivery of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). Through a Memorandum of Understanding (March 2014) B&.NES along with Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils agreed to "work together to understand andplan strategically for the future development needs of the sub-region."

The Placemaking Plan is set within the quantitative requirements of the adopted CS which identifies provision to increase the supply of housing by around 13,000 homes over the Plan period (2011-2029) (Adopted Policy DW1). It should be noted that the housing provision of the adopted CS is not to be applied as a cap on housing development. In this regard the CS Inspector's Report confirmed that:

"Thus 13,000 might be too low, but this evidence alone is insufficient and too crude a tool to justify any specific higher figure. It does justify the need to make clear that the proposed provision in the plan is not a cap on housing development and that more than 13,000 can and should be permitted where consistent with other policies Planning provision of around 13,000 would represent a reasonable, but not generous, response to market signals."

The Placemaking Plan must therefore reflect the fact that the CS housing requirement is a minimum, with suitable and sustainable development opportunities in excess of this figure supported. Moreover, the wider sub-regional JSP will have an impact on the scale of future housing provision that will need to be accommodated within the B&NES district, either in response to needs arising from the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area (HMA) and/or those identified as arising within the B&NES HMA through an updated Strategy Housing Market Assessment, the preparation of which is seen a necessary to ensure soundness of the JSP.

The West of England JSP is being prepared for the period to 2036, i.e. beyond the Plan period of the adopted CS. Separate representations have been made on behalf of Strongvox Homes in relation to concerns as to the soundness of the JSP. These relate to the principle matter of concern which is that the JSP is not based upon a reassessment of the housing needs of Bath and North East Somerset.

It should also be recognised that B&NES Council recently published (December 2015) a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) which sets out the timescale of a Partial Review of the Core Strategy commencing this month, this is in conjunction with the preparation of the West of England JSP. The LDS anticipates that consultation will take place on the Options for the Partial Review later this year, in the autumn. The Council expect to adopt the Partial Review in 2018, work will then commence on the Full Review of the CS.

It must therefore be recognised that the scale of development to be accommodated within B&NES will be subject to significant review in advance of the end date of the adopted CS. New evidence on Objectively Assessed Need arising from within B&NES and the Wider Bristol HMA will necessitate the release of additional appropriate sites within and around settlements, including those within the Somer Valley.

The Somer Valley provides one of the most sustainable locations for growth across Bath and North East Somerset. The area is not constrained by Green Belt, AONB or World Heritage sites that would otherwise restrict development. As a consequence genuine opportunities exist within the Somer Valley, including at Midsomer North / Radstock to make an important contribution to housing needs, both in terms of immediate 5 year housing land supply requirements, as well as responding to longer-term needs once these are established. Policies need to reflect this now, such that they are

11 May 2016 Page 113 of 956

flexible and provide a positive policy framework to facilitate future delivery of appropriate sites.

The CS identifies a requirement for 2,470 homes from 2011 to 2029 in the Somer Valley as a component of the 13,000 (minimum) provision for the Bath and North East Somerset area. Therefore sustainable development in excess of this figure should be supported in accordance with the CS Inspector's conclusions. The benefits of exceeding this figure is greater where the longer-term needs are unknown and are not being planned for, as is the case in Bath and North East Somerset.

The Placemaking Plan identifies that the majority of the 2,470 homes for the Somer Valley have either been built or are subject to planning permissions. On that basis the Placemaking Plan concludes that there is no need for further allocations within the Somer Valley. The evidential basis for this conclusion is the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (April 2015) which identifies sites with a capacity for 2,647 homes in the Somer Valley.

The conclusions of the Placemaking Plan, that no further allocations are necessary, is reliant upon two main assumptions. The first being that the 2,470 requirement represents a cap on development which is clearly not the case and contrary to the CS Inspector's conclusions. Secondly, that all sites identified within the HELAA will deliver as projected. In this regard it should be noted that the HELAA capacity figures includes an allowance for 209 dwellings on unpermitted sites. We do not support this and delivery of such sites cannot be relied upon and it is likely that a proportion of permitted sites will fail to deliver as expected.

Moreover, in the context of the Somer Valley the Placemaking Plan is over-reliant upon the development of brownfield sites. Such sites are often more difficult to deliver both in terms of timescales, but critically in terms of viability. High remediation costs can impact on the delivery of wider objectives set out in the CS including the delivery of affordable housing.

Therefore, a mix of both greenfield and previously developed land is considered necessary to ensure that delivery can be forthcoming in a timely manner, without delays associated within complex land ownerships, contamination, demolition etc, whilst also making efficient use of land.

The consequence of this is that there will be a need for further delivery in the Somer Valley (in additional to the small site windfall allowance), even when compared to the CS minimum housing requirement.

The Placemaking Plan sets out a series of Development Management Policies and we consider these below.

The Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic framework as set out in the adopted CS, providing policy detail for development as well as site allocations. In this context the proposals contained within the Placemaking Plan represent the delivery mechanism for the CS Vision and Strategic Objectives. The spatial strategy is established through CS Policy DW1, the Placemaking Plan does not propose any amendments to this policy. Paragraph 62 provides the strategic overview for housing proposals in the Somer Valley with reference to CS Policy SV1(4).

New text introduced via the Placemaking Plan to SV1 (4) confirms that housing development will be located within the Development Boundary and any development outside the designated boundary only acceptable if permitted in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. We have two principle concerns with this approach. The first being that the quantitative provisions of SV1 are premised on the application of the CS requirement as a cap on development in excess of that accepted as being a minimum, contrary to the explicit reference contained within the CS Inspector's Report.

Secondly, the only mechanism available to deliver development in addition to that allocated / committed is via a Neighbourhood Plan. There is no guarantee that a Neighbourhood Plan will be prepared or that such a plan would look to identify additional sites. Therefore SV1, in the context of its quantitative provisions, effectively imposes a moratorium on additional development. This fails in two respects, firstly it amounts to a blanket restriction on development which is contrary to national policy and guidance, and secondly, it provides no flexibility or policy scope to enable the Somer Valley to make an appropriate contribution to meeting newly identified needs arising from the JSP both in terms of the Wider Bristol HMA and any updated B&NES SHMA assessment. Critically, it also precludes the release of appropriate and

11 Mav 2016 Page 114 of 956

sustainable sites in circumstances where a five year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. Meaning that it is only through the application of Paragraph 49 and 14 of the NPPF that such development opportunities will be considered, i.e. Where the relevant policies for the supply of housing, including Development Boundaries, are considered to be out of date.

Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?					
Respondent Number: 7121 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes					
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 1 District Wide, Housing Requirement & Supply The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
The role of the Placemaking Plan is outlined in the Introduction to the Pre-Submission Version. It is the Council's intention that the Placemaking Plan will complement the strategic planning framework provided in the Council's Core Strategy which was formally adopted by BANES in July 2014 and will deliver the housing and employment requirements established in the Core Strategy and its strategic objectives. The Council's Placemaking Plan focuses more on the specifics, including detailed design principles and development aspirations and updating the planning policies used in determining planning applications. It should be noted that for some locations the Placemaking Plan will be complemented by more detailed neighbourhood planning initiatives.					
Specifically, the Placemaking Plan will: •allocate sites for development for housing, employment and other uses to help meet development needs identified in the Core Strategy; •Review and update the development management policies used in the determination of planning applications •facilitate the delivery of key development sites; and •safeguard and enhance the quality and diversity of places in B&NES including the protection of valued assets and identifying opportunities for change.					
The proposed site allocation at Lansdown View would help the Council meet a number of these specific goals for instance, in terms of allocating land for housing to help meet the housing needs of the district, as well as providing allotments.					
National Policy Context					
The National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF) together with the more technical advice found in National Planning					

11 May 2016 Page 115 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets the context for both the overall development plan and more specifically policies to support the delivery of housing. Key to the NPPF is the emphasis on delivering sustainable development, based on the five guiding principles of the UKs Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future.

The NPPF definition of sustainable development as set out at Paragraph 7 defines sustainable development as having three dimensions; Economic, Social and Environmental. This commitment is implemented through the document's presumption in favour of sustainable development, set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. For plan making this means that: "Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change unless: Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or

Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted "

Paragraph 47 clearly sets out the government's key planning objectives to boost significantly the supply of all sources of housing. This includes the requirement for local authorities to meet local housing requirements through their Local Pan by identifying objectively assessed need, and by being able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

We contend that because of its lack of flexibility the Placemaking Plan will not be able to be in compliance with the adopted Core Strategy as it will not enable the delivery of the required level of housing across the plan period, nor will it be able to maintain a five years supply of housing as required by the NPPF and NPPG. We therefore consider that as drafted the Placemaking Plan would not be in accordance with national policy, and as such could not be found sound.

Housing Delivery Rates

The Core Strategy identifies a total minimum housing requirement of 13,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2029. The Core Strategy at paragraph 1.33 recognises that this represents a significant uplift in delivery rates from historic levels of around 380 dwellings pa (2001-2011) to an average annualised level of around 720 dwellings across the whole plan period. The Core Strategy also acknowledges that there has already been a shortfall in completions between 2011 and 2013 and that an additional 20% buffer of identified sites needs to be added in the first five years to take past poor performance into account. This equates, as identified in the most recent iteration of the Council's SHLAA (Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment: April 2015 update), as 1034 dwellings per annum over the next five years, with a forecast of peak delivery level of 1740 dwellings in 2017/18.

Whilst recognising that the Council's housing trajectory, which at the moment identifies lower levels of housing delivery towards the later part of the Plan period, it is very clear that to even achieve the simple annualised housing target (722 dwellings) would require a marked step change in housing delivery in the District. Historically, it is clear that this level of delivery has never been achieved, even in periods where the housing market and public finances have been very buoyant, peaking at 662 dwellings pa in 1998/99 and 554 dwellings pa in 2007/8. Last year 632 dwellings were delivered which is an improvement but does not represent the necessary increase in housing numbers over the plan period to meet the overall housing requirement. Delivery of housing at a rate that would meet expectations of a five-year housing land supply (currently 1034 dwellings pa) would require an even more significant rise in delivery levels.

Clearly achieving such a step change in housing delivery levels to even the annualised rate is going to be very challenging, and would require a proactive response from the

Council. Ideally this would entail a commitment from the Council to ensure the necessary resources to enable the timely assessment of relevant planning applications for housing are present; a commitment to reducing lead time though proactive engagement with developers and a commitment to help enable the delivery of necessary associated infrastructure to support housing development.

However all of these matters would require significant capital and revenue resources which is challenging in the post November 2015 Public Spending Review. As such the Council has not developed a coherent approach to supporting these high levels of housing delivery. Whilst the Council has developed an Infrastructure Delivery Programme which does help in supporting elements of key infrastructure, and identifying some funding resources through that programme,

11 May 2016 Page 116 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

given the level of change that needs to be achieved in BANES to meet its high aspirations this is simply not enough.

Furthermore it is questionable if the local housing market could support some of the very high projected levels of housing delivery in the next five years (for example, 1740 dwellings in 2017/18), given both levels of demand for property and availability of the necessary levels of skilled contractors and plant. It would be unlikely that discounting such housing to achieve sales in this period would be practical as this would have a knock on effect on the viability necessary to the support CIL and Section 106 contributions required by the Council and would delay or stifle development.

Impact of EZ

Enterprise Zones are the government's flagship policy for economic development and the attractiveness of an EZ to new business is likely to provide a significant boost to the local economy resulting in significant business and job growth in Bath over the Plan period.

Site Constraints

The concern we outline above is exacerbated by the fact that many of the sites identified in the Placemaking plan still require planning permission and are highly constrained. The precise nature of these constraints varies between the locations but they are particularly acute for locations on previously developed land.

Development of sites on previously developed land have greater start-up costs due to site clearance and possible decontamination/remediation. This means that considerably more survey work and due diligence on the part of developers is necessary than is generally expected for greenfield sites, leading to longer lead in times. Furthermore the planning application process can be more complex with the potential for considerable supporting information to accompany such applications.

Whilst estimates in recent iterations of the SHLAA, most recently updated through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (May 2015), have been made about the level of delivery that these sites can provide, in many cases this analysis has been at a relatively superficial level and the underlying policy context for many of these sites in the Placemaking Plan is relatively underdeveloped, in comparison to the far more sophisticated approach developed for some sites in Bath. This should be considered in the context of the Council's Housing Trajectory which places considerable reliance on delivery before 2018/19 from sites on previously developed land but not yet in receipt of planning permission. Thus the confidence with which both estimates of the level of housing yield from these sites, and the suggested timescales by which they could start to contribute must be treated with considerable caution. In some cases these sites may not in fact deliver any housing.

Conclusions on Land Supply Issues

- 3.16It is clear that the BANES Core Strategy and associated Housing Trajectory set an extremely challenging target to meet, even if this simply looks at a flat annualized rate. In order to achieve the levels of supply to be able to continue to demonstrate a five-year land supply (with a 20% poor performance allowance) the authority would need to be very proactive in engaging with developers to ensure prompt delivery of sites and also to carefully manage the supply of developable land in the District. However, BANES is overly reliant on previously developed, or otherwise constrained land, and its overly optimistic projections for the delivery of sites with planning permission. The implementation of the Core Strategy, as articulated in the Placemaking Plan, is not sufficiently flexible to be able to manage both 5-year land supply and overall delivery.
- 3.17In order to overcome these concerns, and meet the Core Strategy's housing target in the Somer Valley including its rural areas, we suggest that BANES needs to allocate more sites in order to give themselves the necessary flexibility to achieve both an ongoing five year land supply and the overall Core Strategy Housing Target.
- 5.1In order to continue to demonstrate a five-year land supply and achieve delivery of the overall housing numbers set out in the Core Strategy there must be a step change in housing delivery in the authority area. Whilst BANES has made some limited efforts through its Infrastructure Delivery Programme to achieve this, we contend that they have not made

11 Mav 2016 Page 117 of 956

sufficient progress in proactively addressing many of the planning and lead in time issues that apply to sites identified in the housing trajectory and the draft Placemaking Plan. This challenge is further exacerbated by the Council's reliance on delivery of a significant number of sites on previously developed land or that suffer from other constraints. Furthermore, BANES' assumptions on the delivery of sites with the benefit of planning permission are also overly optimistic and BANES is also overly reliant on development through the volume housing building model.

to the overly remain on the top ment and age. The total ment and a second or the second or the total ment and a second or the sec
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
why does the respondent reelies necessary to participate at the Examination.
Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 1
Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Housing Requirement & Supply
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
We do not believe the Plan has not been positively prepared and is not consistent with National Policy for the following reasons;
Housing Policies / Councils Approach
We are concerned that the Placemaking Plan is being based on out of date housing figures and fails to make sufficient site allocations to meet both the backlog of housing demand or the emerging needs of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP).
It is of particular concern that BANES has not produced an updated Objectively Assessed Need and is instead relying on historic outdated evidence. The Council will be aware of the of the concerns of the development industry as a whole with regard to the JSP evidence base in particular the Wider Bristol SHMA for North Somerset, South Gloucestershire an Bristol which for some inexplicit reason excludes BANES.
If the present evidence base remains unchanged the Placemaking Plan with be out of date before it is made.
Furthermore it is questionable that the Council have a five year land supply or a trajectory and plan which delivers the proposed Housing requirement (even at the present figures) quickly to deal with the present disparity between supply and demand. This is clearly illustrated by the rapidly increasing House prices within BANES area.
When allocating sites the Council should be mindful that in order to maximise housing supply there is a need to ensure that the widest possible range of sites in respect of size and location are provided. This will provide house builders of all

11 May 2016 Page 118 of 956

types and sizes access to land and ensure that the widest possible range of product is available to the market.

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Overall sales and build out rates are quicker on sites of up to 50 dwellings, three sites of 50 dwellings will be delivered quicker than one site of 1 50 dwellings.

The Council will also be aware of the Housing and Planning Bill 2015/16 which is presently going through its House of Lords readings. There are policies proposed in this which will again have a profound effect on Policies within the Core Strategy and through this the Placemaking Plan. In particular the Council needs to consider the affect on the delivery of Social and Affordable Housing (present NPPF definition) which will be significantly affected with the introduction of Starter Homes.

Local planning Authorities should use their evidence base to ensure their Local Plans, meets the full objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing.

Failure to maintain a five year land supply will also mean the recently made Neighbourhood Plans which fail to make provision for Housing and/or seek to impose restrictive policies to prevent Housing will carry limited weight.

Failure to address these issues will result in confusion and wasted effort by all stakeholders.

Housing Land Supply

BANES has not published a 2014 - 15 Annual Monitoring Report. BANES Local Development Scheme 2015 - 2019 states that "Review and monitoring are crucial to the successful delivery of the spatial vision and objectives of the LDF" and we support this statement. The program indicated the AMR would be issued in December but it is still awaited. Unless such monitoring is carried out on a timely basis it undermines the plan making process.

The partial review of the Core Strategy needs to be taking place in parallel with the West of England JSP. The JSP runs from 2016 to 2026 and therefore unless adequate provision to accommodate Housing numbers (even if only provisional at present) emerging from this is made, there will be an immediate and critical problem early in the two respective plan periods.

An up to date housing trajectory is required which takes on board the proposed site allocations and demonstrates that adequate delivery can be achieved early in the plan period to accommodate both a substantive part of the present 13000 dwellings together with the emerging numbers from the West of England JSP.

All references to 13,000 dwellings in the Placemaking plan should be prefixed by the words 'minimum of'.

The proposed introduction of Starter Homes into the Affordable Housing definition (Housing & Planning Bill 2015/16) will have a profound impact on the delivery of Social and Affordable (as NPPF present definition) identified needs. The Placemaking Plan needs to address this at an early stage.

It is not presently clear if the evidence base for the Core Strategy clearly differentiates between first time purchasers under 40 and other purchasers.

Volume 1; Vision and District Wide Strategy.

The Councils "3 Key Strategies" should be increased to include a 4th being Housing to meet the requirements of the NPPF to plan positively for a significant boost in Housing supply. This would also underline Policy DW1 which states "The overarching strategy for BANES is to promote sustainable development by; 1 focusing new housing, jobs and community facilities in Bath, Keynsham and the Somer Valley"

The Housing Trajectory at page 28 is now substantially out of date and not achievable.

Q5 Change Requested

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



11 Mav 2016 Page 119 of 956

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

Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.

Respondent Number: 7138 Comment Number	r: 1					
Name: Organisation: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd						
Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore						
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Ye						
Does the respondent consider the document is legal	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')					
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No					
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Placemaking	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):					
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	e , Housing Requirement & Supply					
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Wimpey control two parcels of land east of Keynsham,	bove consultation on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited. Taylor one which was removed from the Green Belt safeguarded in the I the other to its south (accessed from Manor Road) which re shown on the enclosed site location plan.					
VOLUME 4, POLICY KE3B: SAFEGUARDED LAND AT EAST KEYNSHAM						
Issues of Soundness						
The Scope for Changes						
it is within the scope of the PMP to amend CS policy. To respond to new evidence and changing circumstance	e Strategy (CS) proposed within the Placemaking Plan (PMP), that hat is the correct approach, because it allows changes to CS policy es. This accords with the NPPF which states that local plans "can changing circumstances". It is also clear from CS paragraph 1.05 s.					

In order for the PMP to be positively prepared and justified, a change should be made to CS Policy KE3b to allow safeguarded land at East Keynsham (the Safeguarded Land) to come forward now and be allocated for development. This change would be within the scope of the PMP (as outlined above) and in the remainder of this section we explain why it is necessary.

A Need to Respond toa New Strategic Context

The Safeguarded Land needs to come forward to respond to the new strategic context since the adoption of the CS. That new strategic context is the preparation of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP).

Parts of the evidence base for the JSP have now been published, including the West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment (July 2015) (WoE SHMA). Although the recommendations of the WoE SHMA are disputed and are likely to be subject to challenge in

the JSP process, they do clearly indicate that the scale of housing needs within the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area, within which Keynsham lies, is very significant and exceeds that currently being planned for.

11 May 2016 Page 120 of 956

The scale of need identified in the WoE SHMA is 85,000 dwellings 2016 -36 within the Wider Bristol HMA. Barton Willmore's own assessment is that the need is 156,440 for the West of England including BANES and 132,540 if B&NES is excluded. Whichever figure is used, the scale of need within the Wider Bristol HMA is considerably in excess of that currently being planned for and will, as the JSP acknowledges, necessitate the identification of additional strategic locations for growth.

Among the options identified in the JSP issues and options consultation, as being considered to accommodate that growth, are areas within B&NES which lie within the Wider Bristol HMA, including Keynsham.

The PMP needs to be cognisant of this new strategic context which, on any analysis, shows mounting future housing need. We accept that it is not the role of the PMP to pre-empt decisions about strategic development in the West of England, but, as the CS Inspector made clear, the allocation of the Safeguarded Land would not do that. The Inspector said that the limited size of the Safeguarded Land means that it would "not be of such a scale as to weigh significantly in any sub-regional assessment of future sustainable locations" (para 137).

Accordingly, there is no need to wait for decisions about the scale and distribution of needs in the JSP and CS partial review before the Safeguarded Land can be allowed to come forward.

A Need for Flexibility

Taking into account this strategic context there is a clear need to build flexibility into the PMP. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that Local Plans (and the PMP would be a Local Plan) need to encompass sufficient "sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change".

We know that change is coming in the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area, so there is a clear need to build in flexibility now.

Allowing the Safeguarded Land to come forward would provide that flexibility and would also respond to the NPPF's call to significantly boost the supply of housing. The CS clearly allows scope for housing delivery to be boosted above its minimum requirement; as paragraph 1.23e identifies "The 13,000 [Core Strategy housing target] is not intended as a cap on housing delivery".

Taking into account the scale of evidenced future needs within the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area, there is a clear need to build into the PMP sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. Such an approach would also be consistent with positive planning. The alternative would be to continue to hold back the Safeguarded Land and wait for its allocation to be necessitated, as it surely will be, by the JSP. But that strategy would be a negative one which would not be in line with the NPPF and would risk storing up problems for the future.

A negative strategy would also increase the risk of the Council being unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply if there were to be a lag in the delivery of any of the existing allocations.

A Need to Respond to Market Signals

The need to allow the Safeguarded Land to come forward now is also shown by an analysis of market signals. In the 4 years since the start of the current plan period (in quarter 2 2011), median house prices in B&NES have increased from £231,000 to £260,000 (quarter 2

2015) 1; a 13% increase. This is slightly above the 12% increase seen across the South West region.

However, the rate of increase in B&NES has significantly increased within the past two years for which data is available. Over the first two years of the plan period (period to Q2 2013), median prices in B&NES actually declined slightly from

11 Mav 2016 Page 121 of 956

£231,000 to £230,500. But since then they have risen rapidly, adding £11,500 in the year to 2014 and then a further £18,000 in the year to Q2 2015.

Of particular concern is that this pattern of rapid price increases since 2013 is mirrored for lower quartile prices, which gained £20,000 (or 12%) in the 2 years ende d Q2 2015. This affordability problem is shown by the ratio of median house price to median gross annual

salary which was 11.3 in B&NES in 2014, compared to an average ratio of 8.78 in England and Wales.

These issues are also felt at the bottom end of the housing market in terms of homelessness. In Bristol city, which (according to the WoE SHMA) unlike Bath city lies within the same Wider Bristol Housing Market Area as Keynsham, numbers accepted as being homeless and in priority need have increased rapidly in recent years. In 2014-15, 872 households were accepted as homeless and in priority need in Bristol. That was an increase from 491 in 2013-14, 324 in 2012-13 and 299 in 2011-122. Homelessness in Bristol has therefore increased by 292% within the current plan period.

These house price and affordability market signals reinforce the strategic picture of significant unmet needs within the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area.

Q5 Change Requested

The Safeguarded Land is Suitable and Deliverable

In light of the above, the most appropriate and positive strategy is to allow the Safeguarded Land to come forward and deliver housing sooner rather than waiting.

The suitability of the Safeguarded Land for development was considered in detailed evidence prepared for the CS examination and it has already been removed from the Green Belt. There is accordingly no need for significant further evidence-base work to allow the site to come forward.

The Taylor Wimpey safeguarded land, which is shown on the enclosed plan and lies to the east of Minsmere Road, is owned by the developer and is deliverable now.

In the context where further strategic allocations (including further Green Belt releases) are being contemplated in the Housing Market Area to address the scale of future housing need, it would be a failure of positive planning to continue to hold back this land.

Required Amendments

Within the strategic context of very significant future housing needs and an impending review of the B&NES CS's housing number, and taking account of market signals, to be positively prepared and justified having regard to proportionate evidence, the P MP should at the least:

- Allow the safeguarded land adjacent to East Keynsham to come forward in advance of 2029 (as was envisaged in the CS) and ahead of the CS Review; and
- Allocate the site for development and provide development management policies for its development.

Further Land

In releasing the Safeguarded Land, regard should also be had to the potential of the land to its south, also within Taylor Wimpey's ownership, which is accessed from Manor Road. In our recent representations to the JSP, we have shown how that southern parcel of land, which is shown in the attached site location plan, could be developed alongside the Safeguarded Land to deliver more comprehensive development and create pedestrian and bicycle connections. The removal of that land from the Green Belt would also allow the creation of a long-term defensible Green Belt boundary along side Manor Road Community Woodland. The explanatory text to CS policy CP8 (Green Belt) states (at para 6.63): "The Placemaking Plan provides the opportunity for a review of the inner detailed boundary, such as to address anomalies".

11 Mav 2016 Page 122 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

That opportunity should be taken in the PMP by removing the southern Taylor Wimpey land from the Green Belt to allow it to come forward alongside the Safeguarded Land.

CONCLUSIONS

The PMP, like any Local Plan, should take account of its strategic context and of market signals. For the reasons we have outlined in these representations, when those factors are taken into account, there is a clear imperative to provide flexibility. The proposed changes to policy KE3B are needed to deliver a plan that is positively prepared and justified and therefore sound.

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 represent the owner of safeguarded land at east Keynsham and wish to expand upon the points made in these representations.

Respondent Number: 7221	Comment Number: 4	ļ				
Name: Simon Gould Organisation: Mitchell Eley Gould						
Agent Name: Tim Stanley Agent Organisation: Colliers International						
Further Information available in th	ne original comment?	No	Attachment	ts sent with the	comment?	Yes
Does the respondent consider the Does the respondent consider the If the respondent considers the Dr	document is sound?	No			ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸	Not Justified 🗸	Not Consi	sten 🗸	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to: Volume The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		ousing Requ	irement & Sup	oply		
O4 Soundness Comment						

QUESTION 2A: DO YOU CONSIDER THE DOCUMENT IS LEGALLY COMPLIANT?

No. the plan does not consider the duty to cooperate and the need to assist in the delivery of any overspill from the Wider Bristol Strategic Housing Market Area.

QUESTION 2B: DO YOU CONSIDER THE DOCUMENT IS SOUND?

No. The Plan does not seek to deliver the correct amount of housing in sustainable locations and areas of least impact, especially when considering the performance of specific sites identified for release from the Green Belt within this version of the plan and those sites that are available and have not been considered for release from the Green Belt.

The plan also does not consider the need to meet the full objectively assessed needs for affordable housing provision as a market-led development strategy will not meet the needs of the Authorities affordable housing provision. The plan is not justified as a consequence of the inadequate supporting evidence.

QUESTION 3: IF YOU CONSIDER THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN IS UNSOUND, IS IT BECAUSE IT IS NOT: POSITIVELY PREPARED, JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE AND CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL POLICY

Tests of Soundness

To be 'sound' a plan must be:

Positively prepared- the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet the objectively assessed

11 May 2016 Page 123 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

- Justified- the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective- the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and
- •Consistent with national policy- the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework;

Positively prepared

In approach, this plan has been positively prepared and sets out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. The plan has considered the overflow needs of the Bristol Housing Market Area within the B&NES Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2013.

Despite this there may been the need for a further update of these figures in light of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP), which identified the need for 85,000 dwellings across the West of England Bristol Housing Market Area. This represents an additional 29,000 dwellings above the levels previously identified, Although other planning practices have suggested a higher figure with NLP identifying the FOAN to be 131,551 to 144,928 dwellings over the Plan period, whereas Barton Willmore have presented a FOAN of 153,000 dwellings. Neither approach by NLP or BW is inconsistent with our understanding that 85,000 dwellings is a gross underestimate of housing needs and that additional housing may be required in parts of B&NES such as Keynsham to help meet this requirement.

Justified

Housing numbers have been forecast accounting for the number jobs likely to be created by the employment allocations within Bath, These numbers have been based on sites approved and allocated under the B&NES Core Strategy part 1, adopted 10th July 2014. Since this document was adopted the Homes and Communities Agency have published new guidance in the form of the Employment Density Guide 3rd Edition, November 2015.

Through reviewing the volumes of employment space allocated within the this area, we estimate the number of jobs that could be supported by the existing allocation to be in the region of 1,900 (Appendix 1). Should this number be delivered the housing allocation of 2,150 new homes will be inadequate to meet demand.

Effective

The proposed allocations within the Draft Placemaking Plan are deliverable given that many of the allocated sites already have existing planning consent and others have had potential developers identified through the SHLAA. The Council have engaged with neighbouring LPAs to assess the need to accommodate housing demand from these areas although they may not have been supplied with sufficiently accurate information by these authorities.

We are of the opinion that whilst the Draft Placemaking Plan satisfies the test of soundness criteria in respect to Coordinated planning, Co-operation and Monitoring. However it lacks the flexibility to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstance as the majority of housing sites allocated are existing full or outline consents limiting the plans ability to respond to any additional housing need emerging during the period up until 2029 as most of the planned supply will be delivered during the early part of the plan period.

It is our opinion that when considered in the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan, which identifies a number of sites to meet the need for housing within the Bath Housing Market area, that the Draft Placemaking Plan should include a greater proportion of medium to longer tem sites to ensure sufficient flexibility to meet any additional need in areas. Given that infill sites within the town are already accounted for in the draft plan, it will be necessary to locate any additional allocations on the edge of the settlement as such the release of land within the greenbelt should be considered where it facilitates sustainable development.

Consistent with national policy

Insofar as the Draft Placemaking Plan is concerned out our only concern in regard to consistency with national policy whether the plan is based on data that is sufficiently up to date, as required by NPPF paragraph 158, when considered in

11 Mav 2016 Page 124 of 956

the context of the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan and updated guidance from the HCA in relation to employment densities.

To positively prepare a local plan the strategy must be proactive in setting and achieving a realistic, yet challenging level of development. This plan is not seeking to deliver against the full objectively assessed need for all types of housing. The gap in need for the delivery of affordable housing will not be fully met by the strategy proposed and an over reliance on the market to provide adequate levels of affordable housing on brownfield and non-green belt sites will not be successful.

The plan requires additional evidence to support its strategy and therefore it is not positively prepared, justified or effective for the purposes of assessing it against national policy.

QUESTION 4: PLEASE GIVE DETAILS OF WHY YOU CONSIDER THE DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN IS NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT OR IS UNSOUND?

The plan does not deal with the Duty to Cooperate and neither does it consider the objectives of the West of England Joint Strategic Plan.

For the reasons set out above, the plan is neither positively prepared, justified nor effective.

Q5 Change Requested

National Policy Context

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?

Yes, we would like to be present at the hearing sessions and to present our verbal representations. It is necessary as we would like to highlight the soundness issues presented above. We would also like to take the opportunity to make formal detailed representations regarding the disparities between the housing market information and economic development figures that are not currently aligned for Bath.

Respondent Number: 7222 Comment Numbe	er: 3					
Name: Phil Rigg Organisation:						
Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited						
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?				No		
Does the respondent consider the document is legal	ly compliant? (Ti	ck if indicated	'yes')			
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No						
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking P	lan is unsound, is	it because it i	s (ticked where indicated):			
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Cons	sisten 🗹	Not Effective ✓			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wid	le , Housing Req	uirement & Sເ	ıpply			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						

Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets the context for both the overall development plan and more specifically policies to support the delivery of housing. Key to the NPPF is the emphasis on delivering sustainable development, based on the five guiding principles of the UKs Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future. The NPPF definition of sustainable development as set out at Paragraph 7 defines sustainable development as having three dimensions;

The National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF) together with the more technical advice found in National Planning

11 Mav 2016 Page 125 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Economic, Social and Environmental. This commitment is implemented through the document's presumption in favour of sustainable development, set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. For plan making this means that: "Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;

Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted "

Paragraph 47 clearly sets out the government's key planning objectives to boost significantly the supply of all sources of housing. This includes the requirement for local authorities to meet local housing requirements through their Local Pan by identifying objectively assessed need, and by being able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.

Given our more detailed comments set out below we contend that because of its lack of flexibility the Placemaking Plan will not be able to be in compliance with the adopted Core Strategy as it will not enable the delivery of the required level of housing across the plan period, nor will it be able to maintain a five years supply of housing as required by the NPPF and NPPG. We therefore consider that as drafted the Placemaking Plan would not be in accordance with national policy, and as such could not be found sound.

Furthermore, since our representation on the Options Draft Placemaking Plan in January 2014, additional government policy statements and new legislation need to be taken into account.

A new Housing and Planning Bill was published on 13th October 2015 and contains a specific section on self-build and custom house building which is relevant to the Draft Placemaking Plan, building upon the provisions of the Private Members Bill Self Build and Custom House Building Act 2015.

There is considerable national policy and government support for Custom Build which should be reflected in the Draft Placemaking Plan. Specifically, paragraph 50 of the Framework requires LPAs to make provision for a wide choice of high quality homes, and plan for '...people wishing to build their own homes'. The government's support for the self-build/custom-build sector has been reiterated in a number of ministerial speeches and the CIL regime for this sector has been relaxed as set out in the NPPG.

The recent Housing and Planning Bill 2015-2016 which was published on 13th October 2015, contains a specific section on self-build and custom house building which gives further weight to the need to include specific support for self-build in the Draft Placemaking Plan. This builds on the provisions of the Private Members Bill Self Build and Custom House Building Act 2015. The Housing and Planning Bill requires that Local Planning Authorities now have a duty to provide sufficient self-build plots with planning permission to meet the demand for self-build housing in their districts, as specified on the Self Build Register for that district, described as the "right to build" with the government setting its intention to double the number of self-build and custom-build homes by the end of the decade. The precise operation of this requirement will be addressed through further secondary legislation but it shows a clear commitment to support the expansion of the self and custom-build sectors as government recognises that the volume homebuilding sector does not have capacity to deliver the number of new homes that are required nationally.

The Draft Placemaking Plan reflects this advice in Policy H4 on Self Build and the site allocation proposed at Camerton could help meet the Council's self-build obligations.

The Development Plan

The Development Plan for BANES consists of the adopted Core Strategy (July 2014) which includes policies saved from the 2007 Local Plan. The intention is that these saved policies will be replaced on adoption of the Placemaking Plan.

The Somer Valley

11 Mav 2016 Page 126 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Paragraph 18 of the Somer Valley Chapter of the Placemaking Plan sets out an overview of development in the area. It states;

There is already a significant number of housing commitments in the Somer Valley and a limited capacity to generate new jobs. New housing in the Somer Valley will therefore be restrained in the interest of sustainability but some additional housing is likely to come

forward on brownfield sites... However in light ofthe objective of economic led revitalisation, it is important that the additional housing does not significantly worsen the balance between homes and jobs and the out-commuting problems.

Furthermore paragraph 19 states; Local designations such as Housing Development Boundaries and Core Business Areas have been reviewed and are shown on the Policies Map.

However there has also been a highly significant change to the economic prospects of the Somer Valley with the recent establishment of the Somer Valley element of the Bristol Bath and Somer Valley Enterprise Zone on a series of sites in the Somer Valley.

Paragraph 13 of the Somer Valley Chapter states:

The Somer Valley element of the Bristol, Bath & Somer Valley Enterprise Zone (EZ) will prioritize the establishment of a new strategic employment location for thearea and provide incentives to bring forward existing sites. Based on land allocated in the placemaking Plan it will promote the delivery of new business investment and employment growth and address the Core Strategy Vision & Spatial Strategy for the area. This is in response to the major factory closures that have affected the area which is suffering from increasing out-commuting as local job growth is not keeping pace with residential expansion. By acting as the catalyst for new investment in the Somer Valley the EZ will also seek to enable the regeneration of brownfield employment locations and the revitalization of the areas town centres.

Core Strategy Policy SV1 sets out the strategy for the Somer Valley as a whole. Midsomer Norton town centre will continue to be the principle centre for the Somer Valley, with Radstock town centre providing a smaller scale but important focal point for neighbouring communities. Amongst a series of requirements in Policy SV1 is the need to enable the delivery of around 2,470 new homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John. Development in other settlements in the Somer Valley will be assessed under the criteria set out in Core Strategy Policies RA1 and RA2.

Sites in the Somer Valley including Camerton are not identified in the Placemaking Plan other than where these reflect already permissioned development. Camerton has been identified as a RA2 settlement in the BANES Core Strategy. Paragraph 61 of the Draft

Placemaking Plan Options Document states that:

"There are no proposed options for site allocations or local green space designations within Camerton due to landscape, highways issues and conservation issues that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated. During the Placemaking Plan period development could come

forward within the housing development boundary. Any potential site would be considered on its individual merits against national and local planning policy."

We consider that this approach is clearly overly restrictive and inflexible by placing too much reliance on a limited number of sites in only a few locations. Such an approach would result in an unsound Placemaking Plan which would not be in conformity with the Core Strategy as it would not be capable of delivering the required minimum level of dwellings for the Somer Valley Area identified in Core Strategy Policy SV1 within the Plan period. Furthermore it is very unlikely that any shortfall in this location could met elsewhere in the District outside the Somer Valley. In addition the economic stimulus provided by the designation of part of the Somer Valley as an Enterprise Zone has not been fully taken into consideration, especially with respect to the strategy to restrict

housing growth in order to limit out commuting. We therefore consider that the need for a more flexible approach in the Placemaking plan is justified for the following reasons:

- Historically BANES has had a very low housing delivery rate, which has been considerably beneath required Local Plan delivery rates. We are not aware that the Local Authority are taking any steps to accelerate this build rate, both by means of additional resources to its planning team or engagement with developers to enable faster delivery.

11 May 2016 Page 127 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

- Many of the sites in the Somer Valley and the wider district are located on previously developed land and may have high associated remediation costs involved. This may result in both delays to the delivery of these sites and in some cases their unviability in current market conditions. In addition this may further impact on other plan considerations such as the provision of affordable housing. Many of the sites in the Somer Valley, and the wider district do not benefit from any form of planning permission and indeed may also be subject to competing land uses which may provide land owners with additional value.
- Overly optimistic assumptions have been made about the delivery of sites with existing planning permission.
- Given the designation of the Enterprise Zone (EZ) in the Somer Valley, assumptions made about the need to limit the amount of Housing in the area to mitigate out-commuting are unduly restrictive.

We set out the reasons for our view in more detail below.

Housing Delivery Rates

The Core Strategy identifies a total minimum housing requirement of 13,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2029. The Core Strategy at paragraph 1.33 recognises that this represents a significant uplift in delivery rates from historic levels of around 380 dwellings pa (2001 -2011) to an average annualised level of around 720 dwellings across the whole plan period. The Core Strategy also acknowledges that there has already been a shortfall in completions between 2011 and 2013 and that an additional 20% buffer of identified sites needs to be added in the first five years to take past poor performance into account. This equates, as identified in the most recent iteration of the Council's SHLAA (Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment: April 2015 update), as 1034 dwellings per annum over the next five years, with a forecast of peak delivery level of 1740 dwellings in 2017/18.

Whilst recognising that the Council's housing trajectory, which at the moment identifies lower levels of housing delivery towards the later part of the Plan period, it is very clear that to even achieve the simple annualised housing target (722 dwellings) would require a marked step change in housing delivery in the District. Historically, it is clear that this level of delivery has never been achieved, even in periods where the housing market and public finances have been very buoyant, peaking at 662 dwellings pa in 1998/99 and 554 dwellings pa in 2007/8. Last year 632 dwellings were delivered which is an improvement but does not represent the necessary increase in housing numbers over the plan period to meet the overall housing requirement. Delivery of housing at a rate that would meet expectations of a five year housing land supply (currently 1034 dwellings pa) would require an even more significant rise in delivery levels.

Clearly achieving such a step change in housing delivery levels to even the annualised rate is going to be very challenging, and would require a proactive response from the Council. Ideally this would entail a commitment from the Council to ensure the necessary resources to enable the timely assessment of relevant planning applications for housing are present; a commitment to reducing lead time though proactive engagement with developers and a commitment to help enable the delivery of necessary associated infrastructure to support housing development.

However all of these matters would require significant capital and revenue resources which is challenging in the current public spending round, which remains extremely challenging for Local Authorities post the November 2015 Public Spending Review. As such the Council has not developed a coherent approach to supporting these high levels of housing delivery. Whilst the Council has developed an Infrastructure Delivery Programme which does help in supporting elements of key infrastructure, and identifying some funding resources through that programme, given the level of change that needs to be achieved in BANES to meet its high aspirations this is simply not enough.

Furthermore it is questionable if the local housing market could support some of the very high projected levels of housing delivery in the next five years (for example, 1740 dwellings in 2017/18), given both levels of demand for property and availability of the necessary levels of skilled contractors and plant. It would be unlikely that discounting such housing to achieve sales in this period would be practical as this would have a knock on effect on the viability necessary to the support CIL and Section 106 contributions required by the Council and would delay or stifle development.

Impact of EZ

11 May 2016 Page 128 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Enterprise Zones are the government's flagship policy for economic development and the attractiveness of an EZ to new business is likely to provide a significant boost to the local economy resulting in significant business and job growth in the Somer Valley over the Plan period. The Somer Valley element of the Bristol, Bath & Somer Valley Enterprise Zone, focused on a parcel of Greenfield Land at Old Mills to the west of Midsomer Norton, whilst relatively modest in scale compared to the other EZ sites in Bristol and Bath, has the potential to significantly rebalance the local economy in this area and mitigate the Council concerns over the balance between housing and employment in this part of the District. Therefore the highly restrictive approach to housing development in the Somer Valley should be more flexible, taking advantage of sustainable and developable sites in the area such as the site at Bridge Place Farm, Camerton.

Site Constraints

The concern we outline above is exacerbated by the fact that many of the sites identified in the Placemaking plan still require planning permission and are highly constrained. The precise nature of these constraints varies between the locations but they are particularly acute for locations on previously developed land.

Development of sites on previously developed land have greater start-up costs due to site clearance and possible decontamination/remediation. This means that considerably more survey work and due diligence on the part of developers is necessary than is generally expected for greenfield sites, leading to longer lead in times. Furthermore the planning application process can be more complex with the potential for considerable supporting information to accompany such applications. These factors when taken in the context of the relatively modest housing market in the Somer Valley, are likely to result in costs which may amount to a development never being viable unless market conditions altered radically and it is possible that without the confidence of detailed viability work, many of the sites identified by the Council in the Placemaking Plan will simply never be developed.

Whilst estimates in recent iterations of the SHLAA, most recently updated through the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (May 2015), have been made about the level of delivery that these sites can provide, in many cases this analysis has been at a relatively superficial level and the underlying policy context for many of these sites in the Placemaking Plan is relatively underdeveloped, in comparison to the far more sophisticated approach developed for some sites in Bath. This should be considered in the context of the Council's Housing Trajectory which places considerable reliance on delivery before 2018/19 from sites on previously developed land but not yet in receipt of planning permission. Thus the confidence with which both estimates of the level of housing yield from these sites, and the suggested timescales by which they could start to contribute must be treated with considerable caution. In some cases these sites may not in fact deliver any housing.

Work in support of 3 planning appeals by Savills (Land at Cappards Road, Bishop Sutton:

APP/F0114/A/14/2217216; Land at Boxbury Hill, Midsomer Norton:

APP/F0114/A/14/2215930 and Land at Abbotts Farm Close, Paulton:

APP/F0114/A/14/2214596) questioned the identified level of delivery in the next five years from identified sites. This critique focused on both the Welton Bibby Baron Site (Welton Bag Factory) and St Peter's Factory/Cobblers Way. Savills estimate that the expected contribution from these two sites needed to be reduced from 170 dwellings over five years to just 30 dwellings. The Welton Bibby Baron site will not be able to deliver any housing in the next five years. In addition it should be remembered that the proposed allocations in both Midsomer Norton and Radstock are both subject to the further Neighbourhood Planning process, which will add a further level of delay to the identification of these sites.

Sites in receipt of planning permission

There is also a considerable element of supply in the Somer Valley from sites that are in receipt of at least outline planning permission but have not yet started. Appendix 2 of the Housing and Economic land Availability Assessment (April 2015) identifies that a considerable proportion of these sites will start in the coming year (201 6/17) but it is unclear on the basis by which this assumption has been made, especially as many of these sites suffer from constraints that need to be satisfactorily overcome and no attempt has been made to estimate likely non implementation of these sites or potential delays to start times. The local authority has not considered the effect of changing levels of housing supply in local markets, and the effect this may have on build out rates and viability, and also have not considered the

11 Mav 2016 Page 129 of 956

reselling of land with permission to other developers who may wish to alter approved schemes. The Savills report also calls into question the assumptions made in assessing the speed at which these sites will deliver, considering them to be overly optimistic.

The Savills report seriously questions the deliverability of a number of permissioned sites on these grounds. In particular it highlights the issues that have arisen on the Old Pit Yard site in Clandown, both in terms of developer readiness and the need for further studies to ensure the safe development of a contaminated and unstable site.

Conclusions on Land Supply Issues

It is clear that the BANES Core Strategy and associated Housing Trajectory set an extremely challenging target to meet, even if this simply looks at a flat annualized rate. In order to achieve the levels of supply to be able to continue to demonstrate a five year land supply (with a 20% poor performance allowance) the authority would need to be very proactive in engaging with developers to ensure prompt delivery of sites and also to carefully manage the supply of developable land in the District. However BANES is overly reliant on previously developed, or otherwise constrained land, and is overly optimistic projections for the delivery of sites with planning permission. The implementation of the Core Strategy, as articulated in the Placemaking Plan, is not sufficiently flexible to be able to manage both 5 year land supply and overall delivery.

This situation is particularly acute in the Somer Valley, where house prices are generally lower than the rest of the district. There is an over reliance on previously developed land much of which is not in the state of readiness necessary to enable these sites to deliver in the next five years, or in some cases ever delivery housing, particularly with respect to viability. Furthermore the authority's assumptions on delivery from sites that have planning permission are again overly optimistic and have failed to take into account some of the significant constraints and issues these sites are affected by. In addition the justification for restricting housing supply in the Somer Valley, due to an over reliance on out commuting, is less justified given the presence of the Somer Valley Element of Bristol Bath and Somer Valley EZ.

In order to overcome these concerns, and meet the Core Strategy's housing target in the Somer Valley including its rural areas, we suggest that BANES needs to allocate a number of relatively unconstrained greenfield sites such as the land at Bridge Place Farm, Camerton, in order to give themselves the necessary flexibility to achieve both an ongoing five year land supply and the overall Core Strategy Housing Target. Additional housing growth in Camerton will also assist in sustaining local facilities such as the primary school.

Even in the event that the Council is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply we consider that there are compelling planning reasons for allowing the site at Camerton to be allocated for self-build housing, given the emphasis on self build in both the draft Housing and Planning Bill and the Private Members Self Build and Custom House Building Act 2015 Bill.

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?

Due to the complexity of these issues and the need to test evidence, we wish to participate at the oral examination.

Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number: 1

Name: Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited
Agent Name: James Millard Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 130 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$						
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 Consisten	Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Housing Requirement & Supply The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA						

Q4 Soundness Comment

Our comments are set with the context of land under the control of my client on land off Stockwood Lane, Whitchurch. It is understood that the consultation is limited to those changes / additional text and deletions highlighted within the combined consultation document and that we are only invited to comment on those parts that are the result of the Placemaking Plan preparation.

The Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic framework as set out in the adopted Core Strategy (CS), providing policy detail for development as well as site allocations. In this context the proposals contained within the Placemaking Plan represent the delivery mechanism for the CS Vision and Strategic Objectives. The spatial strategy is established through CS Policy DW1, the Placemaking plan does not propose any amendments to this policy. Within this context we note that the adopted CS allocates land at Whitchurch, released from the Green Belt to provide 200 dwellings (Policy RA5). Land under the control of my client is located directly to the north west of the RA5 allocation.

Policy CP8 (Green Belt) confirms the extent of the Green Belt designation as that area identified on the CS Key Diagram and associated Policies Map. It is recognised within paragraph 298 that a significant proportion of the District lies within the Green Belt

designation which necessitates the need to carefully manage future development. Paragraph 288 reiterates the "very special circumstances" test as set out at paragraph 87 of the NPPF. The extent of the current Green Belt has been informed by the recent

examination and subsequent adoption of the CS and its quantitative provision, the result of which is that the starting point is that there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant altering the Green Belt. Whilst this is generally accepted at this point in time it is prudent to consider the impact of the involvement of B&NES in the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and future reviews of the adopted CS, particularly where this is informed by an up to date objective assessment of housing need.

The Placemaking Plan is set within the quantitative requirements of the adopted CS which identifies provision to increase the supply of housing by around 13,000 homes over the Plan period (2011-2029) (Adopted Policy DW1). It should be noted that the housing provisions of the adopted CS are not to be applied as a cap on housing development. In this regard the CS Inspector's Report confirmed that:

"Thus 13,000 might be too low, but this evidence alone is insufficient and too crude a tool to justify any specific higher figure. It does justify the need to make clear that the proposed provision in the plan is not a cap on housing development and that more than 13,000 can and should be permitted where consistent with other policies . . . Planning provision of around 13,000 would represent a reasonable, but not generous, response to market signals."

The Placemaking Plan must therefore reflect the fact that the CS housing requirement is a minimum, with suitable and sustainable development opportunities in excess of this figure supported.

The Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic framework set out in the adopted CS and where necessary identifies site specific allocations. Whilst this is accepted the Placemaking Plan, as well as the CS, must be seen in the wider strategic planning

context. In this regard it is prudent to highlight the fact that Bath and North East Somerset is a partner authority signed up to the delivery of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). The wider sub-regional JSP will have an impact on the scale of future housing

11 Mav 2016 Page 131 of 956

provision that will need to be accommodated within the B&NES district, either in response to needs arising from the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area or those identified as arising within the B&NES HMA through an updated Strategy Housing Market Assessment, the preparation of which is seen a necessary to ensure soundness of the JSP.

The West of England JSP is being prepared for the period to 2036, i.e. beyond the Plan period of the adopted B&NES CS. Furthermore, the JSP will inform a partial review of the CS. Separate representations have been made on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd in relation to concerns as to the soundness of the JSP. The concerns relate to the principle matter of concern which is that the JSP is not based upon a reassessment of the housing needs of Bath and North East Somerset.

It should also be recognised that B&NES Council has recently agreed (17th December 2015) a revised Local Development Scheme which sets out the timescale of a Partial Review of the CS commencing this month, this is in conjunction with the preparation of the West of England JSP. The Local Development Scheme anticipates that consultation will take place on the Options for the Partial Review later this year, in the autumn. The Council expect to adopt the Partial Review in 2018, work will then commence on the Full Review of the CS.

It must therefore be recognised that the scale of development to be accommodated within B&NES will be subject to significant review in advance of the end date of the CS. New evidence on Objectively Assessed arising from within B&NES and the wider Bristol HMA will necessitate the identification and release of additional sites, and it is considered that this is very likely to include the further release of sites within Green Belt through a review of existing Green Belt boundaries. Land at Whitchurch under the control of my client, currently within the designated Green Belt, is located approximately 6km south of Bristol city Centre and much of the northern boundary of the site adjoins the administrative boundary of Bristol City. Therefore, in the context of the emerging JSP, irrespective of any newly identified need arising from within B&NES, the site has the potential to make an important contribution to meeting the needs of the Wider Bristol HMA in a manner which is consistent with the Bristol-centric strategy as advocated in the Issues draft of the JSP.

In this context it is prudent to refer to Paragraph 85 of the NPPF which requires that Green Belt Boundaries should endure beyond the plan period "to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period." It would normally be appropriate for Local Plans to include safeguarded land, i.e. land removed from the Green Belt but not allocated for development, in order to ensure longevity of Green Belt boundaries with sufficient headroom to accommodate future needs when identified. The B&NES CS Inspector's Report recognised that future development pressures arising from within B&NES and Bristol HMA will require the release of additional land from the Green Belt. In light of the agreed programme of joint working between B&NES and its neighbouring authorities, including Bristol, the Inspector concluded that if land was removed from the Green Belt in the CS to be safeguarded it would "inappropriately skew the future sub-regional assessment of the most sustainable locations." (para 136 of CS Inspectors Report).

In this context, whilst we recognise the rationale behind advancing the Placemaking Plan in order to implement the strategic objectives established in the adopted CS, we are concerned that this Placemaking Plan will lack longevity and its provisions and policy stance on matters such as Green Belt, specifically reference to the absence of exceptional circumstances, will become redundant and/or contradictory to the strategic objectives set out in the JSP.

The Placemaking Plan introduces 'Core Development Management Policies' which are complemented by a range of district-wide policies. Paragraph 86-88 states that together these will help to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy and will be used to assess and determine planning applications and appeal.

11 May 2016 Page 132 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Respondent Number: 6411 Comment Number:

Name: Organisation: Emergy Ltd

Agent Name: Georgina Tibbs Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore

Further Information available in the original comment? 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 Consisten **✓**

Not Effective ✓

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Housing Requirement & Supply

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Plan should seek to meet an Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for the Joint Spatial Plan area of the West of England. There is no reference to the JSP in the Draft Plan. All Councils preparing new plans are required to comply with the Duty to Cooperate and B&NES appears to be allocating sites and working with a housing requirement that does not plan for the OAHN for the Wider Bristol Area. Unless the Placemaking Plan adopts sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, it will not be sound in that it will not be consistent with national policy, justified nor positively prepared.

The Placemaking Plan proposes only one allocation for Cameley-Temple Cloud. This is a Site that has planning permission (70 dwellings). The strategy for minimal growth at Temple Cloud is not consistent with National Policy. The Draft Placemaking Plan should encourage new residential development rather than restrict. The Planning Practice Guidance (Para 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306) states that "blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence."

The Placemaking Plan does not provide an updated housing supply trajectory. It therefore does not demonstrate how it would contribute to the delivery of the Core Strategy's requirements for market and affordable housing. For this reason, the plan therefore fails the tests of being justified and effective.

In summary, there are a number of issues of soundness including:

- Failure to support the contribution of Cameley-Temple Cloud to delivering sustainable development and indeed adopting a negative strategy of seeking to restrict development (contrary to national policy).
- Failure to produce a positively prepared plan which has regard to the JSP context and adopts insufficient flexibility to respond to impending rapid change (again also contrary to national policy).
- Failure to demonstrate the contribution of the plan to delivering a supply of market and affordable housing.

Q5 Change Requested

The Draft Placemaking Plan should allocate further Sites for development in the Rural settlements.

All settlements can pay a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, the plan should allocate further sustainable sites for development in the Cameley-Temple Cloud area.

The Placemaking Plan should identify land at the Former Garden Nursery site in Temple Cloud as an allocation for residential development. The site covers an area of approximately 0.49 ha and comprises of areas of hardstanding and shrubbery. The hardstanding is what remains of the former garden nursery. The developable area has the capacity for 15 dwellings at an approximate density of 30 dph. However, given the location and context the sketch layout enclosed illustrates a layout for 10 dwellings.

The Former Garden Nursery site is separated from the Housing Development Boundary of Temple Cloud. However, it is

11 May 2016 Page 133 of 956

located adjacent to the A37, opposite a cluster of existing buildings in the area known as Cholwell. The proposed development of 10 dwellings will add to this cluster of dwellings and the site is well related to Temple Cloud being less than a 350 metre walk to the centre of the village. The site is well served by frequent bus services (376 and 379) to Bristol and Wells. The north and south bound bus stops are within a 350 metre walk from the site.

Technical studies have been undertaken these studies demonstrate:

- -The existing access is able to provide a safe access and egress to serve potential development;
- -There are no significant ecological constraints that are likely to affect the principle of development;
- -The area identified for development is within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding).

We enclose the design and access statement prepared for our clients' recent planning application which demonstrates how the site could be developed.

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?

Significant issues require discussion at examination. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

	Respondent Number: 7133 Comment Number:	1			
	Name: Mrs E Russell	Organisation:			
	Agent Name: Andrew Winstone	Agent Organisa	tion: Ian Jewso	on Planning	
	Further Information available in the original comment?	? No	Attachments	sent with the comment?	No
-					
	Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant? (Ticl	k if indicated 'y	es') 🗌	
	Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	No No			
	If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	າ is unsound, is i	t because it is (ticked where indicated):	
	Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified □	Not Consis	sten 🗸	Not Effective 🗸	
_					
	The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Housing Requi	irement & Sup _l	oly	
	The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA				

Q4 Soundness Comment

On behalf of our client Mrs. E. Russell, we set out below a number of detailed representations on the draft Placemaking Plan which was published for formal consultation on 16th December 2015. Our client's interests involve land at Timsbury, within the Rural Areas policy area of the District.

The focus of our representations is on the soundness of the draft Plan's policy approach to housing delivery in the Rural Areas policy area generally, and in Timsbury specifically. With regard to the following policies and paragraphs we consider the draft Plan to be unsound as currently drafted having regard to the relevant tests, and we suggest how the Plan could be made sound.

Volume 1 Paragraph 67

Paragraph 67 explains that the strategy for the Rural Areas is to enable housing developments of around 50 dwellings at each of the RA1 villages, in addition to small windfall sites within the HDB (our emphasis). The objective being to make a major contribution to the 1,120 or so dwellings required in the Rural Areas over the Core Strategy period. We consider this to be a sound basis for a strategy for delivering rural housing, however we have major concerns that the draft Plan's proposals to bring into effect that strategy on a settlement by settlement basis is not sufficiently robust or effective.

The Council's April 2015 Housing Supply Trajectory shows there to have been an under-provision of housing in the Rural

11 Mav 2016 Page 134 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Areas over the years 2011/12 to 2014/15, which reflects the wider picture of significant under-delivery across the District as a whole, as acknowledged at paragraph 1.33 (and Diagram 3a) of the adopted Core Ian Jewson Planning Ltd Limited Company registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 07043110 Registered Office: Sandalwood, Purewell, Puriton, Somerset TA7 8BA Strategy.

Yet a number of Policy RA1 villages, including Bathampton and Batheaston for example, are not proposed to have any allocations.

The village of Timsbury is one of a small number that is proposed to have site allocation polices, but for the reasons given further below, these may only deliver in the region of 35 to 45 dwellings, assuming they come forward.

In addition to extant planning permissions that are then identified as allocations, the draft Placemaking Plan only appears to allocate sites for some 75 dwellings across both RA1 and RA2 settlements. Taking account of completions, this leaves some 330 dwellings that have not been allocated. Even allowing for an annual windfall supply of 11 dwellings (as anticipated in the Council's five year land supply trajectory) that still leaves in excess of 175 dwellings unaccounted for.

Test of Soundness

With reference to the above assessment, the draft Plan as proposed is not sound for the following reasons: Positively Prepared and Consistency with National Policy The Plan fails to make adequate provision for the delivery of market and affordable housing to meet the needs of the Rural Areas policy area of BaNES. Insufficient allocations are made across the RA1 settlements, notwithstanding the stated strategy for the Rural Areas set out in the draft Plan, and as such the Plan is not seeking to meet objectively assessed development requirements in a positive way.

Paragraph 157 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires Local Plans to plan positively for development required in the area, to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework which, amongst other things, includes the imperative to boost significantly the supply of housing.

This requires sites to be allocated to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary. To be positively prepared and consistent with national policy therefore, the Placemaking Plan needs to identify additional development land to ensure housing delivery requirements are met.

Effective

For the reasons set out above, the draft Plan is not effective as far as the delivery of housing in the Rural Areas policy area over the Plan period is concerned. Changes Considered Necessary to make Draft Placemaking Plan Sound The Draft Placemaking Plan should seek to identify and allocate additional sites in Policy RA1 villages to ensure that sufficient land is available to deliver the housing

requirement. This should include a review of current proposals for sustainable housing development in the Rural Areas with a view to allocating further sites even where the notional target of 50 dwellings in any given RA1 settlement may be exceeded to a limited extent, as has happened at settlements including Temple Cloud and Stowey Sutton. For the reasons explained in further detail below, land south of Loves Hill, Timsbury (known as Tim 2 in the BaNES SHLAA) provides a suitable, available and achievable additional site for housing provision in a location where there are no insurmountable constraints.

Q5 Change Requested

The Draft Placemaking Plan should seek to identify and allocate additional sites in Policy RA1 villages to ensure that sufficient land is available to deliver the housing requirement. This should include a review of current proposals for sustainable housing development in the Rural Areas with a view to allocating further sites even where the notional target of 50 dwellings in any given RA1 settlement may be exceeded to a limited extent, as has happened at settlements including Temple Cloud and Stowey Sutton. For the reasons explained in further detail below, land south of Loves Hill, Timsbury (known as Tim 2 in the B&NES SHLAA) provides a suitable, available and achievable additional site for housing provision in a location where there are no insurmountable constraints.

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



Page 135 of 956 11 May 2016

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

We wish to advise that at this stage we would like to participate at the oral stage of the Examination to enable us to explain to the Inspector the land south of Loves Hill site and its scheme and sustainability credentials in more detail.

11 Mav 2016 Page 136 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 49

Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number	r: 6
Name: Nicholas Stubbs	Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \square
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	e , Para 49
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
p16 49: remove NPPF highlight	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	ation (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	pate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 137 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy DW1

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 12
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy DW1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy DW1 para 6 - Fails to mention the international nature of the assets
Policy DW1 para 9b - Mentions review in 2016 without clarifying that this is for the Bristol Wide HMA and not for the Bath HMA
Q5 Change Requested
Include the word 'internationally' after 'District's'
Clarify text to make this point
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $lacksquare$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

11 May 2016 Page 138 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 59

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 11
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 59
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Change final sentence to read: "These present a considerable asset which should be retained in any future development of the site whatever vehicular access is decided".
Q5 Change Requested
See Q4.
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?
As an interested Town Council within RANES and as a mandatory consulted on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 139 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 60

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 12
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 60 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Key Development Sites section would benefit from being laid out in such a way that the policies are in number order and adjacent to the relevant context paragraphs. As an example, Policy SSV1 yellow box could be better located rather than alongside the SSV4 context paragraphs.
Q5 Change Requested
Need to be more specific here about the Victorian buildings being referred to. We would suggest you specifically refer to the following buildings – Add "Examples are, the Midsomer Norton Social Club & Stones Cross Hotel, the Salvation Army building, the former Chemist at Sheldon House and the Dental Surgery" after "beginning of the High Street successfully.
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?
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 140 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 61

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 13	
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council	
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment	t? 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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 61	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The wording here needs revising. Should read, "The Retail Study (July 2015) considered the potential of this sit retail development - coming to the conclusion that it was sequentially inferior to the South Road car park site is delivering new retail floor space. This was on the basis that it represented an 'edge of centre' location outside centre."	in
Q5 Change Requested	
See Q4.	
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?	
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the tow	vn

11 May 2016 Page 141 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 62

Respondent Number: 6434 Comment Number: 3 Name: David Webb Organisation: David Webb Management Ltd Agent Name: Kay Mann Agent Organisation: Phoenix Land Solutions Ltd 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 1 District Wide, Para 62 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
In respect of the Somer Valley, Core Strategy Policy SV1(4) relates to the housing proposals in Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St. John and clarifies that Policies RA1 and RA2 are applicable to the other settlements in the Somer Valley. Policy SV1 confirms that housing development will be acceptable in principle within the HDB and that residential development on sites outside the HDB will be acceptable if adjoining the Housing Development Boundary and brownfield in nature or if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan (see the Somer Valley place-based section).		
12. The changes as proposed would comply with local and national policy as it carries through the Government's emphasis of prioritising brownfield and actively encourages redevelopment of brownfield land before greenfield sites on the edge of the HDB.		
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?		
The proposed changes relate to a specific site rather than a general change that may be could be suggested by other people making representations. For this reason participation is considered necessary.		

11 May 2016 Page 142 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 63

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 2	ion. Educad Mass Homes
	ion: Edward Ware Homes
Agent Name: Agent Org	ganisation:
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 unsour	nd, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ☐ Not	Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 63 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Housing proposals in the villages outside the Green Belt - The 1,12 being a minimum.	0 dwellings for the rural areas should be stated as
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticke	d if yes)? ✓
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the	Examination?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft	Placemaking Plan Examination.

11 May 2016 Page 143 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 64

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number:	3		
Name: Simon Jenkins	me: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd		
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 c	compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \square		
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 1 District Wide , Para 64			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Housing proposals at villages in the Green Belt - This polic policy.	cy needs to be reviewed in line with the emerging Government		
Q5 Change Requested			
NPPF to plan positively for a significant boost in Housing s	clude a 4th being Housing to meet the requirements of the supply. This would also underline Policy DW1 which states "The development by; 1 focusing new housing, jobs and community		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination	ion (ticked if yes)?		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa	te at the Examination?		
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.			

11 May 2016 Page 144 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 67

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 4
·
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 67
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Meeting local need for Housing and Employment - 67. The words "having sufficient capacity (or ability to expand)" in respect of Primary Schools should be removed as this is not conducive to increasing the supply of housing or Policy RA1 aims to direct new Housing to Service Villages. The obligation to ensure that the School provision in the Rural Areas is delivered in a timely manner to meet the needs of the existing and new residents rests with the Council and this should not be used as a mechanism to constrain housing delivery.
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?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination

11 May 2016 Page 145 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 68

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 5 Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 68 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
68. There is nothing within the NPPF to suggest that settlement boundaries should constrain development in sustainable locations. The wording "within the HDB" should be removed.
Q5 Change Requested
The 1,120 dwellings for the rural areas should be stated as being a minimum.
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?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.

11 May 2016 Page 146 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy RA1

Respondent Number: 49 Comment Number: 1 Name: Helen Richardson Organisation: Clutton Parish Council 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy RA1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment We welcome the fact that the Clutton Neighbourhood Plan is recognised as the basic framework for the village and we regard it as essential that where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place, this continues to be the governing document until and unless the Spatial Strategy means that changes are unavoidable. Our representation relates primarily to the "Rural Areas" section but also to district-wide policy and the appendices. We are content with the changes to RA1 which is the key policy for Clutton We are content with the section specifically on Clutton We consider that the section on Urban design needs amendment to give more recognition to the need for appropriate design villages and rural communities
Q5 Change Requested
We require a correction in Policy GB2, vol 6 Appendices, page 59, which is wrong as it does not reflect the position whereby the Clutton Housing Development Boundary should only include the Maynard A (Parcel 0006) site if consent is given to the current reserved matters application. If not, the site should remain outside the HDB. This had been previously agreed with the officer that was preparing the placemaking plan. This will be submitted again on a separate form. In addition we believe that the section on Clutton Paragraph 65 should be amended to make it clear that the geology of Clutton is significantly more complicated and unstable than indicated. There are a large number of faults/Coal Seams across the village that make it difficult and costly to develop.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \qed Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 49 Comment Number: 2 Name: Helen Richardson Organisation: Clutton Parish Council Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

11 May 2016 Page 147 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 1 District Wide , Policy RA1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
When we were asked to submit changes to the Housing Development Boundary, we stated that the HDB around Site A, Parcel 0006 Maynard Terrace should be indicated by a dotted line as this amendment would only apply to the reserved matters application associated with 12/01882/OUT. If the current application does not go ahead, the HDB will revert to its original position and the site will remain outside the HDB.
Q5 Change Requested
Please redraw the line of the HDB around Site A, Parcel 0006 Maynard Terrace, with a dotted line as agreed, indicating that it only applies to Reserved Matters applications associated with 12/01882/OUT. Otherwise the site will remain outside the HDB
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
This does the nespondent receive is necessary to participate at the Examination.
Respondent Number: 4414 Comment Number: 1
Name: Genevieve Collins Organisation: Alder King
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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy RA1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Alder King Planning Consultants have been instructed to submit a representation to the BANES Pre-Submission Draft Placemaking Plan December 2015 for the extension of the Bishop Sutton Housing Development Boundary at Church Lane in order to safeguard land to accommodate future development.
The proposed extension to the Bishop Sutton Housing Development Boundary is shown as a dashed blue line on the enclosed plan. This Plan is taken directly from Annexe 1 Policies Map of the Daft Placemaking Plan Pre-Submission Draft December 2015 and shows the current proposed Bishop Sutton Housing Development Boundary as a red line on this same plan.
The BANES Core Strategy was found sound partly on the basis that a review of Housing Development Boundaries via the

11 May 2016 Page 148 of 956

Placemaking Plan would be able to identify suitable sites in order to deliver sufficient housing (and to avoid having to

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

release Green Belt land) to ensure a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land was secured throughout the plan period. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that in this Draft Placemaking Plan only a minority of Housing Development Boundaries have been reviewed and proposed for alteration. It is considered that this is insufficient to provide sufficient flexibility for future housing need that may become necessary for the District, especially those in rural areas.

Whilst the Stowey-Sutton area has some housing permitted through appeal, the adopted Stowey-Sutton Neighbourhood Plan makes no allocation for development. As such, in the event that the District's housing figures need uplifting as a result of any future identified Housing Need, there is limited available space at present to accommodate anything further without having to plan by appeal.

As a result, it is necessary to include a safeguarding policy in the Rural Areas policy and to facilitate this, it is considered necessary for a comprehensive detailed review of all Housing Development Boundaries to be undertaken. This would enable the identification of areas for safeguarded land in each location which in turn would ensure future flexibility to accommodate any necessary additional development identified by future housing needs assessments. The safeguarding of land through extending appropriate Housing Development Boundaries would enable development to be undertaken in line with proposed policy in the Core Strategy, Placemaking Plan (in this particular case paras 137-143 of rural areas policy) and Neighbourhood Plans, in this case the Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood Plan. Such a safeguarding policy would facilitate meeting any future requirements to deliver additional housing needs identified for rural areas and any future housing as may be required in BANES through the West of England Joint Spatial Plan. This approach would ensure that such future development needs can be provided in a coherent sustainable way via the Placemaking Plan, rather than by speculative piecemeal appeals.

The land proposed for safeguarding in this location sits on the very edge of the Mendip Hills AONB which covers almost 40percent District. The site is set in the dip of undulating topography and largely out of view from the public realm. Moreover, residential development has already been permitted within it at neighbouring properties including the existing ribbon development on the southern edge of Church Lane and accordingly the proposed extension to the housing development boundary in this location would be in line with the existing boundaries of adjacent properties. The land in question abuts the existing Housing Development Boundary and is located outside the Green Belt surrounded by built development on 3 sides. It is located at the RA1 settlement of Bishop Sutton and is in walking distance of good public transport bus services connecting to Bristol and Bath. It is also within a reasonable walking distance of a number of community facilities including a shop, a village hall and a primary school. Extending the Bishop Sutton Housing Development Boundary in this location to provide safeguarded land would enable a flexible approach to accommodate development needs for the organic sustainable growth of Bishop Sutton.

O5 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?					
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original commen	Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation:				
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified □	, ,				

11 May 2016 Page 149 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RA1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy RA1: Development in the Villages Meeting the Listed Criteria
PHSV have two comments on this policy. Firstly, we support the deletion of the paragraph which requires specific identification of sites. This will make the policy more flexible.
However, the amendment to paragraph (a) reduces flexibility by requiring a village suitable for development to have a Primary School. We consider this is not justified by NPPF Guidance. The overall approach in the NPPF is that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Therefore in rural areas development should be in sustainable locations and generally this will be in villages rather than open countryside. NPPF paragraph 55 says: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby'.
This further encourages the positive approach in rural areas and rather than discouraging homes in a particular village because it does not have a specific facility, i.e. in the case a Primary School, the approach should be to look at groups of villages so that there are sufficient facilities to support sustainable development within the group rather than at an individual village. We suggest the first paragraph of the policy should be reworded to say: 'At the villages located outside the green belt or excluded from the green belt, proposals for residential development of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village or group of villages and their setting will be acceptable within housing development boundary. The plan is unsound because this policy is not positive and is contrary to National Policy.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7116 Comment Number: 1
Name: Rosemary Naish Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RA1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Clutton Parish Council, in February 20115, when replying to officers request for proposed changes to the Housing development Boundary (HDB)specified that the HDB should only include parcel 0006 Maynard Terrace if reserved

11 May 2016 Page 150 of 956

matters for application 12/01882/OUT were permitted. This site is not in the preferred area for future development, as shown in the made Neighbourhood Plan and therefore should only be allowed to be developed on the pre-existing permitted application.

O	5	Chang	e Red	quested
·	_	CIIGIIS	C 11C	1003100

The HDB should be amended to show that parcel 0006 is only include conditionally on application 12/01882/OUT being proceeded with, not on any new applications.

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?

As an elected representative for the parish and member of the Neighbourhood Plan steering group I am very well aware of how people of Clutton feel about this matter and want to ensure that their views are represented as fully as possible.

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 6						
Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd						
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ☐						
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RA1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Policy RA1 - The amendment of 'a' is unnecessary and will direct development away from otherwise sustainable locations, reduce the sustainability of facilities, including bus services, in settlements without a primary school and prevent the development of housing to accommodate the needs of existing settlements as well as the wider rural area needs.						
Infrastructure DWI.3 -						
The plan should demonstrate that sufficient land has been safe guarded to make early years, primary and secondary school provision for a minimum of 1,120 dwellings in the Rural Area and/or the mechanism that is going to ensure that adequate provision will be made to support in a timely way the (to be produced) up to date Housing trajectory.						
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?						
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.						

11 May 2016 Page 151 of 956

Respondent Number: 4810 Comment Num	ber: 1
Name: Messrs D and D Salter	Organisation:
Agent Name: Mr Lawrence Eyles	Agent Organisation: Hoddell Associates
Further Information available in the original comm	nent? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is leg	
Does the respondent consider the document is so	und? 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
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District V	/ide,Policy RA1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
prospect of ensuring the timely delivery of social in	g any housing sites in High Littleton, the claim that there is no realistic rastructure to support any additional housing in the village. In does not have any spare capacity, and is unable to expand. its claims.
plan period. Failure to allocate sites in RA1 settlem accommodate the shortfall. It should be noted that the Council has in place a Clinfrastructure List (Regulation 123 List) setting out the includes social infrastructure and school schemes.	ettlement capable of providing about 50 additional dwellings in the ents therefore places greater pressure on other settlements to L Charging Schedule (effective from 6 April 2015) which includes an me infrastructure to which the Council may apply CIL revenues. This t is therefore not unreasonable to assume that some of the social
We consider that the Council has failed to provide p	in High Littleton could be made available from CIL revenues. roportionate evidence to support its reasons for not making any site plan unsound on the grounds that it is not justified or effective.
Q5 Change Requested	
Littleton capable of providing around 50 dwellings.	t its claims, the Council should allocate a suitable site, or sites, in Hig This should include one, or more, of the sites shown in the latest The Council should consult on suitable sites at an early stage.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Example 1	mination (ticked if yes)? 🗹
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to par	ticipate at the Examination?
Should the plan be found to be unsound in this regainclusion in the plan.	rd we would want the opportunity to put forward suitable sites for
Respondent Number: 6411 Comment Num	
Name:	Organisation: Emergy Ltd
Agent Name: Georgina Tibbs	Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore

11 May 2016 Page 152 of 956

No

Attachments sent with the comment?

Yes

Further Information available in the original comment?

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 1 District Wide , Policy RA1						
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
For the BANES Placemaking Plan to be found sound under the four tests of soundness as defined by paragraph 182 of the NPPF, the Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The Plan as drafted is not positively prepared and plans for the minimum housing requirement.						
The Plan should seek to meet the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) for the Joint Spatial Plan area of the West of England. There is no reference to the JSP in the Draft Plan. All Councils preparing new plans are required to comply with the Duty to Cooperate and B&NES appears to be allocating sites and working with a housing requirement that does not plan for the OAHN for the Wider Bristol Area.						
The Placement Plan does not propose any allocations for Clutton. This is because two sites have been granted planning permission in Clutton and feature in the Neighbourhood Plan. The strategy for minimal growth at Clutton is not consistent with National Policy. The Draft Placemaking Plan should Bath and North East Somerset's Draft Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission version) - Representation Form (December 2015) encourage new residential development rather than restrict. The Planning Practice Guidance (Para 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20140306) states that "blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence."						
In our view the proposed approach at Clutton, which involves no allocations, is tantamount to a blanket restriction on development at the village. That approach is therefore not consistent with government policy on the delivery of sustainable development and is not sound.						
Q5 Change Requested						
The Draft Placemaking Plan should allocate further Sites for development in the Rural settlements. All settlements can pay a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, the plan should allocate further sustainable sites for development in the Clutton area.						
This could be achieved by allocation of our Client's land to the west of Upper Bristol Road (A37) is available for residential development and could assist with the delivery of housing (location plan 7enclosed)						
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?						
Significant issues require discussion at examination. Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary						
Respondent Number: 7075 Comment Number: 2 Name: Austin Payne Organisation:						

11 May 2016 Page 153 of 956

No

Agent Organisation: Peter Brett Associate

Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Agent Name: Chris Dadds

Further Information available in the original comment?

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 1 District Wide , Policy RA1							
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA							
Q4 Soundness Comment							
Given our knowledge of the site and its context we do provide the following comments in regard of the policy and supporting text:							
Rural Areas (Volume 5), Para 175.							
West Harptree as a village has a good range of services and facilities and as such it meets the criteria as a RA1 village in							
the adopted Core Strategy. This was confirmed by the council in the committee report in regard of planning application (1st July 2015), wherein the officer confirmed:							
"West Harptree, due to the level of facilities within the village, is considered to meet the criteria of Policy RA1 of the							
Core Strategy meaning that housing developments of around 50 dwellings could meet the criteria of the policy".							
We note the council's proposal to change the criteria for RA1 and RA2 settlements in the Draft PlaceMaking Plan. This effectively means that only settlements with a school can qualify as RA1 settlements. This will create anomalies in the							
categorisation of settlements where places such as East Harptree may be considered RA1 villages and suitable for development of up to 50 dwellings, whilst West Harptree, which has more services and better public transport connectivity, is considered to be an RA2 village.							
The weighting of services and facilities is a finely balanced process, but there is no evidence that a school is the prime factor in defining a sustainable place and as such it is considered that the proposed changes to Policy RA1 are not justified and therefore the plan may be considered unsound.							
The adopted Core Strategy policy was considered to be appropriate and justified and should be retained.							
Indeed, it is unclear how the change to the adopted policy is to be made and whether this actually changes the whole delivery of the strategy as fewer places are likely to meet the new RA1 criteria and therefore delivery of the housing trajectory is uncertain.							
It seems that Policy RA1 is the only policy it is proposed to change from the Adopted Core Strategy. It is unclear why this is considered justified and there appear to be no evidence to support this change. This therefore confuses the status of the two plans but if it is considered that the policies of the Core Strategy are out of date (a view that would be supported) then the whole ocument should be reviewed, not just parts selected by the council without justification.							
Q5 Change Requested							
No change to Policy RA1 should be made.							
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box							
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?							
It is important for the delivery of the Council's Strategy that the role of RA1 villages such as West Harptree are debated and clarified							

11 May 2016 Page 154 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Respondent Number: 7114 Comment Number: 1
Name: Desmond Lynch Organisation:
Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RA1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA
Q4 Soundness Comment
1.0 INTRODUCTION
1.1 On behalf of Mr Lynch Grass Roots Planning have been instructed to prepare and submit written representations to the Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation, with particular regard to a site known as Wood Brooke House, Stockwood Lane, Whitchurch, BS14 OQE (the 'site').
1.2 This statement sets out our position on the emerging Placemaking Plan and the issues and options for consideration, and promotes Wood Brooke House as a future allocation site for housing. The Placemaking Plan should aim to complement the adopted Core Strategy by providing a set of detailed planning policies and site allocations. This will help shape what development takes place and where up to the year 2029.
1.3 Whilst we consider that the preparation of the Placemaking Plan is a positive step, we have significant concerns on the policies set out in the Rural Areas Chapter in particular policies referring to Whitchurch, which aside from the site allocation at Sleep Lane makes no reference to other development that may be able to come forward later on in the plan period.
1.4 It is our assertion that given the close proximity of Whitchurch to Bristol, and the allocation for up to 200 dwellings at Sleep Lane, a permissive approach should be set out in this settlement which allows sustainable brownfield sites to come forward that are be located within the Green Belt designation. This is due to the pressing need to 'significantly boost the supply of housing'as required by paragraph 47 in the NPPF and to address issues of acute affordability which Bath and the surrounding areas currently face.
1.5 Alongside this statement we have submitted the online consultation form and a redline boundary plan for Wood Brooke House, which lies to the north of the allocated site at Sleep Lane. The site contains a large detached property with a number of outbuildings that are currently being used as a builder's storage yard. The applicant considers that the site has potential for some lowmedium density housing. Further technical work will be undertaken to inform any mitigation measures that need to be considered with regards to highways, ecology, landscape, archaeology etc. but it is largely thought that there are no constraints to the site and homes can be delivered within the next five years subject to planning permission.
1.6 We will now set out our representations to the emerging Placemaking Plan.
2.0 OVERARCHING ISSUES
2.1 The Bath Core Strategy sets out the objective to deliver 13,000 homes up to the year 2029. However, whilst it is far

11 May 2016 Page 155 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

from adoption, consideration also needs to be given to the preparation of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan which is currently underway; issues and options for strategic growth have recently been consulted upon due to the potential increased need for housing in the Greater Bristol Area. This is currently identified at 85,000 homes over the next 20 years; 30,000 more than what is already planned for between each of the unitary authorities.

- 2.2 Within the West of England JSP Issues and Options Document, paragraph 5.12 clearly states that, in relation to BANES: 'urban extension options at Bath, where evidence shows development would have an adverse impact on heritage and landscape assets (specifically the World Heritage Site and the Cotswold AONB) have been excluded as possible strategic locations'.
- 2.3 Therefore given the heritage and landscape constraints identified around the main centre of bath, if no additional extensions are proposed in these areas, growth will have to be located in smaller settlements that are in sustainable locations, including further land within the Green Belt aside from the proposed allocation at Sleep Lane, Whitchurch. Consequently either further allocations

need to be made or a more permissive policy approach needs to be set out in response to this to allow sustainably located brownfield sites within the Green Belt to come forward as necessary.

- 2.4 Whilst the NPPF sets out that the protection of the Green Belt is a policy aim the cornerstone of national planning policy is the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the need to foster this in both plan making and decision taking.
- 2.5 It needs to be borne in mind that the Green Belt relates to only one of the three roles of sustainability, namely the environmental role, and this is not the sole element of this role. In respect to other aspects of sustainable development minimising the need to travel and supporting existing communities where housing need is arising is a much stronger element of the social,

economic and environmental roles.

2.6 Whilst we strongly support the continued function of the Green Belt, the pressing demand for housing in the Greater Bristol Area means a thorough review is needed to potentially remove land that does not support the main purposes as set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF, which states:

'The Green Belt serves five purposes:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land'.
- 2.7 This is acknowledged in paragraph 191 of the Draft Placemaking Plan, which in relation to Whitchurch states 'National planning policy makes it clear that when altering Green Belt boundaries consideration should be given as to whether land needs to be safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs. Given the close relationship of the village with Bristol the need for and scope to identify safeguardedland will be considered as part of the Core Strategy review'.
- 2.8 Bristol and 'Greater Bristol' including Bath is almost completely landlocked by the Green Belt designation. Both cities are the key economic driver of this area and housing need should be primarily focused here. Paragraph 191 of the Placemaking Plan indicates that BANES are already considering other parts of land within the settlement of Whitchurch to remove from the Green Belt. It has already been established that Whitchurch is a sustainable location for such growth due to its proximity to the A37 and the wider Bristol Area.
- 2.9 The High Court has recently handed down judgement that residential gardens outside of 'built up areas' should be considered as brownfield land. Consequently, the garden at Wood Brooke House which includes several outbuildings that are currently being used as a builder's storage yard, should be defined as brownfield land (Dartford Borough Council v SSCLG (CO/4129/2015)). The judgement states:

11 May 2016 Page 156 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

'thisdecision holds that residential garden land, outside 'built-up areas' is brownfield land not, as had been widely understood, 'greenfield' land. That finding has consequences in terms of its priority for development. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF provides that brownfield land is where developmentought to be prioritised.'

- 2.10 Therefore given the government's prioritisation of brownfield sites in preference to using Greenfield land (paragraph 111 of the NPPF), the principle of redeveloping this garden land for housing should be supported.
- 2.11 By restricting growth in settlements such as Whitchurch, this reduces the plan's ability to react and adapt to rapid change, a key requirement of the NPPF. If at a later date BANES are found to have a lack of five year housing land supply, policies within the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan will be found to be out-of-date and this may lead to unsustainable patterns of development forming, which may include the prioritisation of Greenfield sites over brownfield land which are quicker and easier to deliver.
- 2.12 Given national government's presumption in favour of sustainable development with particular prioritisation of brownfield sites, a change in policy wording is needed here to ensure that a permissive approach to brownfield sites that are sustainably located, including land within the Green Belt will be considered for development, ensuring choice and competition in the market.
- 2.13 This will result in a plan that is positively prepared and will aim to significantly boost the supply of housing, both key requirements of national planning policy.

3.0 LAND AT WOOD BROOKE HOUSE

- 3.1 Land at Wood Brooke House is defined on the submitted location plan (Ref. 328 A4 020216 Site Location Plan), which is contained as appendix A to this document.
- 3.2 The site itself lies to the east of Stockwood Road and north of the proposed allocation for 200 homes at Sleep Lane. It is bound by mature hedgerows and trees to the north, east and south with open agricultural fields to the east and a recreational ground to the north.
- 3.3 Access is already established on the site as there is a detached home and several outbuildings which are currently being used as a builder's storage yard.
- 3.4 The site lies in close proximity to the A37 which leads directly into Bristol. There are several routes of public transport which creates good linkages with the settlement, and there are a number of everyday services and facilities including a hairdressers, restaurant, estate agents, church, primary school, and local convenience stores.
- 3.5 The site is not designated within a flood zone, nor within an SSSI, Conservation Area, AONB, SNCI, Air Quality Management Area, or County Wildlife Site. Therefore the site is unconstrained apart from its Green Belt designation.

Q5 Change Requested

- 3.6 Accordingly we consider that this land, recently being established as a brownfield opportunity due to the Dartford Borough Council vs SSCLG High Court decision, is a suitable site for development of low density housing, with delivery occurring in the first five years as no major infrastructure would be required. The site is in a highly accessible location with a large number of everyday facilities in close proximity, including employment opportunities in the city of Bristol. There are no major physical constraints to development such as ecology, highways, other infrastructure, archaeology or landscape to prevent the delivery of homes in this location.
- 3.7 Therefore we consider that further sustainable brownfield sites, located within the Green Belt, should be considered for allocation in the BANES Placemaking Plan or a permissive approach set out in this regard, to ensure choice, competition and flexibility in the market, and allow the plan to adapt and react to rapid change, both key requirements of the NPPF.

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

11 Mav 2016 Page 157 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 7117 Comment Number: 1
Name: A C Smith Organisation:
Agent Name: Mel Clinton Agent Organisation: Nash Partnership
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RA1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA
Q4 Soundness Comment
Because the Plan fails to allocate land to the north of Loves Lane in Timsbury which would facilitate sustainable development and mitigate the risk of under delivery against the identified need for housing and the risks of other sites in Timsbury failing to proceed.
Q5 Change Requested
Allocation of the land north of Loves Hill in Timsbury for residential development and open space as set out in the uploaded document titled "Comments in Respect of Site Allocations in Timsbury".
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?
In order to ensure that examination of the issues of soundness raised are fully informed

11 May 2016 Page 158 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy RA2

Respondent Number:	6425	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Paul Jones Organisation:						
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:						
Further Information ava	ilable in t	the original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is legally co	ompliant? (Ti	ck if indicate	d 'yes') \square	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No						
If the respondent consid	ders the D	Oraft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is	it because i	t is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	✓	Not Justified	Not Cons	sisten 🗹	Not Effective	
The representation relate	es to: Vo	lume 1 District Wide ,	Policy RA2			
The Site Reference (if app	olicable) i	s:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

Nationally we need more homes. BaNES need more homes. Rural areas like the RA2 settlement of Camerton needs more homes NOT just the bigger settlements getting even larger. Rural families would like their children and grandchildren to stay and help balance the structure in their communities. The report just states NO sites are suitable. Camelot site IS suitable. The WHOLE Camelot site was entered for the Placemaking Scheme, NOT just the parcel of land at Camelot, but this has been overlooked. The site as a whole could easily accommodate the maximum housing required plus more, perhaps in phases when required. Even a community shop which Camerton woefully lacks or rural businesses, etc.

The site is deemed to be a periphery to the village? Camelot is in the middle and equidistant along the long road through Camerton, that connects the Meadgate part of Camerton to the so called 'village core', so this fact contradicts the report. Housing is built on both sides of the road. Meadgate area has a Garage, The Community Centre and large Recreational grounds, Farm shop and Indian Restaurant whilst the 'core' has the Church, small School, Batch and Playpark. The local builders merchants is also opposite the proposed site. Better to surely cohesively join the Village together with homes equidistant rather than all at one end with Amenities the other.

The report states the existing HDBs are in the Cam Brook valley, which is the thoroughfare for much of the wildlife as well as floodplains. It even states any addition to an existing HDB (Daglands) would be 'undermining the open rural character of the village' and 'the undeveloped slopes are an important characteristic of the Cam Valley'. So very clearly proves the point that the HDBs are not suitable for any extension and again contradicts the report. Therefore the existing RA2 Policy regarding only building on or adjacent to existing HDBs cannot be used in the case of Camerton.

Camelot site however, is positioned uniquely on the first flat area away from the characteristic slopes, away from any wildlife thoroughfares, SNAs, floodplains and is not on valuable Agricultural land or Greenbelt. It is not adjacent, BUT very close to an HDB. The WHOLE site which has been overlooked, has easy access, in fact is adjacent to the former local Chapel that served the community. The site contains a large 1960s house (not in keeping with surrounding properties) that could be demolished if necessary. The road frontage of the site makes up a proportion of the much needed footpath that would link up the village to the Meadgate area that already has established footpaths to neighbouring villages. It is also on the Bus route.

After BANES asked The Parish council and Parishioners to seek sites that they were happy to recommend, they have been ignored. The WHOLE Camelot site was deemed the most suitable in the Site Assessment Results and completes all the criteria except the erroneous RA2 policy that can never be fulfilled.

11 Mav 2016 Page 159 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

- 1. The WHOLE of the Camelot site with existing access needs to be looked at, NOT just the parcel of land.
- 2. The RA2 Policy needs to be amended as in the case of Camerton, the existing HDBs and any adjacent lands are not suitable for development, so another HDB MUST be formed.
- 3. Non building of homes is detrimental for the Villagers who want homes for their families to stay near them and also encouraging rural communities, by bringing in others.
- 4. Community Facilities are meant to be encouraged under the Policy.

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?

Strongly believe BaNES have overlooked this development as they have ONLY looked at part of it.

Respondent Number: 6453	Comment Number: 1					
Name: Organisation: Boystown Ltd						
Agent Name: Tom Rocke Associates Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates						
Further Information available in the	e original comment?	No	Attachment	s sent with the cor	mment? 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 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	me 1 District Wide,Po	olicy RA2				

Q4 Soundness Comment

The following comments were made on behalf of the current representor in response to the Placemaking Plan Options Consultation:

My clients support the intention to review and adjust HDBs through the emerging PMP. Moreover, they support the principle that HDBs do not need to be continuous, and that it may be appropriate given the nature and form of the village to define two or more separate elements.

Pursuant to paragraph 1.451 of the PMP, my clients consider that the former depot at Cold Bath, Bath Road, Farmborough should be included in a separate HDB for Farmborough. Although separated from the main part of the village by undeveloped land, there is a nucleus of development at Cold Bath that is part of Farmborough in physical and community terms, and in which residential development will be consolidated through the planning permission for redevelopment of the former depot site for residential purposes. The land the subject of that permission (Ref: 14/00862/OUT) is identified on the enclosed plan. This site and neighbouring land should be included in a new HDB for the Cold Bath area of Farmborough to be discussed and agreed with my clients as part of the ongoing engagement towards the preparation of the draft Plan.

Objection is now raised to the failure to respond to this suggestion and to include land identified on the Plan at Annex 1 to these representations in the Housing Development Boundary for Farmborough. Since a large part of the site now benefits from planning permission for redevelopment for residential purposes, it should also be removed from the Green Belt. Failure to include such land, and to allow for suitable development opportunities at sustainable settlements, means that the Plan has not been 'positively prepared', nor is it 'effective' or 'consistent with national policy' that seeks to sustain rural communities.

11 May 2016 Page 160 of 956

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?								
Respondent Number: 180 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Bloor Homes Agent Name: Sarah Hawkins Agent Organisation: WYG								
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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 1 District Wide , Policy RA2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA								
Q4 Soundness Comment We wish to make the following representations on behalf of our client, Bloor Homes Limited, in connection with the above. Our client's interest is in a site at Hallatrow, a RA2 settlement in the adopted Core Strategy, see attached plan. This site should be allocated for development of up to 15 dwellings, in line with the Core Strategy and reflecting the Council's reliance on houses coming forward from such RA2 settlements in their 5 year land supply.								
Soundness and Legal Compliance The purpose of the Placemaking Plan is inter aliato allocate sites for development for housing to help meet development needs identified in the Core Strategy and to review Housing Development Boundaries. Yet, the draft consultation version								

of the plan fails to make sufficient allocations for the delivery of housing as required by the Core Strategy and the Housing Development Boundary is untouched in Hallatrow. As a result, it cannot be found to meet the four tests of soundness:

- The plan is not positively prepared as it does not provide sites sufficient to meet the objectively assessed housing needs

- The plan is not positively prepared as it does not provide sites sufficient to meet the objectively assessed housing needs as set out in the Core Strategy, i.e. insufficient number of sites are provided to deliver 1,120 dwellings in the Rural Areas. Moreover, there is no positive solution is promoted in the plan for identified infrastructure shortages despite the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) being in place in the area to pool resources to meet infrastructure requirements, including schools which forms part of the Regulation 123 List.
- The plan is unjustified. It simply does not allocate sites to meet the identified need. The consequence of this is that the Council's 5 year land supply will become under intensified pressure, owing particularly to the Council's history of underperformance for housing delivery.
- The plan is not effective as it will not deliver sufficient levels of housing to meet the identified need already established as required in the Core Strategy.
- The plan will not be consistent with national policy as it will not deliver site capable of meeting the identified development requirements or strategies for the provision of required infrastructure. Thus, it is not positively planned and will not provide sustainable development.

Volume 5 – Rural Areas: High Littleton and Hallatrow (Paragraph 121)

11 May 2016 Page 161 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The draft consultation Placemaking Plan, unlike the previous options version, deals with Hallatrow and High Littleton together. However, these settlements should more appropriately be dealt with separately, as per all other RA1 and RA2 settlements. High Littleton meets the criteria of a RA1 settlement and 'should provide about 50 additional dwellings' (paragraph 121). Hallatrow meets the criteria of a RA2 settlements and 'should provide between 10-15 dwellings'. Despite the fact that allocations shouldbe made, the draft consultation Placemaking Plan makes no allocation in either settlement.

The reason for this is explained at paragraph 121 that 'there are currently no site allocations in High Littleton or Hallatrow as there is no realistic prospect of ensuring the timely delivery of the supporting social infrastructure that would be required to support additional housing. In particular the Church of England Primary School does not have spare capacity and is unable to expand to accommodate pupils resulting from new housing in the villages'.

This approach of providing no site allocations, despite the adopted spatial strategy of the Core Strategy, owing to lack of capacity in schools ignores the fact that it is the Council's responsibility to ensure that there are sufficient schools for providing primary education and that mechanisms are in place to collect the appropriate monies from development (including housing) to assist with the delivery of such school places through the Council's CIL charge. The monies from CIL can properly be directed to school infrastructure, as it is on the Council's Regulation 123 list.

Such a CIL contribution is in line with Policy CP13 contained within the adopted Core Strategy, which deals with the timely delivery of infrastructure to provide balanced and more self-contained communities, the Council working in partnership to ensure infrastructure is retained and improved and that appropriate contributions being paid by developers. The inference quite clearly (and correctly) arising from this policy is that it is for the Council to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place and that developers will make the necessary contribution to facilitate the delivery. A housing development at our client's site at Hallatrow would necessarily make the appropriate CIL contribution. As such, it is inappropriate of the Council to fail to allocate sites on the basis of lack of school spaces.

If this approach is correct, the consequences for Bath & North East Somerset (B&NES) is very alarming, given the conclusions of the Council's January 2016 Infrastructure Delivery Plan. At page 180 of that document it states quite clearly that:

'The majority of existing primary schools are at ornear capacity and it is anticipated that there will be minimal or nil surplus capacity(emphasis added) to absorb primary age children generated from new housing development in the near future.'

It would mean that minimal or nil housing sites could be allocated or housing applications positively determined owing to lack of school places.

Indeed, even in this version of the Placemaking Plan the identified lack of education infrastructure and consequential lack of housing allocation is not limited to Hallatrow and High Littleton; it affects other RA1 and RA2 settlements too, thus preventing a number of dwellings from being allocated. All housing schemes will make the appropriate contribution to education facilities through CIL and it is for the Council to deliver the infrastructure required with the CIL receipt, as per Policy CP13 and required by the Education Acts. This alone is not sufficient reason to inhibit much needed housing delivery, particularly where the Council's underperformance is so acute.

B&NES has consistently underperformed in terms of housing delivery both in the previous local plan period 2001 to 2011 and in the first 4 years of the Core Strategy 2011 to 2014. For example, the interim target for 2014/15 was 2,888 dwellings, but only 1,558 dwellings have been completed1. In regards to the Rural Areas, the Council has not allocated enough sites within the draft Placemaking Plan to deliver the 1,120 dwellings set out in the Core Strategy, and provide no commentary as to where the residual will be found. Looking specifically at the 5 year housing land supply, the latest housing trajectory sets out 56 dwellings in RA2 settlements being delivered from 2015/2016 to 2019/2020 in order for the 5 year housing land supply to be met2. However, the Draft Placemaking Plan does not allocate sufficient sites to deliver these 56 dwellings in the next 5 years.

Conclusion

11 Mav 2016 Page 162 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

In light of the above, we consider that the Draft Placemaking Plan is not legally compliant or sound as it is not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy. B&NES has a history of underperforming in delivering housing and continues to underperform. The purpose of the Placemaking Plan is to allocate specific sites for development which will ensure the strategic housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy will be delivered in the most suitable locations. This purpose is not with the draft consultation version of the plan.

Our client's site on Land at Wells Road, Hallatrow should be allocated for housing to meet the identified role of Hallatrow in delivering the Core Strategy housing requirements. It is available now and offers a suitable location for development for housing, thus meeting the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will make an important contribution to the Council's 5 year housing land supply and is the only deliverable site in Hallatrow, so for that reason the allocation of the site is necessary to ensure that houses can be delivered as envisaged in the Core Strategy.

Q5 Change Requested

Our client's site on Land at Wells Road, Hallatrow should be allocated for housing to meet the identified role of Hallatrow in delivering the Core Strategy housing requirements. It is available now and offers a suitable location for development for housing, thus meeting the requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will make an important contribution to the Council's 5 year housing land supply and is the only deliverable site in Hallatrow, so for that reason the allocation of the site is necessary to ensure that houses can be delivered as envisaged in the Core Strategy.

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

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

Respondent Number: 4808 Comment Number:	4					
Name: Mr and Mrs Currell	Organisation:					
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 of Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared □ Not Justified ✓	? No					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA	, Policy RA2					

Q4 Soundness Comment

Moreover, it is considered that there is scope to release further land within the village in accordance with Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy which allows for some limited residential development (including on sites within and adjoining the housing development boundary) where they are of a scale, character and appearance appropriate to the village. Whilst the narrative to the policy talks of 'around 10 – 15 dwellings' that figure is not part of the policy and should, therefore, be regarded as indicative only since some RA2 settlements – including East Harptree which has a good range of local facilities – are clearly capable of accommodating a higher proportion of the dwellings needed to be found in such settlements (as identified on the Core Strategy). Moreover, the council has, by proposing the allocation of Sites SR5 and SR6, acknowledged that the village could accommodate at least 20 dwellings.

Q5 Change Requested

Delete Reference to Sites SR5 in paragraph 86 of the draft plan and replace with site SR7. Make consequential changes

11 Mav 2016 Page 163 of 956

to the plan in respect of Site SR5.

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 examine alternative sites.

11 May 2016 Page 164 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Table 4

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 13							
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust							
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐							
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Table 4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:							
Q4 Soundness Comment							
Table 4 item 2 - Omits certain key policies Omits certain key policies							
Q5 Change Requested							
Include World Heritage Site Setting SPD Include Pattern Book Include Building heights Strategy.							
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan							

11 May 2016 Page 165 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Part: Table 5 Volume: 1, District Wide Respondent Number: Comment Number: 14 224 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Table 5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **Q4 Soundness Comment** Should include Buildings Heights adopted as SPD. Q5 Change Requested Target to adopt all those SPDs necessary for safeguarding the WHS inc building heights in Bath. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 7 Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Ltd 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Table 5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment

11 Mav 2016 Page 166 of 956

Monitoring & Review -

Delivery - There is already a built in nine month lag between the end of a monitoring year and the proposed publication of the AMR but the Council is still failing to issue the AMR in accordance with this. It is hard to see that the actual completions data cannot be issued within three months of the end of the monitoring year with the ARM being published within a further 3 months.

The delays to publication of the completions data and the ARM undermines the monitoring process and prevent reviews of the plan from taking place on a timely basis to as to guide the Councils planning decision making..

This part of the Placemaking Plan should be made more robust.

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?

Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.

11 May 2016 Page 167 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP2

Respondent Number:	297	Comment Number:	2						
Name:		Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd							
gent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley									
Further Information available in the original comment?			No	Attachmer	ttachments sent with the comment?				
Does the respondent cor	isider th	ne document is legally co	ompliant? (Tic	k if indicated	'yes')				
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes, with minor changes									
If the respondent conside	ers the [Draft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is i	it because it	is (ticked where i	ndicated):			
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified 🔽	Not Consi	sten 🗸	Not Effective	✓			
The		lives a 4 District Wilds	D = 1' = CD2						
The representation relates	sto: vc	nume 1 District Wide ,	Policy CP2						
The Site Reference (if appl	icable) i	is:							

Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy CP 2 confirms that the Council aims to encourage sustainable development by requiring applications to submit evidence to address a range of key local priorities including maximising energy efficiency and integrating renewable and low carbon energy and Climate Change adaptation features. Applications are also required to be accompanied by a Bath and North East Somerset Sustainable Construction Checklist.

The Sustainable Construction Checklist issued in October 2013 is supported by the Council's Sustainable Construction and Retrofitting SPD and relates to policies in the existing Core Strategy. The checklist sets a number of questions and requirements for new development including the need for BREEAM assessment and a requirement for District Heating for development in DH priority areas.

Our clients support the Council's ambition for sustainable construction and the use of a checklist to guide development during its design and application stage but do have some concerns that some elements of the checklist will present challenges which are unique to a sports stadium which we set out here with comments specifically relating to District Heating provided under our representations to draft Policy CP4.

For sports stadia, the application of the BREEAM Methodology can be particularly challenging given that it is likely to require a 'Bespoke' assessment which results in significant additional assessment costs from the Building Research Establishment

(BRE). In addition, it is our experience that there are certain credits that are very difficult to obtain for sports stadia.

To avoid these unnecessary costs and to ensure that the principles of BREEAM are implemented, our clients would like the flexibility to present its own sustainability assessment of the proposals, incorporating other policy targets where appropriate, in lieu of a formal BREEAM assessment.

Our clients supports the Council's decision to remove the reference to 'Allowable Solutions' from Policy CP2 given that the Government has confirmed that this policy will no longer be implemented at a national level.

Q5 Change Requested

We would however request that the end of the introductory paragraph is updated to add the words, "where possible:" Without the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified, effective, or in accordance with government policy.

11 Mav 2016 Page 168 of 956

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: 7150 Comment Number	: 3		
Name: James Proyer	Organisation: Persimmon Homes (Wessex)		
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:			
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No		
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	I?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):		
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ☐	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective □		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Policy CP2		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
PHW agree that the proposed amendment to Policy CP	2 brings it in line with revised Government policy.		
Q5 Change Requested			
We recommend that all the Diagrams are marked as be	ing for "indicative purposes only".		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	ation (ticked if yes)? \square		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	pate at the Examination?		

11 May 2016 Page 169 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP3

Respondent Number: 7079 Comment Number: 1			
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited			
Agent Name: Agen	nt Organisation:		
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No		
Does the respondent consider the document is legally comp	pliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No	0		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is un	rsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):		
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Poli	icy CP3		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
5 is proposed to be removed from CP3 . The Plan is unsound ${f k}$	•		
change policy implementation. The Infrastructure Act 2015 in	·		
these on grounds of affordability, hence the reason why is it continued without replacing it with a sound mechanism for assessing afformations.			
Q5 Change Requested			
p59, CP2 5; p61 100-101; p63 SCR1; p65 Responding to Clima	• • •		
Placemaking Plan, yet nowhere is the affordability of the meas	·		
Climate Change given policy weight. Over the Plan Period, the	·		
net emissions of green houses gases (GHGs), amounting to bill			
annum. The prescriptive nature of the Plan policy wording and derived from PV and district heating schemes. The scientific a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
_			
technologies is that they are prohibitively expensive in terms of their cost per unit of GHGs avoided. In order to make the Plan sound, CP3 5 should be replaced with a mechanism for assessing the cost per unit of the climate change benefit			

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

policy will be to the considerable detriment of citizens in the District.

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

I have represented the matter of affordability of climate change solutions in the past and yet the policy makers do not appear to have sufficient scientific and financial understanding in this specific area to make sound policies. Affordability analysis of climate change measures is indeed an extremely difficult exercise and rarely conducted: although, when it has been undertaken, the results have been shockingly poor. I believe that I have an significant contribution to make to this crucial topic to the benefit of the Plan and the District.

compared with HMG's benchmark figures. If affordability is not considered, the hidden cost / tax of implementing the

11 May 2016 Page 170 of 956

Respondent Number: 7150 Comment Number: 4				
Name: James Proyer Organisation: Persimmon Homes (Wessex)				
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') \Box				
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CP3				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
PHW agree that the proposed amendment to Policy CP3 brings it in line with revised Government policy.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				

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

11 May 2016 Page 171 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 101

Not Justified

Respondent Number: 5653 Comment Number: 1

Name: Rosemary Tiley Organisation:

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 Consisten

Not Effective ✓

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 101

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Not Positively Prepared

1, District Wide

Q4 Soundness Comment

Volume:

The vision for Radstock clearly states that a) improvement in public transport b)attracting tourists c) encouraging businesses and d) reducing carbon footprint are desirable objectives (with which I totally agree), but, whilst referring to the importance of Radstock's railways in its evolvement, no mention is made of examining the feasibility of a railway line to Frome. (I note the enormous cost of increasing bus services in the tables at the end - so obviously cost is not the reason.)

Q5 Change Requested

The possibility of a viability study to reinstate a railway line to Frome should be included in the Vision for Radstock, as it ticks all the boxes mentioned above - it would provide alternative transport to Frome and thence access to the National Railway network: it would attract tourists especially as Frome is a flourishing market town - quaint and relatively unspoiled by modern development in its central High Street area: accessibility to alternative forms of transport may have an impact on small businesses looking for premises as it would open up the possibility of moving packages via train links nationally: and the obvious benefit to carbon footprint would be less cars making the trek to Frome and possibly even less cars into Bath, as the connection to mainstream lines is opened up.

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

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

11 May 2016 Page 172 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 108

Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 1
Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson Operations Ltd
Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 108
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy SCR1 targets a 10% carbon reduction. However, paragraph 108 conflicts with this as it speaks of 10% reduction in energy use. We are of the view that you should be targeting a 10% reduction in carbon and not energy.
Q5 Change Requested
This requires clarification.
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?
There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.

11 May 2016 Page 173 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 109

Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 2 Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 109 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 109 incorrectly states that there is solar PV installed at Bath Riverside. In fact, there is none as it was deemed architecturally unacceptable by the LPA at the time of the planning consent in 2010.
Q5 Change Requested
Paragraph 109 should be corrected to amend the error.
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?
There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.

11 May 2016 Page 174 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy SCR1

Totalie 1, District Wide Turn Folloy Selvi
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited Agent Name: James Millard Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy SCR1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
policies which give positive weight to renewable and local community energy initiatives. The Placemaking Plan demonstrates how such policies relate back to the sustainability objectives set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The Policy aims are broadly supported and we welcome the recognition within the Placemaking Plan to the recent changes in Government Policy. What is less clear is the extent to which standards proposed within the Placemaking Plan reflect or diverge from national standards and the evidence base that supports the policy position. Critically, it is not evidence how such requirements have been considered in the context of site deliverability. We refer specifically to Paragraph 173 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that developments are not subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. Where such standards are imposed through the Placemaking Plan these should be justified in terms of the impact upon the viability of development within the context of other policy burdens.
Policies SCR1 through to SCR6 sets out the Placemaking Plan approach to Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy. The objective of such policies is intended to reflect the requirements set out in the NPPF so that Local Plans establish policies which give positive weight to renewable and local community energy initiatives. The Placemaking Plan demonstrates how such policies relate back to the sustainability objectives set out in the adopted CS. The Policy aims are broadly supported and we welcome the recognition within the Placemaking Plan to the recent changes in Government Policy. What is less clear is the extent to which standards proposed within the Placemaking Plan reflect or diverge from national standards and the evidence base that supports the policy position. Critically, it is not evident how such requirements have been considered in the context of site deliverability. We refer specifically to Paragraph 173 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that developments are not subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. Where such standards are imposed through the Placemaking Plan these should be justified in terms of the impact upon the viability of development within the context of other policy burdens.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 175 of 956

Respondent Number:	224 Con	nment Number: 1	.5		
Name: Caroline Kay		0	rganisation:	Bath Preservation Trust	
Agent Name:		A	gent Organis	ation:	
Further Information avai	ilable in the or	iginal comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsider the doc	ument is legally co	mpliant? (Tid	ck if indicated 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent cor	nsider the doc	ument is sound?	No		
If the respondent consid	ers the Draft P	Placemaking Plan is	s unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	□ Not	Justified	Not Cons	isten ☐ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relate	s to: Volume	1 District Wide,I	Policy SCR1		
The Site Reference (if app	licable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment					
No reference to listed buil	ding requirem	ents or the amenit	cy/character	of the conservation area.	
Q5 Change Requested					
Should refer to LBC and vis	sual amenity.				
Does the Respondent wish	n to participate	e at the Examination	on (ticked if y	es)? 🗹	
Why does the Respondent	feel it is nece	ssary to participate	e at the Exan	nination?	
The Bath Preservation Tru	st made sever	al substantive subi	missions in re	elation to the original core strategy and appe	ared
at the hearings for the Cor	e Strategy. We	e continue to have	significant n	natters to raise on certain points of the	
ala a a a a litta a la la a					
placemaking plan					
	244 Con	nment Number:	8		
Respondent Number:	244 Con	nment Number:		Home Builders Federation	
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green	244 Con	0	rganisation:	Home Builders Federation	
Respondent Number:		O A			No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avai	ilable in the or	O A iginal comment?	rganisation: gent Organis No	ation: Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avail	ilable in the or	O A iginal comment? ument is legally co	rganisation: gent Organis No	ation: Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avail Does the respondent con	ilable in the or nsider the doci	O A iginal comment? ument is legally co ument is sound?	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tid	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avail Does the respondent con Does the respondent con If the respondent consid	ilable in the or nsider the doci nsider the doci ers the Draft P	O Agiginal comment? ument is legally co ument is sound? Placemaking Plan is	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tions unsound, is	ation: Attachments sent with the comment? ck if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avail Does the respondent con	ilable in the or nsider the doci nsider the doci ers the Draft P	O A iginal comment? ument is legally co ument is sound?	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tid	ation: Attachments sent with the comment? ck if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avail Does the respondent con Does the respondent con If the respondent consid	ilable in the or Insider the documents the Draft P Not	O Agiginal comment? ument is legally coument is sound? Placemaking Plan is	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tions s unsound, is	ation: Attachments sent with the comment? ck if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avail Does the respondent conduction of the respondent conduc	nsider the doci	O Agiginal comment? ument is legally coument is sound? Placemaking Plan is	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tions s unsound, is	ation: Attachments sent with the comment? ck if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avai Does the respondent condent condent to the respondent condent con	nsider the doci	O Agiginal comment? ument is legally coument is sound? Placemaking Plan is	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tions s unsound, is	ation: Attachments sent with the comment? ck if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avai Does the respondent con Does the respondent consid Not Positively Prepared The representation relate The Site Reference (if app	ilable in the or insider the document the document the Draft P Not s to: Volume licable) is:	iginal comment? ument is legally coument is sound? Placemaking Plan is Justified 1 District Wide , I	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tides unsound, is Not Consections Policy SCR1	Attachments sent with the comment? ck if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated): isten Not Effective st 10% and Policy CP4 for District Heating	No
Respondent Number: Name: Susan E Green Agent Name: Further Information avai Does the respondent condent condent condent condent consided in the respondent consided in the Positively Prepared The representation related the Site Reference (if appure 1) Q4 Soundness Comment in the requirements of Police in the	ilable in the or insider the document the document the Draft P Not s to: Volume licable) is:	iginal comment? ument is legally coument is sound? Placemaking Plan is Justified 1 District Wide , I	rganisation: gent Organis No mpliant? (Tides unsound, is Not Consections Policy SCR1	Attachments sent with the comment? ck if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated): isten Not Effective st 10% and Policy CP4 for District Heating	No

11 May 2016 Page 176 of 956

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

	ation: Arena 1865 Ltd
	Organisation: Turley
Further Information available in the original comment? N	o Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally complia	nt? (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 unso	und, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓ No	ot Consisten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	SCR1
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Policy SCR1 – On site renewable energy requirement Policy SCR1 states that development of over 1,000m2 or 10 dwe renewable energy generation to reduce regulated carbon emissi The Evidence base to support Policy SCR1 was published in Deceviability to support the policy in accordance with the requirement SCR1 based on an assessment of onsite renewable energy encompassing domestic reviewing the potential for different target levels including regul Within the evidence base Regen SW reviewed a mixed use devel (Old Mills) to determine the viability of the installation of Solar Pathe energy profile of a sports stadium and therefore we consider	ons by 10%. mber 2015 and sets out the technical and financial nts of The Framework. It provides justification for Policy dwellings, mixed use developments and industrial sites ated and total carbon emissions. opment (North Quays) and an industrial development by only. Neither of these case studies accurately reflects or this evidence base insufficient to apply Policy SCR1
across all developments. We note that B2 and B8 development i viability. Our clients are supportive of the need for renewable and low calcommercially and technically viable strategy to reducing carbon new stadiums have unique energy profiles and requirements whas opposed to heat. This immediately restricts the range of technically and low carbon electricity which are predominantly Strature of the development excludes wind turbines and the comfollowing the Government's decision to reduce the Feed in Tariff	rbon energy provided that they represent a emissions. As stated previously in these representations ich are typically focused around the need for electricity nologies available to those capable of producing olar Photovoltaic Cells and Wind Turbines. The urban mercial viability of Solar PV has been drastically reduced

compliance by demonstrating how investments in energy efficiency measures have been used as an alternative."

Our clients are fully supportive of the Council's objective to create low carbon buildings and would suggest that the

-"Where the 10 percent renewable energy is commercially or technically challenging, applicants may secure policy

wording of Policy SCR1 be amended to include text such as that outlined below;

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 177 of 956

Without the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified, effective, or in accordance with government policy.

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

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy SCR1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment The University broadly supports the aim to secure sufficient renewable energy generation in conjunction with major developments to reduce carbon emissions from anticipated (regulated) energy use in the building by at least 10 percent, but it should be recognised that certain renewable technologies are best applied in certain situations. This policy should allow for some flexibility, for example in a campus situation, such that the renewable technology can be applied to a campus-wide strategy or to another more applicable building or location.
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?
Respondent Number: 6406 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: Student Castle Agent Name: James Taylor Agent Organisation: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners 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 1 District Wide, Policy SCR1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 178 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

Q5 Change Requested

Q5 Change Requested

See Q4.

This policy, which proposes a requirement for major developments to reduce their carbon emissions through energy use by 10% using renewable energy generation. This policy is not considered to be consistent with national guidance which supports the introduction of sustainable construction improvements through national described standards such as building regulations.

The NPPF clarifies that additional development plan documents, such as the Placemaking Plan, 'should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development'2 If the Authority wishes to impose such a requirement on developments then this should have been introduced through the B&NES Core Strategy to ensure the cumulative impact on development viability could be assessed.

Planning Practice Guidance confirms that should Authorities wish to impose local requirements in relation to building sustainability then this will need to be based on 'robust and credible evidence and pay careful attention to viability'. In this context the B&NES Viability Assessment (BNP Paribas Real Estate) which forms part of the published evidence base to the Placemaking Plan does not assess PBSA as part of its analysis. As such the impact of the proposed policy on student accommodation has not been assessed and, should further work be undertaken, this will need to be carried out in conjunction with relevant stakeholders using suitable site typologies.

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

effective as it is not implementable. Accordingly this Policy should be removed.

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

·	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?
To ensure that our comments have been interpreted co	orrectly and that any outstanding concerns can be explained.
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number:	r: 9
Name:	Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land
Agent Name: Pegasus Group	Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	d? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified □	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	P , Policy SCR1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	7 1 0110, 30111
The site Reference (ii applicable) is.	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
	Energy Requirement which requires that renewable energy is rbon emissions by at least 10%. This has not been demonstrated

11 Mav 2016 Page 179 of 956

to be viable once the housing mix reflects the identified needs. Furthermore, this requirement is beyond that set out by Building Regulations and is not consistent with an optional standard (which are the only means of requiring more than that set out by the Building Regulations). As a result the proposed policy is not only unjustified but it will also not be

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

Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver 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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy SCR1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Q4 Soundness Comment The Placemaking Plan introduces 'Core Development Management Policies' which are complemented by a range of district-wide policies. Paragraph 86-88 states that together these will help to deliver the objectives of the CS and will be used to assess and determine planning applications and appeal. Policies SCR1 through to SCR6 sets out the Placemaking Plan approach to Sustainable Construction & Renewable Energy. The objective of such policies is intended to reflect the requirements set out in the NPPF so that Local Plans establish policies which give positive weight to renewable and local community energy initiatives. The Placemaking Plan demonstrates how such policies relate back to the sustainability objectives set out in the adopted CS. The Policy aims are broadly supported and we welcome the recognition within the Placemaking Plan to the recent changes in Government Policy. What is less clear is the extent to which standards proposed within the Placemaking Plan reflect or diverge from national standards and the evidence base that supports the policy position. Critically, it is not evident how such requirements have been considered in the context of site deliverability. We refer specifically to Paragraph 173 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that developments are not subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. Where such standards are imposed through the Placemaking Plan these should be justified in terms of the impact upon the viability of development within the context of other policy burdens.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No			

11 May 2016 Page 180 of 956

Does the respondent consider the	ne document is legally c	ompliant? (Tick if indicate	d 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the	ne document is sound?		
If the respondent considers the	Draft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is it because i	t is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Consisten	Not Effective
The representation relates to: Von The Site Reference (if applicable)		Policy SCR1	
Q4 Soundness Comment			
The objective of such policies is in policies which give positive weight demonstrates how such policies rebroadly supported and we welcon	tended to reflect the re t to renewable and loca elate back to the sustain ne the recognition withit ent to which standards are base that supports the ed in the context of site developments are not so y is threatened. Where	quirements set out in the I community energy initianability objectives set out in the Placemaking Plan to proposed within the Placement of the policy position. Critically deliverability. We refer spubject to such a scale of obsuch standards are imposed.	tives. The Placemaking Plan in the adopted CS. The Policy aims are the recent changes in Government emaking Plan reflect or diverge from ly, it is not evident how such pecifically to Paragraph 173 of the bligations and policy burdens that ed through the Placemaking Plan
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to part Why does the Respondent feel it i	•		
Respondent Number: 6426	Comment Number:	1.4	
Respondent Number: 6426 Name:		14 Organisation: Persimmon	Homes Severn Valley
Agent Name:		Agent Organisation:	Tiomes severil valley
Further Information available in			ents sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the	ne document is legally c	ompliant? (Tick if indicate	d 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the	ne document is sound?	No	
If the respondent considers the	Draft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is it because i	t is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Consisten 🗸	Not Effective
The representation relates to: Vo		Policy SCR1	
Q4 Soundness Comment			
5.1.6.4. I.I			
many sites. There is no requireme	ent in National Policy to considerations and be	reduce carbon emissions l subject to viability if it is	render the approach unrealistic on by at least 10%. We consider the to be retained within the plan. The

11 May 2016 Page 181 of 956

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7150 Comment Number: 5 Name: James Proyer Organisation: Persimmon Homes (Wessex) 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy SCR1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
PHW object to Policy SCR1. The definition of 10 dwellings as a major proposal in respect of this policy will render the approach unrealistic on many sites. If the policy is to be retained it should set a more realistic threshold, and be subject to viability and site specific considerations.
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?
Respondent Number: 7152 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: SC Pulteney Road Ltd (Student Castle) Agent Name: James Taylor Agent Organisation: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners 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 1 District Wide , Policy SCR1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

by 10% using renewable energy generation. This policy is not considered to be consistent with national guidance which

11 May 2016

Page 182 of 956

This policy, which proposes a requirement for major developments to reduce their carbon emissions through energy use

Q4 Soundness Comment

supports the introduction of sustainable construction improvements through national described standards such as building regulations 1.

The NPPF clarifies that additional development plan documents, such as the Placemaking Plan, 'should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development'2. If the Authority wishes to impose such a requirement on developments then this should have been introduced through the B&NES Core Strategy to ensure the cumulative impact on development viability could be assessed.

Planning Practice Guidance confirms that should Authorities wish to impose local requirements in relation to building sustainability then this will need to be based on 'robust and credible evidence and pay careful attention to viability3'. In this context the B&NES Viability Assessment (BNP Paribas Real Estate) which forms part of the published evidence base to the Placemaking Plan does not assess PBSA as part of its analysis. As such the impact of the proposed policy on student accommodation has not been assessed and, should further work be undertaken, this will need to be carried out in conjunction with relevant stakeholders using suitable site typologies.

in conjunction with relevant stakenorders using suitable site typologies.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 183 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy SCR2

Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number:	2
Name: Rohan Torkildsen	Organisation: Historic England
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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Policy SCR2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
•	ance of individual heritage assets, townscapes and landscapes. atters to be considered and unfortunately does not include a nce of effected heritage assets.
Q5 Change Requested	
Cross reference to HE policy (para 230) or include specifi	c heritage criteria
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	tion (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	ate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 2919 Comment Number:	1
Name: Dr David Martin	Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Policy SCR2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Supports Policy SCR2.	
, ,	

11 May 2016 Page 184 of 956

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 185 of 956

Organisation: Historic England

Agent Organisation:

Plan Order Reference

Comment Number:

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy SCR3

279

Respondent Number:

Agent Name:

Name: Rohan Torkildsen

Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally of	compliant? (Ti	ick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is	s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Con	sisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide ,	Policy SCR3		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	·		
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Solar Arrays have the potential to cause harm to the sign historic landscapes. However the policy makes no referer			and
Q5 Change Requested			
Cross reference to HE / Landscape policy (para 230) or inc	clude specific	heritage / landscape criteria.	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa			
Respondent Number: 2919 Comment Number:	2		
	2 Organisation:		
Name: Dr David Martin			
Name: Dr David Martin	Organisation: Agent Organis		No
Name: Dr David Martin Agent Name:	Organisation: Agent Organis No	sation: Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Name: Dr David Martin Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment?	Organisation: Agent Organis No compliant? (Ti	sation: Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Name: Dr David Martin Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment? Does the respondent consider the document is legally or	Organisation: Agent Organis No compliant? (Ti	Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes')	No
Name: Dr David Martin Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment? Does the respondent consider the document is legally of Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	Organisation: Agent Organis No compliant? (Ti Yes is unsound, is	Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes')	No
Name: Dr David Martin Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment? Does the respondent consider the document is legally of Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	Organisation: Agent Organis No compliant? (To Yes is unsound, is	sation: Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes') s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Name: Dr David Martin Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment? Does the respondent consider the document is legally of Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide,	Organisation: Agent Organis No compliant? (To Yes is unsound, is	sation: Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes') s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Name: Dr David Martin Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment? Does the respondent consider the document is legally of Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Organisation: Agent Organis No compliant? (To Yes is unsound, is	sation: Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes') s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	No

11 May 2016 Page 186 of 956

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?
Respondent Number: 6580 Comment Number: 2
Name: Andrew Lord Organisation: Cotswolds Conservation Board
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy SCR3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy SCR3 (b) only refers to "sensitive" landscapes and does not include reference to the nationally protected AONBs.
Specific reference should be added to AONBs and Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF.
Q5 Change Requested
The Cotswolds Conservation Board recommends changing Policy SCR 3 (b) to include a statement around the fact that
any proposals within or within the setting of the nationally protected AONBs will be subject to consideration of
Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF where relevant.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
with about the heapondent reer it is necessary to participate at the Examination;

11 May 2016 Page 187 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy SCR4

Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number: 4 Name: Rohan Torkildsen Orga	nisation: Historic England
	· ·
Further Information available in the original comment?	It Organisation: No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Tuttler information available in the original comment:	Attachments sent with the comment: No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally comp	liant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is ur	sound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Poli	cy SCR4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
This policy makes reference to a series of policy consideration reference is made to the potential impact on heritage assets,	·
Q5 Change Requested	
Cross reference to HE / Landscape policy (para 230) or include	specific heritage / landscape criteria.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at	the Examination?
Respondent Number: 2919 Comment Number: 3	
Name: Dr David Martin Orga	nisation:
Agent Name: Agen	t Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally comp	liant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes	s, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is ur	sound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Poli	cy SCR4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The policy needs to make clear what is meant by a "local" con	nmunity, and should do this by defining local to mean that III be residents of Bath & North East Somerset. Further it

11 May 2016 Page 188 of 956

should be made clear that the social and economic benefits shall accrue to people and communities within Bath & North East Somerset.

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?
Respondent Number: 6580 Comment Number: 3 Name: Andrew Lord Organisation: Cotswolds Conservation Board 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy SCR4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Community Renewable Energy Scheme policy should include a cross reference to Policy SCR3 in that Community Renewable Energy schemes will still need to be judged whether they can be accommodated within the AONB in accordance with national policy (Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF).
Q5 Change Requested
Include a cross reference within Policy SCR4 to schemes also complying with Policy SCR3 in terms of proposals within or within the setting of the AONBs, to ensure compliance with Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 189 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 120

on the state of th	3
Name: John Eddison Or	rganisation:
Agent Name: Ag	gent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally con	mpliant? (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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , P	Para 120
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Para 120. Water efficiency proposals are commendable. Th	e climate changes suggested are questionable however.
Q5 Change Requested	
Further work to address and resolve the above points	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinatio	n (ticked if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 190 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP4

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 16
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Reference in Bath central area should be made to the fact that there is substantial below ground archaeology and also in some cases below-street vaults which might render district heating inappropriate
Q5 Change Requested
At the head of the Bath list insert 'subject to archaeological and historic structural conditions'.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared
at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the
placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 9
Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 191 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made Collinells received (iii Flati Order)
Q4 Soundness Comment
The requirements of Policy SCR1 for on-site renewable energy of at least 10% and Policy CP4 for District Heating provision should be re-checked by the Council for consistency with national policy.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
The particular and the particula
Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 4
Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd
Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley
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') \Box
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
At this stage the composition of the new stadium has not been finalised, however stadiums have unique characteristics
which limit the potential of the site to meet some of the Council's requirements and in particular relating to District
Heating.
Stadiums by their nature are primarily made up of unheated spaces with limited heating required for offices, changing
rooms, corporate boxes and onsite concessions or food and non-food retail outlets which are typically used infrequently.
The main demand for this type of development is therefore electrical.
Policy CP4 encourages development to use Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and District Heating (DH) as a means of
providing low carbon heat and power. The Council has identified three 'district heating priority areas' where development is expected to
incorporate infrastructure for district heating and is expected to connect to existing systems unless this would impact on
the viability of the development. District heating systems are best suited to development which has a continuous base
heat requirement, i.e. Developments in continuous/frequent use such as offices, leisure centres and high density housing.
We have reviewed the evidence base to support Policy CP4 which is held on the Council's district heating website.1 In
2010 AECOM produced a District Heating Opportunity Assessment Study which identified three CHP/ DH opportunity
areas, Bath Centre (including the Recreation Ground and Bath Sports and Leisure Centre), Bath Riverside Corridor and Keynsham.
Detailed assessments of these areas including high level network maps and financial evaluations were carried out to
determine the

11 May 2016 Page 192 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The results show that gas fired CHP/ DH systems could be viable, albeit the Rate of Return for the Central Bath and Riverside Schemes is very low. The Study sets out a range of recommendations including one which requests that planners should ensure that development in close proximity to the proposed networks is connected to existing or future systems.

In addition the Council has commissioned a feasibility study specifically to look at the 'District Heating and Bath Riverside Enterprise Area'. The document produced by Buro Happold in 2015 confirms the Council's District Heating Priority Areas and include the Recreation Ground and Leisure Centre within its assessment, as part of an assessment labelled City Centre Plus.

The identified clusters are prioritised with the 6 highest evaluated in more detail. The City Centre Plus cluster (which incorporates the Bath Recreation Ground) is scored second to last of the options reviewed with a poor score for deliverability.

The techno-economic assessment of the 6 options shows that none of the potential schemes offer a positive NPV and higher yields from supplied energy would be required with similar pricing to a private wire supply.

Our clients acknowledge that the site is within the Council's District Heating Priority Areas. However, as previously discussed the unique nature of a sports stadium means it is anticipated that there will be little energy required for heating and primary energy demand will be electrical. This leads to an imbalance in energy requirement limiting the potential for heat driven technologies such as Combined Heat and Power.

The Council's feasibility study, District Heating at Bath Riverside Enterprise Area has raised significant potential issues with the deliverability of a network incorporating the Stadium site and adjacent leisure centre. In addition the technoeconomic assessment of the shortlisted clusters within the report has identified that the financial viability of networks within the city is marginal.

Given the site's energy demand profile and the issues regarding deliverability identified in the Council's own evidence base it is not anticipated at this stage that the creation of a district heating network either facilitated by or including the Rugby Club is a

commercially and technically viable opportunity. Also given the potential economic issues in the development of schemes along the Riverside corridor it is anticipated that connection to schemes across the River from the site are unlikely to be viable.

It is however noted that the Bath Sports and Leisure Centre is identified in the Council's opportunity assessment as a high energy user and in this context the development of the new stadium will include a review of Combined Heat and Power and District Heating options as part of a low carbon renewable energy feasibility study, although we request that the Council note the clear challenges that exist at this stage to the implementation of a successful project.

Our clients supports the Council's sustainability and Climate Change objectives of the Placemaking Plan but do have a number of concerns with regards to the application of the Policy targets given the unique development constraints and energy profile associated with a Sports Stadium. During the design stage of the new stadium the design team will utilise the Council's Sustainability Checklist to inform the development designs which will include a low carbon and renewable energy feasibility study to identify technically and commercially viable technologies which could be incorporated into the development.

Q5 Change Requested

One of these 'priority areas' is the Recreation Ground. We object to the inclusion of the Rec within this policy area, and request that it is removed as there is no evidence to justify the proposed approach.

Without the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified or effective.

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?

11 May 2016 Page 193 of 956

Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey
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') $\ \square$
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 1 District Wide , Policy CP4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The proposed insertion of the phrase: "and shown in detail in the associated evidence base" is unclear. A user cannot know what is referred to and thus cannot know how a decision maker should react to a development proposal, contrary to NPPF para 154. This undermines the effectiveness of the policy
Q5 Change Requested
The plan must state clearly and exactly what is being referred to in the evidence base.
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: 7079 Comment Number: 2
Respondent Number: 7079 Comment Number: 2 Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited 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')
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited 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
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited 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):
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited Agent Name: 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 Consisten Not Effective
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: Resourceful Earth Limited Agent Name: 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CP4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 194 of 956

nearby residential expansion, Policy CP4 for District Heating should be expanded and Diagram 19 amended to show that our site is a District Heating Opportunity Area. This is particularly pertinent in respect of Volume 3 Keynsham Policy KE4

Land Adjoining South West Keynsham Strategic Site Allocation.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 195 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Diagram 19 District Heating Priority Areas

Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 9
Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson
Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Diagram 19 District Heating Priority Areas
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Diagram 19 is incorrect. It shows in red 'Existing or permitted student accommodation'. In the case of Bath Western Riverside, the shading is incorrect and refers to a different area to that shown in the approved Land Use drawing (1268/P/112 Revision E) to Crest's outline planning permission 06/01733/EOUT. This drawing is referred to at Condition 6 of this permission which requires applications for reserved matters to be substantially in accordance with these plans.
Q5 Change Requested
We object to Diagram 19 and request the following change: 1)The red shading should reflect the location of the student accommodation as shown in Land Use drawing (1268/P/112 Revision E) – copy attached.
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?
There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.

11 May 2016 Page 196 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 130

Respondent Number:	828	Comment Number:	: 2				
Name:			Orga	nisation: [Deeley Freed	Estates Ltd and DFE Proje	cts Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Baile	е у		Ager	nt Organisa	tion: Martin	Bailey	
Further Information avails	able in tl	ne original comment	:?	No	Attachmen	ts sent with the comment	:? No
Does the respondent con	sider the	document is legally	comp	oliant? (Tick	if indicated	'yes') \square	
Does the respondent con	sider the	document is sound	? N	0			
If the respondent conside	rs the D	raft Placemaking Pla	n is ur	nsound, is i	t because it is	s (ticked where indicated)	:
Not Positively Prepared [Not Justified		Not Consis	sten 🗌	Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates	to: Vol	ume 1 District Wide	, Par	a 130			
The Site Reference (if appli	cable) is	:					
Q4 Soundness Comment							
On the basis of the AECOM	•	•			•		
Roseberry Place has not be		•	_	•		•	
words of the Council Comm site is outside of the priorit			•		• • •		
on this basis." There is no t	-		-			-	
paragraph 130 under the ho	eading "	Bath". It would be m	islead	ling and uni	reasonable to	include Roseberry Place.	1
Q5 Change Requested							
(1) Delete in paragraph 130 Heating Opportunity Assess			-		more detail	in the OS base maps with	in District
(2) Delete bullet point 11 u	nder the	heading Bath (i.e. R	osebe	rry Place).			
Does the Respondent wish	to partic	ipate at the Examina	ation (ticked if ye	s)?		

11 May 2016 Page 197 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 133

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number Name: John Webb Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	Organisation: Agent Organisation:
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 133
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Flood risk management is covered at Paragraph 133.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate.	

11 May 2016 Page 198 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Respondent Number: 301 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: South West HARP Planning Consortium
Agent Name: Felicity Tozer Agent Organisation: Tetlow King Planning

Agent Organisation: Tetlow King Planning Agent Name: Felicity Tozer Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, SU1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment In line with our comments from January 2015 (M6/0518-12), we support the amendment in the policy making reference to the West of England Sustainable Drainage Developers Guide – which reiterates the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) stating that Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems are expected in new developments of 10 or more dwellings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') **V** 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 Consisten □ Not Effective Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, SU1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **Q4 Soundness Comment**

The approach to incorporating SuDs in conjunction with major development or in areas at risk of flooding is supported by the University, given that the policy accepts this might not be appropriate in all instances and, in such instances,

Page 199 of 956

11 May 2016

agrees that it is appropriate that an alternative means of effectively managing surface water without increasing flood risk must be demonstrated.

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?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 15 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, SU1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
SU1 - Sustainable Drainage Policy Firstly we consider the West of England Sustainable Drainage Developers Guide (2015) is a helpful document. However do not consider it is appropriate to refer to this non-statutory guidance in a statutory Local Plan Policy and therefore the policy references should be removed and reliance placed on the references in the supporting paragraphs. Secondly we consider the requirement to submit a 'SuDS proof of concept' for agreement at the pre-application stage is an unnecessary and onerous requirement. Drainage proposals, including SuDS solutions, where appropriate, will not usually be resolved at the pre-application stage and will develop with the preparation of the planning application proposals and when finalised will be set out in the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the planning application. The plan is unsound because SU1 is contrary to National Policy and is not effective.
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?
Respondent Number: 7150 Comment Number: 6 Name: James Proyer Organisation: Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 200 of 956

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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , SU1				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
SuDS are widely accepted as the optimum method of addressing on-site drainage issues and the intention of the policy is supported. However the proposed requirement for applications to be accompanied with a "SuDS Proof of Concept" is considered to be an unnecessarily onerous request given that details of any SuDS proposals should be set out in the Flood Risk Assessment / Drainage Strategy submitted with a planning application and resolved through the determination process. PHW object to policy SU1 as currently worded.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 201 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP6

placemaking plan

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 17
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP6
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
pecific mention should be made of the World Heritage Site.
pecific mention of CIL to conserve and enhance the historic environment. pecific mention should be made for design tools relevant to the historic environment eg Historic England/EH
publications.
Q5 Change Requested
nsert WHS in paras 2 and 3.
nsert new para re CIL.
nsert 'in partnership with local groups' in bullet point 2. nsert HE publications:
Good Practice Advice note: the setting of heritage assets
Seeing the history within the view
Tall Buildings
Building in context (HE with Cabe)
Understanding Place Historic Area Assessments: Principles anPractice.
oes the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Vhy does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
he Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the

11 May 2016 Page 202 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 188

	1 Organisation: Agent Organisation: No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally of Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Yes, with minor changes
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Para 188
Q4 Soundness Comment	
p85 188.7: typo CABE	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa	, , ,

11 May 2016 Page 203 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 1

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D1

117

Respondent Number:

	O Garrisa troin	Priston Parish Council			
Agent Name:	ů ů				
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No		
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant? (Tic	k if indicated 'yes')			
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? Yes, with mi	nor changes			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where indicated):			
Not Positively Prepared 🗹 Not Justified 🗹	Not Cons	sten 🗹 Not Effective 🗹			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy D1				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
D.1: Urban Design Policy Priston Parish Council welcomes the explicit considerati	on of questions	of good design in assessing Planning Applica	ations.		
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if y	es)?			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	•				
willy does the respondent reel it is necessary to particip	Jace at the Exam	illiation:			
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number:	: 3				
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number: Name:		Robert Hitchins Limited			
	Organisation:	Robert Hitchins Limited ation: Pegasus Planning			
Name:	Organisation: Agent Organisa		No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard	Organisation: Agent Organisa ? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment	Organisation: Agent Organisa No compliant? (Tick	Attachments sent with the comment?	No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally	Organisation: Agent Organisa No compliant? (Tic	Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes')	No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	Organisation: Agent Organisa No compliant? (Tic	Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes')	No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	Organisation: Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Tick) n is unsound, is Not Consi	Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes')	No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Organisation: Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Tick) n is unsound, is Not Consi	Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes')	No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Organisation: Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Tick) n is unsound, is Not Consi	Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes')	No		
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Organisation: Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Tice) n is unsound, is Not Consi	Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes') it because it is (ticked where indicated): sten Not Effective			

11 May 2016 Page 204 of 956

should be clear in terms of which type/scale of development will be expected to be informed by the design principles listed in Policy DI.

The NPPF recognises the "great importance" of design to the built environment (para 56), acknowledging that it is a key aspect of sustainable development. It also confirms that planning policies on design should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail. As drafted Policy D1 appears to meet the aims of the NPPF, however as the principles are broad in their scope, it is not clear how the Council will consider how proposals satisfy the principles. There is therefore a lack of clarity as to how the policy will be implemented, particularly in terms of ensuring compliance from individual development proposals. For example it is not clear what is meant by "opportunities for interaction and delight".

Good design is not always related to replicating existing characteristics/styles etc. Urban design can provide innovative and unique design solutions that would not harm the existing character of a settlement, whilst not attempting to replicate existing features. Policy D1 would therefore benefit from greater flexibility in terms of appropriate design to allow for appropriate / suitable departures from the existing key features where such proposals would still satisfy the primary objective of delivering good quality design. To some extent this is achieved in Policies D2, D3, D4, D5 and D6 which in turn questions the need for a policy that simply list principles, i.e. Policy D1.

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 18
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
'Conserve and enhance' should be used to relate to the conservation areas.
Q5 Change Requested
ert new para Development should conserve and enhance the characteristics of the historic environment, particularly in
those areas designated as conservation areas.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

11 May 2016 Page 205 of 956

Respondent Number: 244 Comment Nu	umber: 4	
Name: Susan E Green	Organisation: Home Builders Federation	
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original com	mment? No Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is I	legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is	sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaki	ing 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 1 District	t Wide,Policy D1	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
are repetitive especially given that specific "Devel	or assess "delight" as set out in Policy D1. Policies D2, D3, D4, D5 and lopment Requirements and Design Principles" are also set out for each finement and streamlining to produce a shorter more concise	
Q5 Change Requested		
Describe Description to continue to the Eu	organic ation (tipled if one)?	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Ex		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to p	participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 274 Comment Nu	umber: 4	
Name: Gary Parsons	Organisation: Sport England	
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original com	mment? No Attachments sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is I	legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is s	sound? No	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaki	ing 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 1 District	t Wide , Policy D1	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
Active Design		
consider has considerable synergy the Plan. It ma	ave recently launched our revised guidance 'Active Design' which we ay therefore be useful to provide a cross-reference (and perhaps and . Sport England believes that being active should be an intrinsic par	

11 May 2016 Page 206 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

- The guidance is aimed at planners, urban designers, developers and health professionals.
- The guidance looks to support the creation of healthy communities through the land use planning system by encouraging people to be more physically active through their everyday lives.
- The guidance builds on the original Active Designs objectives of Improving Accessibility, Enhancing Amenity and Increasing Awareness (the '3A's), and sets out the Ten Principles of Active Design.
- Then Ten Active Design Principles have been developed to inspire and inform the design and layout of cities, towns, villages, neighbourhoods, buildings, streets and open spaces, to promote sport and physical activity and active lifestyles.
- The guide includes a series of case studies that set out practical real-life examples of the Active Design Principles in action. These case studies are set out to inspire and encourage those engaged in the planning, design and management of our environments to deliver more active and healthier environments.
- The Ten Active Design Principles are aimed at contributing towards the Governments desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design.

The developer's checklist (Appendix 1) has been revised and can also be accessed via www.sportengland.org/activedesign

Sport England would encourage development in Bath and NE Somerset be designed in line with the Active Design principles to secure sustainable design. This could be evidenced by use of the checklist.

MODEL POLICY FOR ACTIVE DESIGN

A suggested model policy for Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans is set out in the original representat	lon.
---	------

77 3466 estea finder policy for Eocal Fians and Weighbor	arriooa	1 10113 13	set out in the onginal representation.	
Q5 Change Requested				
Include an Active Design Policy in the Plan and make reference to the document in appropriate locations.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examir	nation (ticked if	yes)?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partic	ipate a	t the Exa	mination?	
Respondent Number: 279 Comment Numbe	er: 5			
Name: Rohan Torkildsen	Orga	nisation	: Historic England	
Agent Name:	Ager	nt Organ	sation:	
Further Information available in the original commer	nt?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	ly comp	oliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d?			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl	lan is uı	nsound,	is it because it is (ticked where indicated):	

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D1

Not Justified

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Not Positively Prepared

Q4 Soundness Comment

This welcome policy highlights certain extracts from NPPF section 7 Requiring Good Design. However the preamble to the policy fails to refer to the importance of responding to local character, identity and history as reflected the local surroundings and materials, as encouraged by NPPF paragraph 58 4th bullet.

Not Consisten

Not Effective

Q5 Change Requested

Adjust criteria b to Policy D1.b) Development should enrich the character and qualities of places and should contribute

11 May 2016 Page 207 of 956

positively to locally distinctiveness, identity and history.		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
As an advocate of the importance of good design, the University supports the intent of the design principles described and the change in emphasis (since the Options draft) that now proposes to positively support developments that reflect these general urban design principles. This is in keeping with the positive approach to design as proposed in the Core Principles under para. 17 of the NPPF.		
However, it must be recognised that it is not always possible or appropriate to apply all criteria to all development. For example, criterion e) proposes that places should be mixed use, which clearly cannot apply to all development proposals. To ensure that the policy is not too prescriptive and is positively applied to all development, the policy should be reworded to state that these principles 'should be applied where appropriate to the particular type and location of development proposed'.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		
Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No		

11 May 2016 Page 208 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed		
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 Consisten Not Effective		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D1		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
The policy wording states that the general esign principles will be applied "particularly for large scale development". We question the apparent ambiguity of this part of the policy, the policy should be clear in terms of which type/scale of development will be expected to be informed by the design principles listed in Policy D1.		
The NPPF recognises the "great importance" of design to the built environment (para 56), acknowledging that it is a key aspect of sustainable development. It also confirms that planning policies on design should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail. As drafted Policy DI appears to meet the aims of the NPPF, however as the principles are broad in their scope, it is not clear how the Council will consider how proposals satisfy the principles. There is therefore a lack of clarity as to how the policy will be implemented, particularly in terms of ensuring compliance from individual development proposals. For example it is not clear what is meant by "opportunities for interaction and delight". Good design is not always related to replicating existing characteristics/styles etc. Urban design can provide innovative and unique design solutions that would not harm the existing character of a settlement, whilst not attempting to replicate existing features. Policy D1 would therefore benefit from greater flexibility in terms of appropriate design to allow for appropriate / suitable departures from the existing key features where such proposals would still satisfy the primary objective of delivering good quality design. To some extent this is achieved in Policies D2, D3, D4, D5 and D6 which in turn questions the need for a policy that simply list principles, i.e. Policy D1.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 4 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 Consisten Not Effective		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		

11 May 2016 Page 209 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Q5 Change Requested

Policy DI: General Urban Design Principles - The policy wording states that the general design principles will be applied "particularly for large scale development". We question the apparent ambiguity of this part of the policy, the policy should be clear in terms of which type/scale of development will be expected to be informed by the design principles listed in Policy DI.

The NPPF recognises the "great importance" of design to the built environment (para 56), acknowledging that it is a key aspect of sustainable development. It also confirms that planning policies on design should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail. As drafted Policy D1 appears to meet the aims of the NPPF, however as the principles are broad in their scope, it is not clear how the Council will consider how proposals satisfy the principles. There is therefore a lack of clarity as to how the policy will be implemented, particularly in terms of ensuring compliance from individual development proposals. For example it is not clear what is meant by "opportunities for interaction and delight".

Good design is not always related to replicating existing characteristics/styles etc. Urban design can provide innovative and unique design solutions that would not harm the existing character of a settlement, whilst not attempting to replicate existing features. Policy D1 would therefore benefit from greater flexibility in terms of appropriate design to allow for appropriate / suitable departures from the existing key features where such proposals would still satisfy the primary objective of delivering good quality design. To some extent this is achieved in Policies D2, D3, D4, D5 and D6 which in turn questions the need for a policy that simply list principles, i.e. Policy D1.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number:	16			
Name:	rganisation:	Persimmon	Homes Severn Valley	
Agent Name: A	gent Organis	ation:		
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts 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				
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Cons	sisten 🗌	Not Effective 🔽	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide ,	Policy D1			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Taken together the above policies set out detailed design	guidance but	they are rep	etitive and as a consequence la	ick

There are numerous other examples of such repetition. -We suggest the Council should produce a matrix of all the design requirements, combining guidance where appropriate and setting it out under an appropriate policy head.

in D4 and does not need to be repeated in DI and D3.

clarity. For example, Policy DI at sub-paragraph (c) refers to streets being legible and easy to move around and, then Policy D3 sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) provide further advice including the need for a choice of routes for a site and in Policy D4 sub-paragraph (a) refers to a clear hierarchy of streets and spaces. In this example all this advice could be included as a single paragraph under one of the policies and as this relates to streets and spaces it would be appropriate

11 May 2016 Page 210 of 956

The plan is unsound because this approach is not effective.
In addition we have set out separately specific comments on some of the policies.
Policy DI - General Urban Design Principles PHSV have the following comments on this policy: Neither the policy nor the supporting paragraphs provide a definition of what is meant by 'large scale development' in the first paragraph. If this is the same definition as in Policy SCR1, ie 10 dwellings or more, we consider the requirements of the policy too onerous.
Sub-paragraph (b) lacks clarity and it is not clear how the Council will assess opportunities for interaction and particularly opportunities for 'delight'. Policies should be clear and easily understood and applicants should be able to understand how their schemes will be assessed in order to meet the needs of the policy.
Sub-paragraph (e) says 'places should be mixed use' and again this lacks clarity. What is meant by 'places' in relation to both the application and the neighbourhood or the village in which it is located?
Q5 Change Requested
Amend the policy and supplementary paragraphs to take account of the above comments.

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?

11 May 2016 Page 211 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D2

Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number	: 2
Name: Christine Hunt	Organisation: Priston Parish Council
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') \Box
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy D2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
D.2: Local Character Distinctiveness Priston Parish Council is strongly in favour of the new deassessed. In particular clauses a), d), f) and g).	etailed criteria against which applications for development will be
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number	: 4
Name:	Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited
Agent Name: James Millard	Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning
Further Information available in the original comment	
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 Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
	D. II. DO
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy D2
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy D2
·	, Policy D2

11 May 2016 Page 212 of 956

becoming too prescriptive and detailed. Moreover, in some respects the policy could be considered to be contradictory, with b referring to the need to improve areas of poor design, with the remaining criteria seeking to ensure that development is consistent with existing design features, apparently irrespective of their quality. It is considered that there should be a clear separation of criteria b so that the policy provides clear support for proposals that would improve areas of poor design

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?		
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 19 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust		
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
Should be specific reference to the historic environment.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Include the words 'heritage context' in the list in para 'a'.		
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan		
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 4		
Name: Organisation: University of Bath		
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd		
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐		

11 Mav 2016 Page 213 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
The University supports the change in emphasis (since the Options draft) that now proposes to positively support developments that contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness, as this is in keeping with the positive approach to design as proposed in the Core Principles under para. 17 of the NPPF.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 10		
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd		
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey		
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 1 District Wide , Policy D2		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
The policy appears to overlook the fact that it is desirable in some circumstances for areas to change their character and appearance more radically – for example, Western Riverside and surrounding areas – also other parts of the Enterprise Area. The policy should not stifle such opportunities and should encourage sustainable development which allows areas to evolve and sometimes to change whilst respecting structural elements of character and distinctiveness which it is desirable to reflect.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Qualify the policy by referring (generically) to areas of major change identified in the plan where development is expected to change the appearance, character and distinctiveness of a locality more substantially - whilst still responding to and reflecting key existing characteristics.		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		

11 May 2016 Page 214 of 956

Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number:	5
Name:	Organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name: Pegasus Group	Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver
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	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy D2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
would appear to be leaning towards a design-led policy Moreover, in some respects the policy could be conside areas of poor design, with the remaining criteria seeking	posals will be considered, certain aspects of which, c, d, f and g, that is in danger of becoming too prescriptive and detailed. red to be contradictory, with b referring to the need to improve g to ensure that development is consistent with existing design insidered that there should be a clear separation of criteria b so would improve areas of poor design.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	ate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number:	5
Name:	Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver	Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group
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	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy D2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
certain aspects of which, c, d, f and g, would appear to b	riteria upon which development proposals will be considered, be leaning towards a design-led policy that is in danger of the respects the policy could be considered to be contradictory.

11 May 2016 Page 215 of 956

with b referring to the need to improve areas of poor design, with the remaining criteria seeking to ensure that development is consistent with existing design features, apparently irrespective of their quality. It is considered that

there should be a clear separation of criteria b so that the policy provides clear support for proposals that would improve areas of poor design. 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? Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 17 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Name: 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 Effective ✓ Not Consisten 🗸 The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Policy D2 - Local Character and Distinctiveness PHSV is concerned about sub-paragraph (b). This says 'the development scheme improves areas of poor design', but it is not clear how the proposal can respond to areas of poor design outside the development site. This requirement is too onerous and it is not clear how it will be assessed. This policy is not justified or effective and is contrary to National Policy.

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?

11 May 2016 Page 216 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D3

Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number:	3
Name: Christine Hunt C	Organisation: Priston Parish Council
Agent Name:	gent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally co	ompliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide ,	Policy D3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
D.3: Urban Fabric Priston Parish Council is in support of D.3.I in its requireme	ent for continuity of street frontage.
Q5 Change Requested	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participat	e at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number:	5
Name:	Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited
Agent Name: James Millard A	gent Organisation: Pegasus Planning
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally co	ompliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide,	Policy D3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
	ite positively to the urban fabric, whilst we would support such
a policy the criteria based approach would appear to be o	verly prescriptive and potentially contrary to Paragraph 59 of

11 May 2016 Page 217 of 956

the NPPF. As drafted it would appear that the requirement of the policy is that aN the criteria (a to m) should be satisfied, which is in itself too prescriptive. Secondly, the policy provides little scope for developers to bring forward proposals which they consider provide an appropriate and suitable design solution to schemes. Policy D3 is considered to be overly-detailed, therefore inconsistent with the NPPF. Greater flexibility should be contained within the policy so that the overall objectives upon which the policy is based, i.e. to ensure that development is positive to the existing urban fabric, can be developer-led to reflect the site specific context and the overall viability and deliverability of proposals whilst meeting wider objectives of the Plan in terms of housing mix, landscape, environment and accessibility objectives.

Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 5				
Name: Organisation: University of Bath				
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D3				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
The University supports the change in emphasis (since the Options draft) that now proposes to positively support				
developments that contribute positively to the urban fabric, as this is in keeping with the positive approach to design as				
proposed in the Core Principles under para. 17 of the NPPF.				
However, whilst it is appropriate to encourage development to consider the criteria identified by this policy, it must be				
recognised that it is not always possible or appropriate to apply all criteria to all development. For example, criterion e)				
proposes that development should be mixed use and criterion k) that development should create positive microclimate effects. These criteria clearly cannot be appropriate to all development proposals.				
chects. These effects elearly earnot be appropriate to an development proposals.				
To ensure that the policy is not too prescriptive and is positively applied to all development, the policy should be				
reworded to state that these principles 'should be applied where appropriate to the particular type and location of development proposed'.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 218 of 956

Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 6
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver
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 Sustified Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D3 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy D3 requires development to contribute positively to the urban iehoric, whilst we would support such a policy the criteria based approach would appear to be overly prescriptive and potentially contrary to Paragraph 59 of the NPPF. As drafted it would appear that the requirement of the policy is that all the criteria (a to m) should be satisfied, which is in itself too prescriptive. Secondly, the policy provides little scope for developers to bring forward proposals which they consider provide an appropriate and suitable design solution to schemes. Policy D3 is considered to be overly-detailed therefore inconsistent with the NPPF. Greater flexibility should be contained within the policy so that the overall objectives upon which the policy is based, i.e. to ensure that development is positive to the existing urban fabric, can be developer-led to reflect the site specific context and the overall viability and deliverability of proposals whilst meeting wider objectives of the Plan in terms of housing mix, landscape, environment and accessibility objectives.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 6 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D3 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment

a policy the criteria based approach would appear to be overly prescriptive and potentially contrary to Paragraph 59 of

Page 219 of 956

11 May 2016

Policy D3 (Urban Fabric) requires development to contribute positively to the urban fabric, whilst we would support such

the NPPF. As drafted it would appear that the requirement of the policy is that aM the criteria (a to m) should be satisfied, which is in itself too prescriptive. Secondly, the policy provides little scope for developers to bring forward proposals which they consider provide an appropriate and suitable design solution to schemes. Policy D3 is considered to be overly-detailed, therefore inconsistent with the NPPF. Greater flexibility should be contained within the policy so that the overall objectives upon which the policy is based, i.e. to ensure that development is positive to the existing urban fabric, can be developer-led to reflect the site specific context and the overall viability and deliverability of proposals whilst meeting wider objectives of the Plan in terms of housing mix, landscape, environment and accessibility objectives.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 Mav 2016 Page 220 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D4

Respondent Number: 262 Comment Number: 2 Name: Justin Milward Organisation: Woodland Trust 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Woodland Trust is pleased to support the reference to street trees in Policy D4 (paragraph H)as a key element of green infrastructure provision for successful placemaking in Bath and North East Somerset.
The Woodland Trust supports the work, and is a member of, the Trees and Design Action Group - a unique multi-disciplinary group of professionals and organisations from both the private and public sectors that is seeking to promote the benefits of trees within the built environment. A South West TDAG is currently being set up, led by Exeter City Council. TDAG has produced guidance - 'No Trees, No Future' (TDAG, 2010) and 'Trees in Townscape' (TDAG June 2012) - which are aimed at designers, developers and planners to encourage integrated, joined up thinking, strategies, policies and implementation relating to trees in the urban realm. 'Trees in Townscape' in particular is endorsed by a number of local authorities - http://www.tdag.org.uk/endorse-trees-in-the-townscape.html. These documents support the use of street trees.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 6 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 221 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The University supports the change in emphasis (since the Options draft) that now proposes to positively support developments that are well connected, as this is in keeping with the positive approach to design as proposed in the Core Principles under para. 17 of the NPPF.
However, whilst it is appropriate to encourage development to consider the criteria identified by this policy, it must be recognised that it is not always possible or appropriate to apply all criteria to all development. To ensure that the policy s not too prescriptive and is positively applied to all development, the policy should be reworded to reflect this.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 7
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment Policies D4 (Streets and Spaces) and D5 (Building Design) and D6 (Amenity) are moadly supported as key considerations
n the design process.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 7
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
TUTTIEL INTOTTIATION AVAIJADIE III THE OTISMAL COMMENT! — NO — ALLACHINENIS SENEWINI ME COMMENT! — NO

11 May 2016 Page 222 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \square$						
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 Consisten Not Effective						
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Policies D4 (Streets and Spaces) and D5 (Building Design) and D6 (Amenity) are broadly supported as key considerations in the design process.						
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?						

11 May 2016 Page 223 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D5

D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
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 Consisten Not Effective Not Effective Not Positively Prepared is: Not Positively Prepared Positive Not Justified Policy D5 The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide Policy D5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
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 Consisten Not Effective P The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
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 Consisten Not Effective P The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
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 1 District Wide , Policy D5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Q4 Soundness Comment D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
D.5: Building Design Priston Parish Council is in agreement with all elements of this policy but with respect to clause c suggests that the approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
approval for good modern design should not be restricted to extensions to existing buildings. 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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
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? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
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: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 7 Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
Not continued in the consistent in the control in t
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment

11 May 2016 Page 224 of 956

However, whilst it is appropriate to encourage development to consider the criteria identified by this policy, it must be recognised that it is not always possible or appropriate to apply all criteria to all development. To ensure that the policy is not too prescriptive and is positively applied to all development, the policy should be reworded to state that these principles 'should be applied where appropriate to the particular type and location of development proposed'.

Furthermore, criterion d) is overly prescriptive and an unnecessary duplication of other policies within the PMP that seek to provide Green Infrastructure conserve and enhance species and habitats (notably Policies NE1 and NE3). This criterion should, therefore, be deleted.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 8
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policies D4 (Streets and Spaces) and D5 (Building Design) and D6 (Amenity) are broadly supported as key considerations in the design process.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 225 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D6

	r: 6
Name: Rohan Torkildsen	Organisation: Historic England
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	e , Policy D6
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Might the Plan refer to good practice examples of appr	opriately designed and located bin storage?
Q5 Change Requested	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	pate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number	r: 11
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number	
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Martin Bailey	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd
Name:	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey
Name: Agent Name: Martin Bailey Further Information available in the original commentation and the properties of the document is legally poes the respondent consider the document is sound to the d	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Name: Agent Name: Martin Bailey Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Place	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') d? No an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
Name: Agent Name: Martin Bailey Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') d? No an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 226 of 956

contrary to NPPF para 154. This renders it ineffective.
Q5 Change Requested
Redraft the policy so that it is clear what is expected/sought.
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: 6415 Comment Number: 9
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D6
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policies D4 (Streets and Spaces) and D5 (Building Design) and D6 (Amenity) are broadly supported as key considerations in the design process.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 227 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 5

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D7

117

Respondent Number:

Name: Christine Hunt	Organisati	on: Priston	Parish	Council		
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:					
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Atta	chment	ts sent with the o	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant	(Tick if ind	icated '	yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? Yes, wit	h minor cha	anges			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsoun	d, is it beca	use it is	s (ticked where ir	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not (Consisten 🔽	/	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy D7					
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
D.7: Infill and Backland Development Priston Parish Council suggest that under clause infill cla Statement as well as a Neighbourhood Plan. The PC gen				•	/illage Design	
Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked	l if yes)? [
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	oate at the I	Examination	ո?			
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number	: 12					
Name:	Organisati	on: Deeley	Freed	Estates Ltd and [OFE Projects Ltd	d
Agent Name: Martin Bailey	Agent Org	anisation: N	Martin	Bailey		
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Atta	chment	ts sent with the o	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant?	(Tick if ind	icated '	'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? No					
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsoun	d, is it beca	use it is	s (ticked where in	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not (Consisten 🔽		Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy D7					
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
The policy is poorly constructed in that it uses vague ter and not inappropriate". The statement "Neighbourhood		•		• •		

11 May 2016 Page 228 of 956

adds further uncertainty. As a result, the policy is vague and there is no clear indication as to how the decision maker will react, contrary to NPPF para 154. This renders the policy ineffective.

Q5 Change Requested

Redraft the policy so that it is clear what is expected/sought.

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: 6426 Comment Number: 18 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment Policy D7 - Infill and Back Land Development The wording of the policy lacks clarity when it says 'infill development and back land development' could be supported. If infill development meets all the requirements of sub-paragraphs (a)-(c) and back land development meets all the requirements of (a)-(d) both should be permitted and the policy should say so. In addition sub-paragraph A relating to back land development is badly worded and therefore lacks clarity. It should be positively worded so that back land development would be supported where it reflects the character of the area or improves the character of the area. This policy is contrary to National Policy and not justified or effective.				
Q5 Change Requested Amend the policy as follows: 'Infill development will be supported where Back land development will be supported where (a) it reflects the character of the area.'				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?				

11 May 2016 Page 229 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Part: Policy D8 Volume: 1, District Wide Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FoBR Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment This is basically meaningless, because by definition one cannot accept the unacceptable; and moreover unacceptable to whom, and on what criteria? Also, it covers open countryside, urban areas or villages; ie everywhere, so it is unnecessary to itemise them. This sub-paragraph is also unnecessary, as the policy is adequately covered in sub-paragraphs 1b-1d. Q5 Change Requested Delete paragraph 1a. 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? FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary. Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number: Name: Christine Hunt Organisation: Priston Parish Council 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D8

11 May 2016 Page 230 of 956

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

D.8: External Lighting

Priston Parish Council believes that the inclusion of the wording "in villages where present levels of illumination are low" should be included in section 1 clause a). The council is also strongly in favour of the text of section 2.

Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
,			
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 21			
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 21 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust			
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:			
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No			
, and a second of given some o			
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 1 District Wide , Policy D8			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Specific mentions should be made to the adverse impact of lighting on the historic environment.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Insert historic environment in paragraphs a and/or b.			
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared			
at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the			
placemaking plan			
Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number: 7			
Name: Rohan Torkildsen Organisation: Historic England			
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 Consisten Not Effective			

11 May 2016 Page 231 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
It may be helpful to refer to the potential positive and negative implications for the historic environment of lighting and the policy response as a consequence. It may also be useful to refer to External Lighting for Historic Buildings Guidance produced by Historic England. https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/external-lighting-for-historic-buildings/external-lighting2.pdf/				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 8				
Name: Organisation: University of Bath				
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd				
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 1 District Wide, Policy D8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Criterion 1 a) of the policy states that proposals for artificial lighting will only be permitted where it does not give rise to an 'unacceptable level of illumination'. This term is not defined and open to wide interpretation. It is therefore difficult to effectively apply this criterion, which is potentially restrictive to sustainable development. In a similar respect, criterion 1 b) permits artificial lighting only where it can be demonstrated that this will have 'no detrimental impact' on visual and residential amenity or local ecology, which conflicts with the approach proposed under criterion 1 c) that seeks to implement control measures so as to 'minimise' any adverse impact of lighting proposals.				
Policy D8 is not, therefore, in accordance with para. 125 of the NPPF, which seeks to 'limit the impact' of light pollution on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Policy D8 is not in accordance with para. 125 of the NPPF, which seeks to 'limit the impact' of light pollution on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation, and should be reworded to reflect this.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 232 of 956

Respondent Number: 6580 Comment Number: 4				
Name: Andrew Lord Organisation: Cotswolds Conservation Board				
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:				
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes				
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy D8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
The dark night skies are a specific and recognised special quality of the nationally protected AONB (see existing Cotswolds Management Plan Policy DTP1). The Board have also issued specific guidance in the form of a Position Statement on this issue.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Recommend that in relation to the issue of lighting that specific reference is made to the dark night skies of the AONB within Policy D8. The relevant Position Statement on Dark Night Skies from the Cotswolds AONB Board is therefore attached which provides additional guidance.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				

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

11 May 2016 Page 233 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 214

Respondent Number: 194 Name: John Webb Agent Name: Further Information available in	Age	ganisation: ent Organisation:	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider to Does the respondent consider to If the respondent considers the Not Positively Prepared	he document is sound?			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 214 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment Page 214 deals with "Recreational Routes". No mention is made of tow or riverside paths.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 234 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 218

Respondent Number: Name: John Webb	194		ganisation:			
Agent Name:		Ag	ent Organisa	ation:		
Further Information avail	ilable in t	the original comment?	No	Attachmer	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is legally cor	npliant? (Tic	k if indicated	'yes')	
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is sound?				
If the respondent consid	lers the D	Praft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Cons	isten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relate	s to: Vo	lume 1 District Wide,P	ara 218			
The Site Reference (if app	licable) i	s:				
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Park and Ride referred to criver ie. "Park and Glide".	on Page	218 identifies the need fo	or this to the	e east of Bath	but makes no reference to us	ing the
Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$						

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

11 May 2016 Page 235 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy D10

Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 6 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy D10 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
With regard to the financial contributions sought for public realm infrastructure improvements under Policy D10 the Council is reminded of advice set out in the NPPG in particular ID 23b-004-20150326. The Council is also reminded that the use of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) should not introduce additional costs and it is inappropriate to hide policy requirements in SPD.					
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?					
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 13					
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd					
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey					
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 1 District Wide, Policy D10 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					

11 May 2016 Page 236 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Q5 Change Requested

Redraft the policy so that it is clear what is expected/sought.

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 policy is poorly constructed in that it uses terms that are not explicit. For example, it refers to requirements in the Planning Obligations SPD yet there is only one reference to public realm in that document – as part of a long list of items for which obligation may be sought by the Council. Similarly, the policy refers to adopted design codes yet it appears that the Western Riverside Design Codes are the only such codes. As a result, the policy and its requirements are vague and there is no clear indication as to how the decision maker will react, contrary to NPPF para 154. This renders the policy ineffective.

Respondent Number: 6426	Comment Number: 19)			
Name:	Org	ganisation: Pe	ersimmon Ho	omes Severn Valley	
Agent Name:	Age	ent Organisati	on:		
Further Information available in th	ne original comment?	No	Attachment	s sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the Does the respondent consider the If the respondent considers the Dr. Not Positively Prepared	document is sound?	No	because it is	,	
The representation relates to: Volume The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		olicy D10			
Q4 Soundness Comment					

The supporting paragraphs state that the policy is interpreted as requiring improvements to the public realm generally outside the development site. However the policy is worded that development proposals must be designed to enhance the public realm and contribute towards achieving public realm infrastructure improvements. This should be covered through CIL rather than requiring development proposals to make additional off site contributions. All policies should accord with the CIL regulation and NPPG guidance which says that the relevant tests for planning obligations is that they should be 'necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.' In addition 'planning obligation should not be sought where they are clearly not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms'. Finally 'planning obligations must be fully justified and evidenced.' In respect of this policy it is not clear that it requires contributions directly related to the development, that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and it does not justify or provide evidence for the requirements of the policy. This policy is contrary to National Policy.

PHSV had two issues with this policy. Firstly, it is one of a number of policies which includes reference to a non-strategy document in a statutory Local Plan Policy, in this case the planning obligations SPD. In addition here it involves a policy which is likely to require additional contributions. The use of supplementary documents should not introduce additional costs or include additional policy requirements in an SPD and then seek to implement this through a statutory Local Plan

Q5 Change Requested

Policy D10 - Public Realm

Policy.

11 Mav 2016 Page 237 of 956

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	on?

11 May 2016 Page 238 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 221

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 3				
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd				
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey				
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 1 District Wide, Para 221 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Heritage asset is defined by the Council in para 221 differently than the national definition in NPPF Annex 2 – Glossary. There is a significant risk that this will lead to confusion and disagreement. Such "re-definition" appears contrary to National Planning Policy Guidance on local plan policies, paragraph 10.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Redraft the text to use the NPPF definition of heritage asset.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$				

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

11 May 2016 Page 239 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 225

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: Name: Agent Name: Martin Bailey Further Information available in the original comment	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey			
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 225			
Q4 Soundness Comment				
This paragraph could be misleading as regards Bath Conservation Area as it suggests that the Council's appraisals are up to date whereas no appraisals are available.				
The various 1968 Conservation Area designation reports and Council resolutions relating to designation of the Bath Conservation Area and its enlargement in 1973 are not available. Whilst the Conservation Area is an area of special architectural or historic interest in which it is desirable to preserve or enhance the character or appearance, there is no record of the specific features of the special architectural or historic interest which justified designation of the conservation area in Bath. This undermines and precludes any reasonable interpretation, application or development of conservation area policy for land within or adjoining in the Conservation Area.				
Compounding this difficulty, the Council has apparently preservation and enhancement of Bath Conservation Ar				
Q5 Change Requested				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	on in Bath and to indicate how the present circumstances are to r possibly reassess and re- designate the Conservation Area).			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina				

11 May 2016 Page 240 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 229

Respondent Number: 4811 Comment Number: 1
Name: Alan Clarkson Organisation: F.R. Daw Ltd / Prior Park Garden Centre
Agent Name: Mel Clinton Agent Organisation: Nash Partnership
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 229
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Not sound because it includes within the Green Belt land that does not serve Green Belt purposes, which is not open and which it is not necessary to keep permanently open.
1. Introduction
1.1 Nash Partnership is instructed by FR Daw, owners of Prior Park Garden Centre in Bath, to make representations in respect of the Placemaking Plan: Pre-Submission Draft, December 2015.
1.2 These representations relate to the Policies Map and to paragraph 299 of the Pre-Submission Draft: Part 1.
1.3 Representations have previously been submitted in respect of Prior Park Garden Centre in response to the publication of the Placemaking Plan Launch Document, September 2013 and the Options Document, January 2015. These representations are included here as Appendix A.
1.4 The location and characteristics of Prior Park Garden Centre are shown in Appendix A.
2. Pre-Submission Draft Provisions on the Green Belt Boundary
2.1 The general extent of the Green Belt is shown in the adopted Core Strategy which forms Part 1 of the new Local Plan, providing the overarching spatial strategy and Core Policies. This is set out in Policy CP8 which cross refers to the Green Belt extent shown in the Key Diagram. In the supporting text at paragraph 6.63 the Core Strategy states that "The Placemaking Plan provides the opportunity for a review of the inner detailed boundary"
2.2 The Draft Placemaking Plan Policies Map shows the Green Belt boundary at the Prior Park Garden Centre site unaltered from its delineation in the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan 1996-2011.
2.3 Within the Draft Placemaking Plan Green Belt policy is repeated as in Policy CP8 and confirms that the detailed

11 May 2016 Page 241 of 956

boundary is defined on the Policies Map and that the openness of the Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with national policy. Supporting paragraph 299 to this policy states that "Through the Core Strategy it has been established that there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant altering the Green Belt boundary

for development opportunities, other than at the four allocated Strategic Sites."

3. The National Policy Context and Placemaking Plan Role

- 3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides that "Local planning authorities should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy" and that once so established "... should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through preparation or review of the Local Plan. "
- 3.2 The NPPF at Annexe 2 defines the Local Plan as comprising development plan documents adopted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. For the purposes of continuity it also includes old policies which have been saved under the 2004 Act.
- 3.3 Where exceptional circumstances exist it is therefore the role of the Placemaking Plan to establish the detailed Green Belt boundary and in doing so to have regard to the NPPF provisions on defining boundaries (para 85) and the related purposes of Green Belts (para 80).
- 4. Defining the Green Belt Boundary
- 4.1 An independent assessment on appropriate definition of the Green Belt boundary in this location has already been undertaken by the Inspector conducting the Public Local Inquiry in respect of the Bath City Plan. Whilst this was in 1988, it is considered that the Inspector's conclusions remain sound. In considering the Green Belt boundary at the garden centre site the Inspector found that the open country "... appears to terminate at the hedgerow which separates the site from Rosemount Field and this hedgerow, in my view, marks the limits of development, and should form the boundary of the Green Belt."
- 4.2 Following the Public Local Inquiry a Special Joint Meeting of Bath City Council's Policy, Housing, Environment and Planning Committees agreed a recommendation from the Director of Environmental Services to allocate the land occupied by the garden centre for housing and to realign the Green Belt boundary to the south and west. However, this decision was subsequently reversed by a full City Council meeting on 13 June 1989 and the Green Belt consequently continued to include the garden centre.
- 4.3 Since this time, when an independent Inspector found that the Green Belt boundary should be amended, the content and purpose of Green Belt policy has remained largely unchanged. It is important however, to pay particular attention to national policy as currently set out in the NPPF.
- 4.4 The key requirement is to establish whether exceptional circumstances exist to warrant consideration of amendment to the Green Belt boundary. In the case of Prior Park Garden Centre it is considered that such circumstances do exist because this land does not fulfil Green Belt purposes and should not therefore be included within the Green Belt. This is considered further in Section 5 and in more detail in Appendix A.
- 4.5 When defining boundaries, the NPFF (para 85) sets out a number of requirements that local planning authorities should comply with. Those relevant to the land at Prior Park Garden Centre are considered below:

Ensure consistency with the Local Plan Strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development 4.6 Core Strategy Policy DW1 seeks to focus new housing, jobs and community facilities in the principal urban areas, the largest of which is Bath. In relation to housing the Core Strategy, through Policy B1, proposes delivery of 1,150 new homes in Bath through small scale intensification distributed throughout the urban area.

4.7 The Prior Park Garden Centre site is part of the urban area of Bath about a 600m walk from the city centre. Removal of the site from the Green Belt would therefore be consistent with the spatial strategy to facilitate sustainable development.

Not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open

4.8 The site is developed and in commercial use as a garden centre. As set out in the previous submission included as

11 May 2016 Page 242 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Appendix A, this land does not fulfil the Green Belt's fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl or the five purposes of Green Belt designation as set out in the NPPF (para. 79 and 80). The open land at this point on the edge of the city, as concluded by the Inspector considering the former Bath City Plan, begins to the south of the site.

4.9 The land at Prior Park Garden Centre is land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open and it is indeed currently not open but developed land. It should therefore not be included within the Green Belt.

Satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period 4.10 A realignment of the Green Belt boundary was proposed in the previous representations included at Appendix A. This boundary establishes a clear demarcation between the urban area of Bath and the adjoining open countryside. Amendment as proposed would therefore result in no need for future alteration of the Green Belt boundary in this location.

Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent 4.11 The revised boundary put forward in Appendix A follows historic boundaries that are clearly and strongly defined by trees and hedges. These boundaries are likely to remain as recognisable features on a permanent basis.

- 5. The Council's Reasons for Retaining the Green Belt Boundary Unaltered
- 5.1 The draft Placemaking Plan contends that through the Core Strategy it has been established that there are no exceptional circumstances warranting alteration of the Green Belt to facilitate development, other than those areas allocated as Strategic Sites. However, as noted, the Core Strategy at para 6.63 refers to the Placemaking Plan's role in reviewing the detailed inner boundary.
- 5.2 In response to the previous representations included at Appendix A, proposing amendment to the Green Belt boundary, the Council has set out its reasons in the Background Evidence documents, "Requests for land to be removed from the Green Belt Analysis and Recommendations: November 2014" and "Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission Draft) Requests for land to be removed from the Green Belt: Analysis and Recommendations:
- December 2015". In respect of the November 2014 document, the Council's reasoning is considered in detail at Appendix A. However, in summary, the reasons put forward for not undertaking an amendment to the Green Belt boundary at Prior Park Garden Centre are that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, the site contributes to the purpose of the Green Belt as evidenced by the Arup Study (Green Belt Review (Stage 1), April 2013) no change in circumstances since the boundary was last defined in 2007, no compelling or overriding reasons put forward to justify amendment and, should the respondent wish to redevelop the site at some point in the future, NPFF para 89 provides for this.
- 5.3 Each of these points is considered in turn below:

Need for exceptional circumstances

- 5.4 Land at Prior Park Garden Centre is not and does not need to be kept permanently open. The proposed boundary revision set out in Appendix A includes all the land that does need to be kept permanently open and provides a readily recognisable and enduring boundary.
- 5.5 Where land included within the Green Belt does not fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt this constitutes exceptional circumstances warranting Green Belt boundary adjustment. The relationship between the site and the purposes of the Green Belt is addressed below. The site contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt
- 5.6 This contention is based upon the Arup Review. However, this review is based upon large parcels of land and provides a very broad assessment of the Green Belt. There is no analysis of the particulars of the boundary at this location or any evidence that the land at Prior Park Garden Centre performs the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.
- 5.7 In respect of the primary Green Belt purpose of preventing urban sprawl, it is particularly significant that the Arup

11 Mav 2016 Page 243 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

assessment identifies the potential for "rounding off" the urban edge on the south eastern fringes of Bath as a result of the relative fragmentation, topography, inconsistency of urban edge and diversity of development types along this periphery of the city.

That is exactly what is proposed through the boundary realignment put forward in Appendix A.

5.8 In relation to the other four Green Belt purposes, the Prior Park Garden Centre Site plays no role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, it is part of the urban area and consequently does not perform a role in safeguarding the countryside, is urban in character within an urban setting and as a result its inclusion within the Green Belt does not contribute to preserving the special character of the city and, because of its urban characteristics its designation as Green Belt is not necessary in order to assist urban regeneration.

No change in circumstances since 2007 and no compelling or overriding reasons for boundary amendment put forward 5.9 Since 2007 the Core Strategy has been adopted and this specifically identifies the opportunity for the inner Green Belt boundary to be reviewed through the Placemaking Plan. The Prior Park Garden Centre site does not fulfil the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, it is not open and it is land that it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. These are compelling and overriding reasons for amending the Green Belt boundary.

NPPF para 89 provides for redevelopment in the Green Belt

5.10 This is not a sound reason for including within the Green Belt land that does not fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt and which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open.

5.11 The December 2015 Council assessment puts forward slightly difference reasons for not amending the Green Belt boundary in this location. These are, that the boundary is clearly drawn to form a clear separation between the open rural character and denseness of the urban form, there are no obvious anomalies in definition of the Green Belt boundary at this location, the site forms an important part of the Green Belt in this location with the Arup Review concluding that the land contributes to the five purposes of the Green Belt, there has been no change in circumstances or exceptional circumstances put forward and the NPPF at para 89 allows for appropriate development.

5.12 Again, each of these is taken in turn below:

The Green Belt boundary provides clear separation between open rural and dense urban character 5.13 This is simply not the case. The land at Prior Park Garden Centre is not of open rural character. As concluded by the Local Plan Inspector referred to above, the open countryside terminates at the hedgerow to the south which separates the site from Rosemount Field. As set out in the NPPF, definition of the Green Belt boundary must not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. The land at Prior Park Garden Centre is not open and it is not necessary to keep it permanently open in order for the Green Belt to serve the five purposes set out in the NPPF. This is addressed further below.

The site contributes to the five purposes of the Green Belt

5.14 The contention is based upon the Arup Review. However, this review is strategic and assesses large parcels of Green Belt land to provide part of the evidence base to inform the Examination of the Core Strategy. It was prepared specifically in response to the Examiner's concerns over the planned number of new dwellings and a potential shortfall in housing land supply. This review did not therefore comprise a detailed assessment of the inner Green Belt boundary. It is however significant that the Arup Review referred to potential opportunities for "rounding off" the Green Belt boundary due to the particular nature of its alignment along the south and eastern periphery of the city. This is what is proposed through the Green Belt boundary amendment put forward in Appendix A.

5.15 Whilst it is agreed that the large land parcel described in the Arup Review as "South East of Bath" serves the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, it is not accepted that the Prior Park Garden Centre site, as a very small element of this, serves any of the five purposes set out in the NPPF. The reasons why the site is not considered to serve the purposes of including land within the Green Belt are set out in Appendix A.

11 May 2016 Page 244 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

There has been no change in circumstances or exceptional circumstances put forward to justify amendment 5.16 As noted above, the Core Strategy identification of the Placemaking Plan's role in reviewing the inner Green Belt boundary is a change in circumstances and the fact that the land does not serve the purposes of the Green Belt constitutes exceptional circumstances warranting a boundary amendment.

NPPF para 89 provides for redevelopment in the Green Belt

5.17 Again, as noted above, this is not a sound reason for including within the Green Belt land that does not serve Green Belt purposes.

- 6. Sustainability Appraisal
- 6.1 It is a requirement of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Regulations to identify and evaluate likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan and reasonable alternatives.
- 6.2 Amendment of the inner Green Belt boundary to ensure that it fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt and supports sustainable development is a reasonable policy alternative. The Sustainability Appraisal does not appear to have considered the option of amendment to the inner Green Belt boundaries and the likely effects of this in relation to achieving sustainable development. This is particularly significant in relation to the land at Prior Park Garden Centre which, as noted above, is approximately 600m walking distance from Bath City Centre.
- 7. Conclusions
- 7.1 The Pre-Submission Draft Placemaking Plan is considered to be unsound for the reasons set out below.

Justified

7.2 The Draft Plan Policy CP8 and related Policies Map in proposing to retain the Green Belt boundary without amendment, save for the changes necessary to accommodate the four Strategic Sites allocated in the Core Strategy, is not considered justified or the most

appropriate strategy. This is because the proposed policy continues to include within the Green Belt land at Prior Park Garden Centre, which is part of the urban area. This land does not fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt and its continued inclusion may prejudice its future use and development in the most appropriate manner in the interests of achieving sustainable development.

Consistent with national policy

7.3 The site at Prior Park Garden Centre does not fulfil the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, it is not open and it is not necessary to keep it permanently open. These considerations constitute exceptional circumstances that warrant amendment to the Green Belt boundary. Retention of this land within the Green Belt is therefore contrary to national policy provisions on Green Belt designation.

Sustainability Appraisal

7.4 In addition to these matters of soundness, it is not considered that the Draft Placemaking Plan Sustainability Appraisal has considered and adequately assessed reasonable alternatives in respect of the Green Belt boundary.

Q5 Change Requested

Amendment to the Green Belt boundary as set out in the uploaded document titled "Comments in Respect of the Green Belt Boundary at Prior Park Garden Centre, Prior Park Road, Bath".

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?

Because the issue of soundness involves matters of planning judgement and participation is considered necessary in order to enable ta fully informed process of examination.

11 May 2016 Page 245 of 956

Respondent Number:

7113

Respondent Number: 7113 Comment Number: 1
Name: Mike and Sue Collins Organisation:
Agent Name: Mel Clinton Agent Organisation: Nash Partnership
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 229
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Because the Green Belt boundary at Orchard House does not follow the general alignment at this location and includes land within the Green Belt that does not need to be kept permanently open.
1. Introduction
1.1 Nash Partnership is instruction by Mr and Mrs Collins of Orchard House, Bathwick Hill in Bath, to make representations in respect of the Placemaking Plan: Pre-Submission Draft, December 2015.
1.2 These representations relate to the Policies Map and to paragraph 299 of the Pre-Submission Draft: Part 1.
1.3 Representations have previously been submitted in respect of Orchard House in response to the publication of the Placemaking Plan Launch Document, September 2013 and the Options Document, January 2015. These representations are included here as Appendix A.
1.4 The location and characteristics of Orchard house are shown in Appendix A.
2. Pre-Submission Draft Provisions on the Green Belt Boundary
2.1 The general extent of the Green Belt is shown in the adopted Core Strategy which forms Part 1 of the new Local Plan, providing the overarching spatial strategy and Core Policies. This is set out in Policy CP8 which cross refers to the Green Belt extent shown in the Key Diagram. In the supporting text at paragraph 6.63 the Core Strategy states that "The Placemaking Plan provides the opportunity for a review of the inner detailed boundary, such as to address anomalies."
2.2 The Draft Placemaking Plan Policies Map shows the Green Belt boundary at the Prior Park Garden Centre site unaltered from its delineation in the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan 1996-2011.
2.3 Within the Draft Placemaking Plan Green Belt policy is repeated as in Policy CP8 and confirms that the detailed boundary is defined on the Policies Map and that the openness of the Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development in accordance with national policy. Supporting paragraph 299 to this policy states that "Through the Core Strategy it has been established that there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant altering the Green Belt boundary.

3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides that "Local planning authorities should establish Green Belt

for development opportunities, other than at the four allocated Strategic Sites."

3. The National Policy Context and Local Plan Role

11 May 2016 Page 246 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy" and that once so established "... should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through preparation or review of the Local Plan. "

- 3.2 The NPPF at Annexe 2 defines the Local Plan as comprising development plan documents adopted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. For the purposes of continuity it also includes old policies which have been saved under the 2004 Act.
- 3.3 Where exceptional circumstances exist it is therefore the role of the Placemaking Plan to establish the detailed Green Belt boundary and in doing so to have regard to the NPPF provisions on defining boundaries (para 85) and the related purposes of Green Belts (para 80).
- 4. Defining the Green Belt Boundary
- 4.1 The key requirement is to establish whether exceptional circumstances exist to warrant consideration of amendment to the Green Belt boundary. In the case of Orchard House it is considered that such circumstances do exist because this land does not fulfil Green Belt purposes and should not therefore be included within the Green Belt. This is considered further in Section 5 and in more detail in Appendix A.
- 4.2 When defining boundaries, the NPFF (para 85) sets out a number of requirements that local planning authorities should comply with. Those relevant to the land at Orchard House are considered below:

Ensure consistency with the Local Plan Strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development 4.3 Orchard House is within the urban envelope of Bath and the proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary would be consistent with the Local Plan strategy for delivering sustainable development.

Not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open

4.4 The land at Orchard House does not fulfil the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, as set out in Appendix A. The boundary here does not conform with the general alignment of the Green Belt in this location, which follows the rear boundaries of properties on Cleveland Walk and Bathwick Hill.

Satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period 4.5 A realignment of the Green Belt boundary was proposed in the previous representations included at Appendix A. This boundary establishes a clear demarcation between the urban area of Bath and the adjoining open countryside. Amendment as proposed would therefore result in no need for future alteration of the Green Belt boundary in this location.

Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent 4.6 The revised boundary put forward in Appendix A follows boundaries that are clearly and strongly defined by trees and hedges. These boundaries are likely to remain as recognisable features on a permanent basis.

- 5. The Council's Reasons for Retaining the Green Belt Boundary Unaltered
- 5.1 The draft Placemaking Plan contends that through the Core Strategy it has been established that there are no exceptional circumstances warranting alteration of the Green Belt to facilitate development, other than those areas allocated as Strategic Sites. However, as noted, the Core Strategy at para 6.63 refers to the Placemaking Plan's role in reviewing the detailed inner boundary.
- 5.2 In response to the previous representations included at Appendix A, proposing amendment to the Green Belt boundary, the Council has set out its reasons in the Background Evidence documents, "Requests for land to be removed from the Green Belt Analysis and Recommendations, November 2014 and Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission Draft) Requests for land to be removed from the Green Belt: Analysis and Recommendations, December 2015". In respect of the November 2014 document the Council's reasoning is considered in detail at Appendix A. However, in summary, the reasons put forward for not undertaking an amendment

11 Mav 2016 Page 247 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

to the Green Belt boundary at Orchard House are that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, the site contributes to the purpose of the Green Belt as evidenced by the Arup Study (Green Belt Review (Stage 1), April 2013 no change in circumstances since the boundary was last defined in 2007 and there are no compelling or overriding reasons put forward to justify amendment.

5.3 Each of these points is considered in turn below:

Need for exceptional circumstances

- 5.4 The land at Orchard House does not need to be kept permanently open. The proposed boundary revision set out in Appendix A includes all the land that does need to be kept permanently open and provides a readily recognisable and enduring boundary.
- 5.5 Where land included within the Green Belt does not fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt this constitutes exceptional circumstances warranting Green Belt boundary adjustment. The relationship between the site and the purposes of the Green Belt is addressed below.

The site contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt

- 5.6 This contention is based upon the Arup Review. However, this review is based upon large parcels of land and provides a very broad assessment of the Green Belt. There is no analysis of the particulars of the boundary at this location or any evidence that the land at Orchard House performs the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.
- 5.7 In respect of the primary Green Belt purpose of preventing urban sprawl, it is particularly significant that the Arup assessment identifies the potential for "rounding off" the urban edge on the south eastern fringes of Bath as a result of the relative fragmentation, topography, inconsistency of urban edge and diversity of development types along this periphery of the city.

That is exactly what is proposed through the boundary realignment put forward in Appendix A.

- 5.8 This review is strategic and was prepared to provide part of the evidence base to inform the Examination of the Core Strategy. It was prepared specifically in response to the Examiner's concerns over the planned number of new dwellings and a potential shortfall in housing land supply. This review did not therefore comprise a detailed assessment of the inner Green Belt boundary.
- 5.9 In relation to the other four Green Belt purposes, the land at Orchard House plays no role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging, it is part of the urban area and consequently does not perform a role in safeguarding the countryside, is urban in character within an urban setting and as a result its inclusion within the Green Belt does not contribute to preserving the special character of the city and, because of its urban characteristics its designation as Green Belt is not necessary in order to assist urban regeneration.

No change in circumstances since 2007 and no compelling or overriding reasons for boundary amendment put forward

- 5.10 Since 2007 the Core Strategy has been adopted and this specifically identifies the opportunity for the inner Green Belt boundary to be reviewed through the Placemaking Plan. The land at Orchard House site does not fulfil the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, and it is land that it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. These are compelling and overriding reasons for amending the Green Belt boundary.
- 5.11 The December 2015 Council assessment puts forward slightly different reasons for not amending the Green Belt boundary in this location. These are that the boundary follows the rear garden boundaries of properties on Cleveland Walk and Bathwick Hill and provides a clear separation of the openness of the rural character and the denseness of the urban form. On this basis it is contended that there are no obvious anomalies in the definition of the Green Belt boundary at this location.
- 5.12 It is agreed that the alignment of the Green Belt boundary in this location is based on the rear boundaries to the residential properties. This however is not the case with Orchard House, where the Green Belt boundary is extended to

11 Mav 2016 Page 248 of 956

run along the frontage to Bathwick Hill. This is the only place where this occurs and is an anomaly that needs to be addressed to ensure an appropriate definition of the Green Belt in order to ensure that land within it serves Green Belt purposes.

6. Conclusions

6.1 The Pre-Submission Draft Placemaking Plan is considered to be unsound for the reasons set out below.

Justified

6.2 The Draft Plan Policy CP8 and related Policies Map in proposing to retain the Green Belt boundary without amendment, save for the changes necessary to accommodate the four Strategic Sites allocated in the Core Strategy, is not considered justified or the most

appropriate strategy. This is because the proposed policy continues to include, within the Green Belt, land at Orchard House which is within the urban envelope of the city and which it is not necessary to keep permanently open in order for the Green Belt to fulfil its purposes as set out in the NPPF.

Consistent with national policy

6.3 The land at Orchard House does not fulfil the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, it is not open and it is not necessary to keep it permanently open. These considerations constitute exceptional circumstances that warrant amendment to the Green Belt boundary. Retention of this land within the Green Belt is therefore contrary to national policy provisions on Green Belt designation.

Amendment

6.4 Incorporation of the amendment to the Green Belt boundary proposed in Appendix A would address the issues of soundness set out above and make the Plan sound in respect of these.

Q5 Change Requested

Amendment to the Green Belt boundary as set out in the uploaded document "Comments in Respect of the Green Belt Boundary at Orchard House, Bathwick Hill, Bath".

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?

Because the issue of soundness involves matters of planning judgment and participation is considered necessary in order to enable a fully informed process of examination.

11 Mav 2016 Page 249 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy HE1

Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number Name: Christine Hunt	: 7 Organisation: Priston Parish Council
Agent Name:	
Further Information available in the original comment	Agent Organisation: ? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Tarther information available in the original comment	Attachments sent with the comment: No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy HE1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
· · ·	d more inclusive protection for heritage assets but believes there nt protection would be afforded to these heritage assets. It is not acquire and are protected by the heritage designation.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number	pate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number	pate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participose. Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay	oate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation:
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name:	oate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? No
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plac	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? No n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? No n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	orate at the Examination? : 9 Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation: :? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? No n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 250 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

inappropriate development until robust Conservation Area character appraisals are in place and adopted. Para 5 of HE1 assumes that the HWER and CACA records are in place and up to date whereas this is not the case consistently for Bath's large Conservation Area which is 66% of the World Heritage Site, itself a protected designation.

Q5 Change Requested

Respondent Number:

279

Prioritise completion and adoption of character appraisals covering the whole of Bath World heritage Site and give this a high priority in the monitoring section of the 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?

The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan (see reps). The Trust is a significant amenity group in the City of Bath with a specific public benefit remit relating to the heritage of the City and its environs. We request to be kept directly involved by PINS at all stages of the Examination

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 22 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy HE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment
Specific mention should be made of the role of local groups and amenity societies.
Q5 Change Requested
Para 234 insert ref to other guidance produced by national and local amenity societies.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

Name: Rohan Torkildsen

Agent Name:

Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment?

No Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Comment Number:

11 Mav 2016 Page 251 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy HE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Historic England note, welcome and endorse HE1 however to streamline the policy one might consider combining criteria 1 and 3 as follows.
Q5 Change Requested
Within the scope of Core Strategy Policies B4 and CP6, development that has an impact upon a heritage asset, whether designated or non-designated, will be expected to enhance or better reveal its significance and setting, and make a positive contribution to its character and appearance.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 283 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Prior Park College & Paragon School Agent Name: Chris Burton Agent Organisation: GVA 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy HE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Though in general agreement with the Policy we believe section A to G is two prescriptive. Point 7 of the Policy provides a sound policy base for justifiable harm; it should be made clear that this can be applied to all forms of development covered by Policy HE1. A blanket ban on development that may cause any form of harm to these developments will not only stifle innovation but will also risk the operation of the building in a conservation and heritage area.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 252 of 956

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 9 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 1 District Wide , Policy HE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: O4 Soundness Comment
Q4 Soundness Comment The University supports the overarching principle for safeguarding heritage assets and has actively sought to manage development of the campus within the context of the existing historic environment through the preparation of a campus Masterplan. However, the criteria proposed under this policy as a means of safeguarding heritage assets is too negative and prescriptive, with the result that it could, for example, prevent development that promotes high levels of sustainability. In this respect the policy does not reflect the wider considerations proposed under para. 65 of the NPPF, which states: Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design (unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset and the impact would cause material harm to the asset or its setting which is not outweighed by the proposal's economic, social and environmental
benefits). Given the requirements of the NPPF that seek to conserve and enhance the historic environmental (including also paras. 128 and 129), the policy should be reworded to reflect the distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets, and the wider economic, social and environmental considerations that should be applied in determining applications for development.
Q5 Change Requested
Given the requirements of the NPPF that seek to conserve and enhance the historic environmental (including paras. 65, 128 and 129), the policy should be reworded to reflect the distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets, and the wider economic, social and environmental considerations that should be applied in determining applications for development.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 16 Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 253 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed
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 1 District Wide , Policy HE1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
1) The first part of the policy (paras 1-8) is largely a restatement of national policy (NPPF section 12) – but with the policy tests defined differently (e.g. the tests in paras 132 and 133 of the NPPF apply to designated heritage assets whereas paragraph 6 of the draft policy relates to designated and undesignated heritage assets). This will lead to confusion and disagreement and it also conflicts with relevant national guidance in the NPPG para 10 that "there should be no need to reiterate policies that are already set out in the NPPF". Applying amended national policy is not justified (NPPF para 151). 2) Adopted Policy CP4 is clear regarding the WHS. However, paragraph (a) of the draft policy reduces that clarity by suggesting a need to "comply" with "all other relevant supplementary information and guidance". There is no clear indication of how a policy maker will react, contrary to NPPF para 154 guidance.
3) Re paragraph (c) the absence in Bath of any Conservation Area designation reports, related Council resolutions or conservation area enhancement statements precludes any reasonable interpretation, application or development of conservation area policy for sites in or adjoining the Conservation Area. There is apparently no record of the "elements which contribute to the special character or appearance of the conservation area" and which justified conservation area designation in 1968/1973. However, the Council analysis of these matters is a pre-requisite to applying the test set out in this policy, that is, will proposed development "preserve or enhance those elements which contribute to the special character or appearance of the conservation area". Without the missing information there is no clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal, contrary to NPPF paragraph 154.
Q5 Change Requested
1) Edit policy text to accords with NPPF guidance – or to cross refer to it.
2) Be explicit as to which relevant World Heritage Site documents are referred to – or where that information is.
3) Find and make available the relevant Conservation Area designation documents – or reassess and re-designate the conservation area.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 20 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 254 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 1 District Wide , Policy HE1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy HE1 - Historic Environment Sub-paragraph 6 needs to be clearer about whether it relates to the impact of development on a heritage asset or the impact of works on a heritage asset. In order to address proposals that will not require works to a heritage asset but may have indirect impacts, we suggest the end of sub-paragraph 6 should be reworded to say 'where the proposal results in works to the asset, whether the proposed works are the minimum required to secure the long-term use of the asset.' This policy is not justified.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 255 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 236

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 11
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 236 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Typo 'is a nationally important'.
Q5 Change Requested
Delete 'a'.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

11 May 2016 Page 256 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy HE2

Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number:	9
Name: Rohan Torkildsen	Organisation: Historic England
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 considered.	ompliant? (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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide ,	Policy HE2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
	ne surviving locks and bridges on the Northern Branch of the
	rdance with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 126 we would
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	a positive strategy for their conservation and future enjoyment. via the Local Plan intends to positively address the condition of
these assets and therefore it does not accord with the NP	, <i>,</i>
Curprisingly Delicy LLC2 fails to gross reference to the position	tive initiative agreed in relation to POLICY Page Land edicining
Odd Down, Bath Strategic Site Allocation.	tive initiative agreed in relation to POLICY B3a: Land adjoining
Q5 Change Requested Policy HE2 should set out a positive strategy for these her	ritago accoto at rick
Policy HEZ should set out a positive strategy for these her	itage assets at risk.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinati	ion (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa	te at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 257 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Part: Table 6 Volume: 1, District Wide Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 24 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Table 6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **Q4 Soundness Comment** Specific mention of designed historic views. Q5 Change Requested Insert historic views in paragraph 3. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 5 Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Table 6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 Mav 2016 Page 258 of 956

We would suggest that the section entitled "2. Cultural and Human Factors including:" is reinforced by adding specific

Q4 Soundness Comment

reference to sporting, leisure and cultural activities that take place with the District that contribute to the distinct character of the area. We note that there is reference to "landscapes associated with events such as fairgrounds, traditional villages greens", but consider that there are much broader activities than those identified.

Q5 Change Requested

In particular, we suggest that a further bullet point is added, as follows:

" - Sporting, leisure and cultural activities which positively contribute to the identity of the City;"

Without the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified or effective.

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?

11 May 2016 Page 259 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE2

Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number: Name: Christine Hunt Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	Organisation: Priston Parish Council Agent Organisation:
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy NE2
Q4 Soundness Comment	
NE2: Conserving and Enhancing the Landscape Prison Parish Council welcomes the emphasis on import favour of the need for Landscape and Visual Impact Asse	ant views, landmarks and vistas in clause 1; and is strongly in essments as detailed in clause 3.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number:	7
Name:	Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited
Agent Name: James Millard	Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning
Further Information available in the original comment	
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	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy NE2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
	to distinguish between the hierarchy of designated sites in order

11 May 2016 Page 260 of 956

a distinction between designated and non-designated landscapes. The emphasis within the policy fails to recognise that when appropriate greenfield sites are released, there will be some negative landscape impact as a consequence of development. As a result, the release of appropriate greenfield sites would conflict with NE2 1(a) which requires development to conserve or enhance landscape character, features and local distinctiveness. Greater flexibility is necessary within the policy to facilitate the delivery of sustainable patterns of development, where such development is responding to identified needs and/or ensuring that the planning authority is able to maintain a deliverable supply of housing sites to meet its land supply obligations.

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?	
Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 10 Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Policy NE2: Conserving and Enhancing the Landscape and Landscape Character Firstly, this policy at (1) needs to be clarified to ensure that the policy requirements relate to a requirement to comply with parts a., b., c., and d. It is not clear at this time. With respect of part (1)d. we object to this section as drafted. It is unclear as to how the policy will be used to identify 'important views', which are not defined within this document. As such, the policy is unclear, as particularly within Bath, it will likely be problematic for the LPA to differentiate between 'normal views' and 'important views', and the policy would be open to subjective interpretation. It is noted that paragraph 254 refers to the City of Bath WHS Setting SPD, but that document does not define those 'important views'. Further, there appears to be some disparity between this element and part (2) of the policy – part (1) inter alia seeks to resist development that does not conserve or enhance 'important views', whereas part (2) appears to take a 'softer'	
view if appropriate mitigation can be demonstrated to mitigate any adverse impact.	
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?	

11 May 2016 Page 261 of 956

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number:				
	Organisation: University of Bath			
	Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd			
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 1 District Wide ,	Policy NE2			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
The University continues to support the conservation and enhancement of valued landscapes, and the preparation of a strategic Landscape & Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) demonstrates the University's commitment to being a sensitive and diligent custodian of its landscape environment. Para. 109 of the NPPF supports a positive approach to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.				
However, criterion 2 of the policy requires that development should seek to avoid or adequately mitigate any adverse impact on any landscape, without reference to the value of such. NPPF para. 113 clearly proposes that criteria based policies should be set by planning authorities against which proposals for any development on or affecting landscape areas will be judged. Criterion 2 of the policy should, therefore, be reworded to include specific reference to positively protect designated or				
	ainst which an assessment can be made to demonstrate any nich that could be moderated (as required under para. 116 of			
Criterion 3 is also overly prescriptive in proposing that 'proposals with potential to impact on the landscape / townscape character of an area or on views should be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment', without any appropriate reference to the significance or scale of such an impact that might be considered necessary to trigger the need to undertake such an assessment. Not all development that has an impact requires this level of assessment and this criterion should be reworded to appropriately reflect this.				
As such, the broad-brush approach proposed by Policy NE2 confuses the application of the other site-specific policy by imposing conflicting constraints on development within and around the campus, and on this basis Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number:	4			
Name:	Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land			
Agent Name: Pegasus Group	Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn			

11 May 2016 Page 262 of 956

No

Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Further Information available in the original comment?

Does the respondent consider t	he document is legally	compliant? (Tick if inc	dicated 'ye	es') 🗌		
Does the respondent consider t	he document is sound?	? No				
If the respondent considers the	Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is it beca	ause it is (1	ticked where i	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸	Not Justified	Not Consisten	✓	Not Effective		
The representation relates to: V	olume 1 District Wide	Policy NE2				
The Site Reference (if applicable)		7 Tolley NEZ				
Q4 Soundness Comment						
The NPPF (Para 113) requires Loca	al Planning Authorities	to distinguish betwee	n the mei	rarchy of desig	gnated sites in	order
to ensure that protection is comma distinction between designated when appropriate greenfield sites development. As a result, the reledevelopment to conserve or enhancessary within the policy to factoresponding to identified needs and housing sites to meet its land sup	and non-designated lass are released, there wile as of appropriate greance landscape charact lilitate the delivery of sud/or ensuring that the	indscapes. The empha ill be some negative la enfield sites would co er, features and local ustainable patterns of	sis within indscape i inflict with distinctive developn	the policy fail mpact as a co n NE2 1(a) whi eness. Greater nent, where so	s to recognise nsequence of ch requires r flexibility is uch developm	that ent is
Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish to part. Why does the Respondent feel it	·		□ n?			
Respondent Number: 6414	Comment Number:	9				
Name:		Organisation: Radsto	ock Land L	.P		
Agent Name: Pegasus Group		Agent Organisation:				
Further Information available in	the original comment	? No Atta	achments	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 Consisten Not Effective						
The representation relates to: V The Site Reference (if applicable)		, Policy NE2				
Q4 Soundness Comment						

The NPPF (Para 113) requires Local Planning Authorities to distinguish between the hierarchy of designated sites in order to ensure that protection is commensurate with their status. Within this context it is important to note that there is also a distinction between designated and non-designated landscapes. The emphasis within the policy fails to recognise that when appropriate greenfield sites are released, there will be some negative landscape impact as a consequence of development. As a result, the release of appropriate greenfield sites would conflict with NE2 1(a) which requires development to conserve or enhance landscape character, features and local distinctiveness. Greater flexibility is necessary within the policy to facilitate the delivery of sustainable patterns of development, where such development is responding to identified needs and/or ensuring that the planning authority is able to maintain a deliverable supply of

11 May 2016 Page 263 of 956

housing sites to meet its land supply obligations.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 11 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 Consisten Not Effective		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
Policy NE2 (Conserving and Enhancing the Landscape and Landscape Character) - The NPPF (Para 113) requires Local Planning Authorities to distinguish between the hierarchy of designated sites in order to ensure that protection is commensurate with their status. Within this context it is important to note that there is also a distinction between designated and non-designated landscapes. The emphasis within the policy fails to recognise that when appropriate greenfield sites are released, there will be some negative landscape impact as a consequence of development. As a result, the release of appropriate greenfield sites would conflict with NE2 1(a) which requires development to conserve or enhance landscape character, features and local distinctiveness. Greater flexibility is necessary within the policy to facilitate the delivery of sustainable patterns of development, where such development is responding to identified needs and/or ensuring that the planning authority is able to maintain a deliverable supply of housing sites to meet its land supply obligations.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?		
Respondent Number: 6580 Comment Number: 6 Name: Andrew Lord Organisation: Cotswolds Conservation Board Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No		

11 May 2016 Page 264 of 956

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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Cotswolds Conservation Board supports reference to Policy NE2 though recommends (in accordance with Section 8 of the CRoW Act 2000)that specific reference is made to the AONB its Adopted Management Plan and Position Statements.
The NPPG states "This duty is particularly important to the delivery of the statutory purposes of protected areas. The duty applies to all local planning authorities, not just national park authorities. The duty is relevant in considering development proposals that are situated outside National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty boundaries, but which might have an impact on the setting of, and implementation of, the statutory purposes of these protected areas.
The NPPG also advises "Planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment and other characteristics of the area. As part of this, local planning authorities and neighbourhood plannin bodies should have regard to management plans for National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, as these documents underpin partnership working and delivery of designation objectives."
Q5 Change Requested
Include reference within Policy NE2 to Section 85 of the CRoW Act 2000, the Management Plan and Position Statement in reference to the AONBs as legally required and advised by the NPPG.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 265 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Comment Number: 9

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE2A

117

Respondent Number:

	Organisation	Priston Parish Council	
Agent Name:	Agent Organi	sation:	
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes') \square	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? Yes, with r	ninor changes	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, i	s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗹 Not Justified 🗹	Not Cor	sisten 🗸 Not Effective 🔽	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy NE2A		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
NE2A: Landscape Setting of Settlement Priston Parish Council welcomes the greater emphasis o	on the landscap	e setting of settlements.	
Q5 Change Requested			
Pagnandant Numbers 170 Comment Numbers			
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number:	: 8		
Name:		Robert Hitchins Limited	
	Organisation	Robert Hitchins Limited sation: Pegasus Planning	
Name:	Organisation Agent Organi		No
Name: Agent Name: James Millard	Organisation Agent Organi	sation: Pegasus Planning Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment	Organisation Agent Organi ? No compliant? (T	sation: Pegasus Planning Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally	Organisation Agent Organi R No Compliant? (T	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	Organisation Agent Organi R No Compliant? (T) R n is unsound, i	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	Organisation Agent Organi R No Compliant? (T R No Is unsound, i	sation: Pegasus Planning Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes')	No
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Organisation Agent Organi R No Compliant? (T R No Is unsound, i	sation: Pegasus Planning Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes')	No
Name: Agent Name: James Millard Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Organisation Agent Organi Property No Compliant? (T) Organisation Compliant? (T) Not Corganisation Organisation Not Corganisation	Attachments sent with the comment? ick if indicated 'yes') s it because it is (ticked where indicated): sisten Not Effective	

11 May 2016 Page 266 of 956

an adequate supply of deliverable housing sites to meet short-term 5 year housing land supply requirements. It is also relevant in the context of the West of England JSP which, upon adoption, will set out the strategic policy context for the distribution of future development to meet the needs of Wider Bristol Hosing Market Area, and in light of our representations submitted to the JSP consultation (January 2016), identified up-to-date housing needs for the BANES HMA. This will necessitate the release of appropriate sites across B&NES so it is therefore important that Policy NE2A recognises the longer-term development pressures across the Plan area.

The policy states that any development that would result in harm to the landscape setting of settlements will not be permitted. This is not considered to be consistent with National Policy. It effectively places a moratorium on future development that would otherwise be sustainable and necessary to respond to identified needs, including those identified through the West of England JSP. It sets out policy test that exceeds those set out in the NPPF and in doing so it applies a blanket restriction on development that is not justified and is at odds with the clear emphasis in the National Planning Practice Guidance, which states that such blanket restrictions should be avoided.

Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 234 Comment Number: 3				
Name: Michael Fenton Organisation: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd				
Agent Name: Simon Fitton Agent Organisation: RPS Planning & Development				
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 1 District Wide , Policy NE2A The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
We note that the land area to the west of the site, but falling outside of it, has been designated as a 'Landscape Setting' for Midsomer Norton. It is unclear from the evidence base what specific elements of this land contributes towards the landscape setting of Midsomer Norton and we therefore seek further clarification on this.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Nonetheless, we would request that the wording of Policy NE2A is amended to ensure that protection of locally designated landscape areas is 'commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to the importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks' (para. 13 of the NPPF). I.e Landscape Settings designated in Policy NE2A should not be given the same weight as national designations such as the AONB.				
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 also request that we are given the opportunity to appear and speak at any forthcoming Examination Hearings.				

11 May 2016 Page 267 of 956

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 13 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 1 District Wide , Policy NE2A The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
As with other green infrastructure and landscape related policies within the PMP, the University does not support this policy in relation to development associated with Claverton Campus. More significantly, the supporting draft map incorporates the entire Claverton Campus. This adds additional constraints to development within the campus and conflicts with the principles and objectives proposed elsewhere in the PMP as set out within the specific campus-related policy (Policy SB.19), which also seeks to address landscape conservation and enhancement. The purpose of the PMP is to set out detailed development and design principles to complement the Core Strategy and specifically proposes to focus development on-campus in relation to the University. In this respect Policy SB.19 acknowledges that the existing campus is already substantially developed and seeks to optimise the delivery of that development alongside other infrastructure to meet the needs of the University and, as such, should be relied upon to provide an appropriate framework (subject also to the specific representations submitted on behalf of the University in relation to that policy) for considering future applications for development. In doing so it should provide clarity and certainty that the University's future needs can be appropriately addressed to support the key role that it plays in the District. As such, the approach proposed by Policy NE2A confuses the application of the other site-specific policy by imposing conflicting constraints on development within and around the campus, and on this basis Claverton Campus should be			
specifically excluded from this policy.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy.			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 4532 Comment Number: 1 Name: Kevin Bird Organisation: The Silverwood Partnership Agent Name: Laura Wilkinson Agent Organisation: D2 Planning Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No			

11 May 2016 Page 268 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$			
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 1 District Wide , Policy NE2A			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Policy NE2A Landscape Setting of Settlements (shown on Diagram 2 Somer Valley Strategy Map)			
Objections are lodged to the designation of the land north of Kilmersdon Road, Manor Farm, Haydon as part of the landscape setting of Radstock. The Council's SHLAA (2013) assessed both RAD 31c (3.8ha) (the site) as well as the larger site RAD 31b (12ha). RAD 31b was discounted as it was concluded: Building on the entire 12ha field would likely to have a more significant impact on the contribution of this are to the setting of Radstock.			
The SHLAA identifies the site (RAD 31c) as having potential to deliver a yield of about 100 dwellings. It states: In respect of the smaller area only (RAD 31c), development would have a low to moderate impact on landscape character. Whilst it would be seen from a distance, it would relate well to the rest of Haydon village on the ridge top. The SHLAA continues to state: Development would have moderate impact on the houses opposite which are set back from the road and their front garden hedge restrict rural views; moderate impact from the road – the rural view is limited so loss will not be great; low to moderate impact on the view from the Clandown plateau as development would relate well to the adjacent housing			
Regarding design, the SHLAA states: A design which is sensitive to the adjacent SSSI would ensure it was not harmed, neither directly nor indirectly. A design reflecting the layout and modest character of stone cottage opposite would effectively mitigate development by securing a scheme that would maintain local character and distinctiveness. Planting and an appropriate layout of houses at the new rural boundaries would effectively integrate the development into the surrounding landscape. The design should not make the new rural boundary the boundary of back gardens to take the control of planting away from residents.' The SHLAA clearly assessed the landscape impact of developing the site and concluded that the development of the			
smaller site north of Kilmersdon Road would have a low to moderate impact on landscape character. Furthermore, as part of the assessment of a recent outline planning application for up to 100 dwellings (15/01075/OUT), the Council's Landscape Architect commented that they would not have any 'in principle' objections. Their comments were update in September 2015 to state:			
This brief additional response is intended to clarify my 'no objection subject to conditions' position. There will obviously be a change in character from an open field to a residential development and some loss of view. This will cause, in my opinion, only a limited amount of landscape harm.			
Therefore, it appears at odds with the views of the Council's Landscape Architect that the site is now allocated as part of the 'landscape setting' Radstock. In view of the above, strong objections are made to the proposed landscape setting designation on the site on the basis that it is not justified.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Delete the Landscape Setting designation for the site			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?			

11 May 2016 Page 269 of 956

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

Because the issues are complex and need to be debated as part of the examination.

Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number: 5 Name: Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn 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 1 District Wide , Policy NE2A The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Emerging Policy NE2A Conserving And Enhancing The Landscape And Landscape Character proposes that development that would result in any harm to the landscape setting of settlements will not be permitted. This is far more restrictive than the NPPF, which identifies that even within National Parks and AONBs (with the highest level of protection) ajor development is acceptable providing the need for development is demonstrated and ^Tnat any harm is minimised. In a non-designated or locally designated area such as the Landscape Settings identified on the policies maps it would be inconsistent with the NPPF to apply even more restrictive landscape policies. It effectively places a moratorium on future development that would otherwise be sustainable, necessary to respond to identified needs, including those identified through the West of England Joint Spatial Plan. It sets out a policy test that exceeds those set out in the NPPF and it applies a blanket restriction on development that is not justified and is at odds with the clear emphasis in the National Planning Practice Guidance, which states that such blanket restrictions should be avoided. As a result Policy NE2A is not justified nor is it consistent with the NPPF. The Policy should be modified to remove the final sentence.				
Paragraph 252 recognises that there is an on-going need for further development. This is particularly relevant in terms of maintaining an adequate supply of deliverable housing sites to meet short-term 5 year housing land supply requirements. It is also relevant in the context of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan which, upon adoption, will set out the strategic policy context for the distribution of future development to meet the needs of Wider Bristol Flousing Market Area and in light of our representations submitted to the JSP consultation (January 2016) it should also respond to up-to-date housing needs for the B&NES FIMA. This will necessitate the release of appropriate sites across B&NES so it is therefore important that Policy NE2A recognises the longer-term development pressures across the Plan area and does not place unduly restrictive policies around settlements. It is noted that the area designated landscape setting to the north of Radstock has been extended from that included in the adopted Local Plan. It is not clear what the justification is for such an approach as set out in Policy NE2A apart from to place an embargo on any development outside the settlement which is a more onerous approach than for Green Belt				
to place an embargo on any development outside the settlement which is a more onerous approach than for Green Belt or the AONB.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 270 of 956

Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 10			
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP			
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy NE2A The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Paragraph 252 recognises that there is an on-going need for further development. This is particularly relevant in terms of maintaining an adequate supply of deliverable housing sites to meet short-term 5 year housing land supply requirements. It is also relevant in the context of the West of England JSP which, upon adoption, will set out the strategic policy context for the distribution of future development to meet the needs of Wider Bristol Hosing Market Area, and in light of our representations submitted to the JSP consultation (January 2016), identified up-to-date housing needs for the B&NES HMA. This will necessitate the release of appropriate sites across B&NES so it is therefore important that Policy NE2A recognises the longer-term development pressures across the Plan area. The policy states that any development that would result in harm to the landscape setting of settlements will not be permitted. This is not considered to be consistent with National Policy. It effectively places a moratorium on future development that would otherwise be sustainable and necessary to respond to identified needs, including those identified through the West of England JSP. It sets out policy test that exceeds those set out in the NPPF and in doing so it applies a blanket restriction on development that is not justified and is at odds with the clear emphasis in the National Planning Practice Guidance, which states that such blanket restrictions should be avoided.			
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?			
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 12 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 Consisten Not Effective			

11 May 2016 Page 271 of 956

,
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE2A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
NE2A: Landscape Setting of Settlements - Paragraph 252 recognises that there is an on-going need for further development. This is particularly relevant in terms of maintaining an adequate supply of deliverable housing sites to meet short-term 5 year housing land supply requirements. It is also relevant in the context of the West of England JSP which, upon adoption, will set out the strategic policy context for the distribution of future development to meet the needs of Wider Bristol Hosing Market Area, and in light of our representations submitted to the JSP consultation (January 2016), identified up-to-date housing needs for the B&NES HMA. This will necessitate the release of appropriate sites across B&NES so it is therefore important that Policy NE2A recognises the longer-term development pressures across the Plan area.
The policy states that any development that would result in harm to the landscape setting of settlements will not be permitted. This is not considered to be consistent with National Policy. It effectively places a moratorium on future development that would otherwise be sustainable and necessary to respond to identified needs, including those identified through the West of England JSP. It sets out policy test that exceeds those set out in the NPPF and in doing so it applies a blanket restriction on development that is not justified and is at odds with the clear emphasis in the National Planning Practice Guidance, which states that such blanket restrictions should be avoided.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7112 Comment Number: 1 Name: Brian Clark Organisation: Agent Name: Craig Jones Agent Organisation: JCR Planning Ltd 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE2A The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Whilst it is accepted that development should seek to conserve or enhance a landscape - with the emphasis on "seek". But the second part of the policy states "Development that would result in harm to the landscape setting of settlements will not be permitted." is too strict and prescriptive. Arguably, any type of development has potential to "harm" a site, therefore, suggest that the emphasis changes to "unacceptable harm".
Q5 Change Requested
Add the word "unacceptable" before harm.

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

11 May 2016 Page 272 of 956

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

In order to respond to any matters raised. Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy NE2A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The wording used in this policy is very subjective and we would suggest that harm to the setting of a settlement needs to be able to be proven though evidence. We would propose that the word 'demonstrable' be inserted before "harm" to ensure this policy is NPPF compliant. 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? Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination. Respondent Number: 7217 Comment Number: Name: Peter Roberts Organisation: Barton Willmore 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') **V** 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy NE2A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment We object to the proposed Landscape Setting around Whitchurch. This designation covers part of the land at

11 May 2016 Page 273 of 956

proposals for this site can take account of, and where possible conserve and enhance the landscape character of

Whitchurch included within the site proposed for as an option development through the Joint Spatial Plan. Whilst future

Whitchurch, it should not be used as a policy to restrict development where it is required to meet the long term housing needs of the West of England. This policy is unsound as it is not justified.

Q5 Change Requested

The landscape setting policy should acknowledge that development may be necessary which could have an impact on the landscape character, but that this should be 'minimised'.

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 fully explain the reasons for the requested changes and expand on the context of these representations.

11 May 2016 Page 274 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE2B

Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number:	10
Name: Christine Hunt	Organisation: Priston Parish Council
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 of	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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Policy NE2B
Q4 Soundness Comment	
NE2B: Extension of Residential Curtilages in the Countrys Priston Parish Council is opposed to the presumption that neighbouring agricultural land.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinat	tion (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa	ate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 275 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 5

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE3

245

Respondent Number:

Name: Mark Willitts	Organisation: Environment Agency		
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? (Ticl	k if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is i	t because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consi	sten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy NE3		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Biodiversity The Agency welcomes the plan's policy aims and provis references in respect of Sites, Species and Habitats. No appropriate to further review this matter with referenc	twithstanding th	e above, the Planning Authority may consid	er it
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if ve	oc)2	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	oate at the Exam		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	to at the Exam		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate of the Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number	to ate at the Exam 14 Organisation: 1	ination?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name:	oate at the Exam : 14 Organisation: U	ination? Jniversity of Bath	No
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Mark Rose	e at the Exam 14 Organisation: U Agent Organisa 7 No	Jniversity of Bath tion: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Mark Rose Further Information available in the original comment	e at the Exam 14 Organisation: U Agent Organisation: No 12 Compliant? (Ticl	Jniversity of Bath tion: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Mark Rose Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally	oate at the Exam : 14 Organisation: It Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Ticle) ? No	Jniversity of Bath tion: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes') ✓	No
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Mark Rose Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	oate at the Exam : 14 Organisation: It Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Ticle) ? No	Jniversity of Bath tion: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes') t because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Mark Rose Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	e at the Exam 14 Organisation: It Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Tick No n is unsound, is i	Jniversity of Bath tion: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes') t because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Mark Rose Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	e at the Exam 14 Organisation: It Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Tick No n is unsound, is i	Jniversity of Bath tion: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes') t because it is (ticked where indicated):	No
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Mark Rose Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	e at the Exam 14 Organisation: It Agent Organisation: No compliant? (Tick No n is unsound, is i	Jniversity of Bath tion: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment? k if indicated 'yes') t because it is (ticked where indicated):	No

11 May 2016 Page 276 of 956

As such it does not reflect the positive approach to ecological enhancement and sustainable development set out in the NPPF (para. 114).

In particular criterion 1) seeks to prevent all development that would adversely affect internationally or nationally protected species or their habitats, without any reference to the potential for mitigation or compensation that might on balance make a development acceptable. This policy should be revised to positively promote ecological protection, conservation and enhancement and seek to manage development with reference to the importance of specific sites, species or habitats and making reference to the exceptional circumstances under which development would be considered acceptable in those instances.

This is more appropriately reflected in criterion 3) of the policy, which set out the criteria for against which development affecting specific ecological features of importance might be considered acceptable. However, criterion 4) goes on to state that in all cases: a) any harm to the nature conservation value of the site is minimised; b) compensatory provision of at least equal nature conservation value is made for any outstanding harm; and c) ecological enhancements are made. This implies that all development must make a contribution to nature conservation or enhance ecological value and does not recognise the balance of planning merits that development might bring (as reflected in criterion 3 of the policy).

The overall policy is, therefore, considered to be unsound as it has not been positively prepared and takes a generally negative and restrictive approach. To ensure it is effective and does not inhibit growth, the policy needs to be reworded to reflect the positive approach to ecological enhancement that is unpinned within the NPPF.

More significantly, the supporting plan incorporates the entire Claverton Campus, which does not accurately reflect the setting of the University. The University does not support this approach or designation, as it directly conflicts with the principles and objectives proposed elsewhere in the PMP as set out within the specific campus-related policy (Policy SB.19), which also seeks to address the provision of associated GI.

The purpose of the PMP is to set out detailed development and design principles to complement the Core Strategy and specifically proposes to focus development on-campus in relation to the University. In this respect, Policy SB.19 seeks to optimise the delivery of that development alongside other infrastructure to meet the needs of the University and, as such, should be relied upon to provide an appropriate framework (subject also to the specific representations submitted on behalf of the University in relation to that policy) for considering future applications for development. In doing so it should provide clarity and certainty that the University's future needs can be appropriately addressed to support the key role that it plays in the District.

As such, the broad-brush approach proposed by Policy NE1 confuses the application of the other site-specific policy by imposing conflicting constraints on development within and around the campus, and on this basis Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy.

Q5 Change Requested

Criterion 1 of this policy should be revised to positively promote ecological protection, conservation and enhancement and seek to manage development with reference to the importance of specific sites, species or habitats and making reference to the exceptional circumstances under which development would be considered acceptable in those instances.

To ensure it is effective and does not inhibit growth, the overall policy needs to be reworded to reflect the positive approach to ecological enhancement that is unpinned within the NPPF.

Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 277 of 956

Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 21 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sen	Severn Valley t 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 (tick Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓ Not Consisten □ Not	ed where indicated):
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE3 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Policy NE3 - Sites, Species and Habitats Firstly this policy contains three negative obligations in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 and the gene obligation applies and they should be reworded to positive objections. Secondly, sub-paragraph 2b is unclear and open to considerable interpretation. What is me reasons' and secondly how will 'overriding public interest' be assessed? These appear to be explanation of how they will be assessed. Thirdly, the tests in paragraph 2 are in conflict. If appropriate mitigation measures can be sto require assessment of alternative solutions or indeed the public interest test. Sub-paragraph 3a in requiring an assessment of broader impact on the national network of Interest is not directly related to the site and so fails the tests in CIL Regulations and NPPG consider the merits of the development. Paragraph 4 merely repeats the requirements in the first three of paragraphs and sub-para repetitive and should be deleted. This policy is not positive or justified.	eant by firstly 'imperative e very high tests with no ecured then there is no need Sites of Special Scientific and on the requirement to
Q5 Change Requested This policy needs to be completely redrafted in accordance with the above comments.	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?	

11 May 2016 Page 278 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE4

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

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 15	;
Name: Or	ganisation: University of Bath
Agent Name: Mark Rose Ag	ent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally cor	mpliant? (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 1 District Wide , Policy Po	olicy NE4
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The NPPF (para. 109) proposes that the planning system sho environment by recognising the wider benefits of ecosyster recreation. However, it is not at all clear what Policy NE4 ad that seek to maintain the those ecosystems. As such this po	m services, such as food, water, flood and disease control and lds to this and other policies in the Core Strategy and PMP
Q5 Change Requested	
This policy should be deleted.	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination	n (ticked if yes)? \square

11 May 2016 Page 279 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE5

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 16 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 1 District Wide , Policy NE5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The University fully supports the management of ecological networks and has demonstrated its commitment to this through the preparation of a campus wide Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) in consultation with the Council and Natural England, based upon extensive ecological and landscape surveys. The landscape strategy within the LEMP seeks to maximise the amenity offered and proposes a strategy that will establish a coherent and legible structure between the built form, external spaces, planting and landform, as well as seeks to retain and enhance green infrastructure throughout the campus to provide wildlife corridors and sensitively managed habitats to support ecological enhancement. The draft map of Ecological Networks that supports Policy NE5 is unclear and takes a broad-brush approach to include large areas of the District, without clear justification by reference to their specific contribution to the ecological network, and taking no account of the extensive areas of development that area incorporated within this network. The policy is not, therefore, effective as a means of securing or managing ecological networks across the District. More significantly, the supporting plan incorporates the entire Claverton Campus, which does not accurately reflect the setting of the University and does not recognised the comprehensive approach to ecological management encompassed within the LEMP. The University does not support this approach or designation, as it directly conflicts with the principles and objectives proposed elsewhere in the PMP as set out within the specific campus-related policy (Policy SB.19), which also seeks to protect and enhance ecology within the campus.
As such, the broad-brush approach proposed by Policy NE5 confuses the application of the other site-specific policy by imposing conflicting constraints on development within and around the campus, and on this basis Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy.
Q5 Change Requested
Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 280 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE6

Respondent Number: 262 Comment Number: 3 Name: Justin Milward Organisation: Woodland Trust 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy NE6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Woodland Trust strongly supports Policy NE6 and its supporting text (paras 272-276). We particularly support paragraph 3 of policy NE6 that reflects national policy in providing absolute protection for ancient woodland and ancient trees. Emerging national policy is increasingly supportive of absolute protection of ancient woodland and ancient trees. The Communities and Local Government (CLG) Select Committee published its report following its June 2014 inquiry into the Operation of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)', in which it has specifically recognised the need for better protection for ancient woodland (Tues 16th Dec 2014). The CLG Select Committee report states: 'We agree that ancient woodland should be protected by the planning system. Woodland that is over 400 years old cannot be replaced and should be awarded the same level of protection as our built heritage. We recommend that the Government amend paragraph 118 of the NPPF to state that any loss of ancient woodland should be "wholly exceptional". We further recommend that the Government initiate work with Natural England and the Woodland Trust to establish whether more ancient woodland could be designated as sites of special scientific interest and to consider what the barriers to designation might be.' http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmselect/cmcomloc/190/190.pdf.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 11 Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 281 of 956

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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☑
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy NE6: Trees and Woodland Conservation
We would suggest that part (2) of this policy be updated to include reference to the allocation of sites for development contained within the Placemaking Plan, as follows:
Q5 Change Requested Update part (2) of Policy NE6 as follows: • "If it is demonstrated that an adverse impact on trees is unavoidable to allow for appropriate development, particularly including those sites allocated for development within the Placemaking Plan, compensatory provision will be made in accordance with guidance in the Planning Obligations SPD (or successor publication) on replacement tree planting." Without the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified or effective.
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?
why does the nespondent recritis necessary to participate at the Examination.
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 22
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 22 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Name: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Name: 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?
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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')
Name: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Name: 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):
Name: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Name: 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 □
Name: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Name: 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 1 District Wide , Policy NE6
Name: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Name: Further Information available in the original 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 1 District Wide , Policy NE6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □ The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Policy NE6 - Trees and Woodland Conservation The policy should be amended to remove the negative obligation in paragraph 1 and delete the reference to separate

11 May 2016 Page 282 of 956

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	on?

11 May 2016 Page 283 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 281

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Numbe	er: 6
Name: John Webb	Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commer	ent? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legal	ally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is soun	nd?
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl	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 1 District Wid	de , Para 281
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Transport and movement is covered at Page 210. No n	mention is made of the river.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	ination (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partic	cipate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 284 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP7

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 10
Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd
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 1 District Wide , Policy CP7
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The policy seeks to protect and enhance the integrity, multi-functionality, quality and connectivity of the strategic Green Infrastructure (GI), proposing that this is delivered through the Development Management process and with reference to the adopted GI Strategy that sets out how the GI principles should be applied to development.
Diagram 20 identifies the Illustrative Green Infrastructure (GI) Network that supports GI policy within the PMP. However, this diagram is unclear and takes a broad-brush approach to include large areas of the District and City, without clear justification by reference to their specific contribution to the GI network, and taking no account of the extensive areas of development that are incorporated within it. This lack of clarity impacts on the ability to effectively apply Policy CP7 in relation to protecting and enhancing the integrity, multi-functionality, quality and connectivity of the strategic GI network.
More significantly, the supporting plan incorporates the entire Claverton Campus, which does not accurately reflect the setting of the University. The University does not support this approach or designation, as it directly conflicts with the principles and objectives proposed elsewhere in the PMP as set out within the specific campus-related policy (Policy SB.19), which also directly seeks to address the provision of associated GI. As such, the broad-brush approach proposed by Policy CP7 confuses the application of the other site-specific policy by imposing conflicting constraints on development within and around the campus, and on this basis Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy and the associated diagram.
Q5 Change Requested
Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy and associated Diagram 20.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 285 of 956

Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name:	r: 23 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	e , Policy CP7
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Policy CP7 - Green Infrastructure The proposed amendment is an example of the inadeque to reintroduce the first 'and'. This policy is not effective	uate proof reading of the plan and will need further amendment e.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	ation (ticked if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 286 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Diagram 20 Illustrative Green Infrastructure Network

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

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 5	
Name: John Webb Orga	anisation:
Agent Name: Age	nt Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally com	pliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is u	nsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Dia	agram 20 Illustrative Green Infrastructure Network
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The Green Infrastructure Network is covered at Page 119. Th covered by this and where passing through Bath itself is desc	,
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination	(ticked if yes)?

11 May 2016 Page 287 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy NE1

Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number: 6 Name: Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited Agent Name: James Millard Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy NE1 - This policy takes its strategic direction from CS Policy CP7. We question whether 1(a) is either justified, necessary and consistent with national policy. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF requires that sites and the scale of development proposed should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. NE1 (1-a) requires development to "maximise" opportunities to design GI into the proposed development. This is considered to represent an onerous requirement that is not supported by national planning policy or guidance. The NPPG states: "Sufficient green infrastructure should be designed into a development to make the proposal sustainable. If this green infrastructure helps to mitigate any significant harm to biodiversity (among other benefits) then this should be taken into account in deciding whether compensation may also be needed". (NPPG - Para 019 Reference ID: 8-019-20140306)
The emphasis within NE1 that development should "maximise" green infrastructure is not supported by national policy. As currently drafted there is too much ambiguity contained within this part of the policy, principally because it is not clear whether this reference to GI being "maximised" is intended to be applied to what provision is appropriate in terms of ensuring viability and deliverability, or whether it relates to a specific and deliberate policy burden whereby development will be expected to contribute a isproportionate GI provision, in the context of development viability. The policy approach could be simplified by requiring that development proposals "make a positive contribution to the GI network through the creation, enhancement and management of new, and existing GI assets", i.e. lb of the Policy. The rest of the policy is
superfluous and is considered to introduce policy requirements that replicate and add little to the overriding policy objective of protecting and enhancing the GI network.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 288 of 956

Respondent Number: 234 Comment Number: 4 Name: Michael Fenton Organisation: Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd Agent Name: Simon Fitton Agent Organisation: RPS Planning & Development 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 1 District Wide, Policy NE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
We note that the eastern parcel of the land at Chilcompton Road has been identified as a forming part of the 'Green Infrastructure' (GI) corridor which runs from north to south across Midsomer Norton. We are unclear on the specific features contained within the site that contribute towards the purpose of the GI and seek further clarification on this. Further, we would highlight the significant potential benefits that development would have on the site in terms of enhancing Green Infrastructure links through design, master-planning and landscaping.	
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? We would also request that we are given the opportunity to appear and speak at any forthcoming Examination Hearing	gs.
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 11 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 1 District Wide , Policy NE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	

The policy is set within the context of Policy CP7 and sets out criteria for development to protect and enhance Green Infrastructure (GI) and the network as identified in Diagram 20. Diagram 20 identifies the Illustrative Green Infrastructure (GI) Network that supports GI policy within the PMP. However, this diagram is unclear and takes a broadbrush approach to include large areas of the District and City, without clear justification by reference to their specific contribution to the GI network, and taking no account of the extensive areas of development that are incorporated

11 May 2016 Page 289 of 956

within it. This lack of clarity impacts on the ability to effectively apply Policy NE1 to development and is, therefore, unnecessarily restrictive to development.

More significantly, Diagram 20 incorporates the entire Claverton Campus, which does not accurately reflect the setting of the University. The University does not support this approach or designation, as it directly conflicts with the principles and objectives proposed elsewhere in the PMP as set out within the specific campus-related policy (Policy SB.19), which also directly seeks to address the provision of associated GI.

The purpose of the campus policy is to set out detailed principles to complement the Core Strategy and specifically proposes to focus development on-campus in relation to the University. In this respect, Policy SB.19 seeks to optimise the delivery of that development alongside other infrastructure to meet the needs of the University and, as such, should be relied upon to provide an appropriate framework (subject also to the specific representations submitted on behalf of the University in relation to that policy) for considering future applications for development. In doing so it should provide clarity and certainty that the University's future needs can be appropriately addressed to support the key role that it plays in the District.

As such, the broad-brush approach proposed by Policy NE1 confuses the application of the other site-specific policy by imposing conflicting constraints on development within and around the campus, and on this basis Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy and the associated diagram.

Q5 Change Requested
Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy and associated Diagram

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

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

	3			
Name: C	rganisation: Lin	den Homes Strategic Land		
Agent Name: Pegasus Group A	Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn			
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 i	s unsound, is it b	pecause it is (ticked where indicated):		
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified □	Not Consiste	en ✔ Not Effective □		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Policy NE1			

Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy NE1 Development And Green Infrastructure requires that Green Infrastructure Hi-ovision is "maximised" in developments. The Policy as drafted is unduly onerous as the NPPF requires only that "sufficient Green Infrastructure should be designed into a development" (my emphasis). It is also unclear whether this maximisation takes any account of other obligations. If not, then the scale of obligations and policy burdens will compromise the viability of sites contrary to paragraph 173 of the NPPF.

As currently drafted there is too much ambiguity contained within this part of the policy, principally because it is not clear whether this reference to GI being "maximised" is intended to be applied to what provision is appropriate in terms of ensuring viability and deliverability, or whether it relates to a specific and deliberate policy burden whereby

11 May 2016 Page 290 of 956

development will be expected to contribute a disproportionate GI provision, in the context of development viability.

The policy approach could be simplified by simply requiring that development proposals "make a positive contribution to the GI network through the creation, enhancement and management of new, and existing GI assets", i.e. (1b of the Policy). The rest of the policy is superfluous and is considered to introduce policy requirements that replicate and add little to the overriding policy objective of protecting and enhancing the GI network.

little to the overriding policy objective of protecting and enhancing the GI network.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 8				
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP				
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy NE1				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
This policy takes its strategic direction from CS Policy CP7. We question .wiether 1(a) is either justified, necessary and				
consistent with national policy. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF requires that sites and the scale of development proposed should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is				
threatened. NE1 (1-a) requires development to "maximise" opportunities to design GI into the proposed development.				
This is considered to represent an onerous requirement that is not supported by national planning policy or guidance.				
The NPPG states: "Sufficient green infrastructure should be designed into a development to make the proposal sustainable. If this green				
infrastructure helps to mitigate any significant harm to biodiversity (among other benefits) then this should be taken into				
account in deciding whether compensation may also be needed". (NPPG - Para 019 Reference ID: 8-019-20140306)				
The emphasis within NE1 that development should "maximise" green infrastructure is not supported by national policy.				
As currently drafted there is too much ambiguity contained within this part of the policy, principally because it is not				
clear whether this reference to GI being "maximised" is intended to be applied to what provision is appropriate in terms of ensuring viability and deliverability, or whether it relates to a specific and deliberate policy burden whereby				
development will be expected to contribute a disproportionate GI provision, in the context of development viability.				
The policy approach could be simplified by requiring that development proposals "make a positive contribution to the GI				
network through the creation, enhancement and management of new, and existing GI assets", i.e. lb of the Policy. The				
rest of the policy is superfluous and is considered to introduce policy requirements that replicate and add little to the overriding policy objective of protecting and enhancing the GI network.				
Q5 Change Requested				

11 May 2016 Page 291 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 10 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy NE1 - This policy takes its strategic direction from CS Policy CP7. We question whether 1(a) is either justified, necessary and consistent with national policy. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF requires that sites and the scale of development proposed should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. NE1 (1-a) requires development to "maximise" opportunities to design GI into the proposed development. This is considered to represent an onerous requirement that is not supported by national planning policy or guidance. The NPPG states: "Sufficient green infrastructure should be designed into a development to make the proposal sustainable. If this green infrastructure helps to mitigate any significant harm to biodiversity (among other benefits) then this should be taken into account in deciding whether compensation may also be needed". (NPPG - Para 019 Reference ID: 8-019-20140306) The emphasis within NE1 that development should "maximise" green infrastructure is not supported by national policy. As currently drafted there is too much ambiguity contained within this part of the policy, principally because it is not clear whether this reference to GI being "maximised" is intended to be applied to what provision is appropriate in terms of ensuring viability and deliverability, or whether it relates to a specific and deliberate policy burden whereby development will be expected to contribute a disproportionate GI provision, in the context of development viability.
The policy approach could be simplified by requiring that development proposals "make a positive contribution to the GI network through the creation, enhancement and management of new, and existing GI assets", i.e. Ib of the Policy. The rest of the policy is superfluous and is considered to introduce policy requirements that replicate and add little to the overriding policy objective of protecting and enhancing the GI network.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 292 of 956

Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 24 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy NE1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Policy NE1 - Development and Green Infrastructure Sub-paragraph 2 does not provide a definition of major developments. If the same definition of 10 units used in Policy SCR1 applies here, we consider the requirements of the policy too onerous for developments of that size. This policy is not effective.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 293 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP8

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

Respondent Number: 1	17 Comment Number:	11			
Name: Christine Hunt	C	Organisation:	Priston Parish	n Council	
Agent Name:	Д	gent Organis	ation:		
Further Information availabl	le in the original comment?	No	Attachmer	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consid	ler the document is legally co	ompliant? (Tic	ck if indicated	'yes')	
Does the respondent consid	ler the document is sound?	Yes, with m	inor changes		
If the respondent considers	the Draft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗹	Not Justified 🗹	Not Cons	isten 🗸	Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP8					
The Site Reference (if applica	ble) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment					
CP.8: Green Belt					
Priston Parish Council is very s	supportive of the policy prot	ecting the ext	tent and natu	re of the Green Belt.	
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to	participate at the Examination	on (ticked if y	es)?		

11 May 2016 Page 294 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: CP8 Green Belt Boundary Changes

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 17 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 1 District Wide, CP8 Green Belt Boundary Changes The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The policy seeks to protect the openness of the Green Belt as set out on the Core Strategy Key Diagram, proposing that this is delivered through the Development Management process and with reference to Existing Buildings in the Green Belt SPD to guide decisions on proposals within it. Whilst the principle of protecting the Green Belt is generally supported, PMP para. 299 goes on to state that the Core Strategy has established that there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant altering the Green Belt boundary. The University does not consider this to be the case, as noted in its objection submitted in relation to Policy B5. This highlights that land should be removed from the Green Belt to allow the full growth needs of both the city and the District, as well as the University to be met, given the wider economic benefits that directly derive from the University's activities.
This could entail the release of land from the Green Belt around the city or elsewhere in the District to accommodate some of the housing and/or office floorspace requirements. This would relieve the development pressures in the city to allow the off-campus student residence development to come forward, controlled either by a generic policy that allows schemes to be considered on their own merits or through the allocation of specific sites. Alternatively the release of the Sulis Club could contribute towards enabling the University to meet its operational accommodation requirements. Policy CP8 should therefore be revised accordingly.
Q5 Change Requested
Policy CP8 should be revised to reflect the potential for land to be removed from the Green Belt to allow the full growth needs of the city, District, and University to be met, given the wider economic benefits directly derived from the University's activities.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 295 of 956

	Respondent Number:	4800	Comment Number:	1			
	Name: Walter Sweeten	ham	(Organisation:			
	Agent Name:		,	Agent Organis	sation:		
	Further Information ava	ilable in t	he original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	Yes
	Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is legally c	ompliant? (Ti	ck if indicate	d 'yes') 🔽	
	Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is sound?	No			
	If the respondent consid	lers the D	Praft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is	s it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
	Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified 🗹	Not Con	sisten 🗹	Not Effective	
_	- 1			0000	1. 5 1		
	The representation relate			CP8 Green B	elt Boundary	Changes	
	The Site Reference (if app	olicable) is	S:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

Justified: The Draft Plan Policy CP8 and related Policies Map in proposing to retain the Green Belt boundary without amendment, save for the changes necessary to accommodate the four Strategic Sites allocated in the Core Strategy, is not considered justified or the most appropriate strategy. This is because the proposed policy continues to include within the Green Belt land at Combe House, which does not fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt and its designation as such is an anomaly, out of keeping with the general alignment of the Green Belt along the rear boundaries of residential plots in this location on the edge of Bath.

Consistent with national policy: The site at Combe House does not fulfil the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and it is not land that it is necessary to keep permanently open. These considerations constitute exceptional circumstances that warrant amendment to the Green Belt boundary. The Arup Green Belt Review suggested the opportunity for amendments to 'round off' parts of the Green Belt boundary along the south-eastern edge of Bath and that is what is required here. Retention of this land within the Green Belt is therefore contrary to national policy provisions on Green Belt designation.

- 1. Introduction
- 1.1 Nash Partnership is instructed by Mr Walter Sweetenham and Dr Dileas Sweetenham, owners of Come House, Lynbrook Lane in Bath, to make representations through the Bath and North East Somerset Placemaking plan process in respect of amendment to the current Green Belt boundary. The proposed amendment and the planning case are set out in this report.
- 2. The Site
- 2.1 The site is broadly triangular in shape with an access off Lynbrook Lane serving a two storey dwelling that is positioned centrally within the site (see Appendix 1). Along its south-eastern boundary the land rises steeply to a heavily wooded ridge line that defines the boundary here. To the north-east the boundary is defined by a strong tree belt. On its north-western/western edge the site boundary is defined by trees and hedging which in part abuts the rear boundaries of the dwellings at Entry Hill Gardens. Much of the land within these boundaries is laid to lawn, with a copse of trees in the northern corner and the wooded embankment described above.
- 3. Green Belt Designation
- 3.1 The site is covered by a narrow finger of Green Belt that reaches into the urban area. Generally in this area the Green Belt boundary follows the rear boundaries of properties on the edge of the urban area of Bath. In respect of Combe House however, the Green Belt runs across the property and right up to the road frontage of Lynbrook Lane (see Appendix 2).

11 May 2016 Page 296 of 956

4. Planning Policy

- 4.1 Bath and North East Somerset Council (B&NES) is in the process of producing a Core Strategy. This will set out broad strategic policies across B&NES and the 'Placemaking Plan' will set out more detailed policies and site allocations for particular places within B&NES. These documents will replace the current Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan to become the new Local Plan for the area.
- 4.2 It is the Placemaking Plan that will set the detailed Green Belt boundary. In this respect, a Placemaking Plan launch document has been published for consultation and this invites proposals to address minor anomalies in the Green Belt boundary, within the context of national policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides (para. 80) that there are five purposes for Green Belts. These are to:
- 1. Check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- 2. Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
- 3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- 4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
- 5. Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 4.4 The NPPF goes on to say (para 83) that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time authorities are advised to consider Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries authorities are advised to take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development (para 84) and to ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development, not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open and to define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.
- 5. Amendment to the Green Belt Boundary
- 5.1 The site, as outlined above, sits at a lower elevation than the open land to east and its character is clearly residential. The site is not visible from this adjoining open land and in character forms part of the low density residential fringe to this part of the city. Its inclusion within the Green Belt does not contribute significantly to any of the five purposes of the Green Belt:
- Check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas: The site is enveloped within the broad spatial form of the built up area.
- Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another: It does not perform any role in this respect.
- Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment: The site is within the broad spatial envelope of the built-up area, sitting at a level significantly below the ridge line of the open countryside beyond to the east/northeast and can be more appropriately safeguarded by resetting the Green Belt boundary.
- Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: The site is situated within the City of Bath World Heritage Site and Bath Conservation Area and is therefore subject to important sensitivities in respect of the character of the city. However, Green Belt designation is not necessary for safeguarding the setting of heritage assets or the Universal Values of the World Heritage Site in this particular location. In this respect, fingers of green land penetrating the urban area are an important characteristic of Bath and its setting and here this characteristic can be maintained without a Green Belt designation running across the residential property to abut the road frontage of Lynbrook Lane. Other planning controls are available to safeguard the interests of character and setting.

Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: The site is not of a scale that would prejudice the recycling of derelict and other urban land and is itself in a very sustainable location within the built-envelope of the city.

5.2 The Green Belt designation here is considered to be an anomaly that should be rectified through the Placemaking

11 Mav 2016 Page 297 of 956

Plan. The current residential use of the site is overly constrained by the Green Belt designation when other appropriate planning controls are in place to safeguard character and amenity. Also, while the current owners have no intention of development to provide additional dwellings on this land, it is in a very sustainable location and the potential for considering future development, taking account of the Conservation Area, World Heritage Site and other factors, should not be precluded by Green Belt Designation. A revised Green Belt boundary is therefore proposed as shown at Appendix 3.

- 5.3 This boundary reflects the general principle, exhibited generally by the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity, of following the rear boundaries of properties defining the edge of the urban area. The proposed boundary follows the ridge line which marks the dramatic change in level between the open land to the east/north-east and the built up area of this part of the city. This ridge line is wooded as is the proposed north-eastern boundary.
- 5.4 Amendment of the boundary as proposed would therefore establish a Green Belt boundary that does not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open, defining the boundary using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent and would facilitate a pattern of sustainable development, in accordance with the provisions of the NPPF.
- 6. Conclusion
- 6.1 The land as outlined in Appendix 1 does not fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt and its designation as such is an anomaly, out of keeping with the general alignment of the Green Belt along the rear boundaries of residential plots in this location on the edge of Bath. The proposed realignment of the Green Belt boundary as shown in Appendix 3 would address this anomaly while safeguarding the purposes of the Green Belt and establishing a clear boundary to the Green Belt that is capable of enduring beyond the period of the emerging Placemaking Plan. The local planning authority is therefore requested to make this boundary alteration within its Placemaking Plan development plan document.

Q5 Change Requested

The Plan can be made sound in respect of the points raised here by amending the Green Belt boundary as set out in the following attachments:-

BaNES Placemaking Plan Submission

Nash Partnership Report (Please note that Appendix 3 in this report should be disregarded as It has been replaced by Appendix 3A)

Green Belt Appendix 3A

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

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

11 May 2016 Page 298 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number:

Plan Order Reference

Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FOBR

Part: Policy GB1 Volume: 1, District Wide

102

Respondent Number:

Name: Robin Kerr

Agent Name:	it 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 co	ompliant? (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 1 District Wide ,	Policy GB1			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
	Belt within and beyond the actual Green Belt. That would ling within Bath. There may well be a need for significant noneg an Eastern Bath park and ride.			
Q5 Change Requested				
FoBRA proposes deleting the entire item, or at least the w	vords 'or conspicuous from			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinati	on (ticked if yes)? 🗹			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participat	te at the Examination?			
FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination				
,				
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number:	18			
Name:	Organisation: University of Bath			
Agent Name: Mark Rose	Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd			
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No			
Does the respondent consider the document is legally co	ompliant? (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 1 District Wide ,	Policy GB1			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
The policy proposes to provide additional protection to sa	afeguard visual amenity of the Green Belt, seeking to ensure			
1 May 2016	Page 299 of 956			

development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt does not prejudice but seeks to enhance visual amenities of the Green Belt. This policy is overly prescriptive and implies a presumption that all development that is visible from within the Green Belt (but outside of the defined Green Belt boundary) is subject to stringent design constraints that are managed through other policies within the PMP, most notably Policy NE2, that propose to manage visual amenity and the impact of development for areas outside of the Green Belt and Policy GB1 should be reworded to reflect this.

Policy GB1 should be reworded to be less prescriptive to all development visible from within the Green Belt and in

Q5 Change Requested

recognition of other policies already in place elsewhere within the PMP.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
,				
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 25				
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley				
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy GB1				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Policy GB1 - Visual Amenities of the Green Belt				
Green belt is not a specific landscape protection designation. Protection of the landscape in the green belt is covered by Policy NE2. Introduction of a second test in GB1 is repetitive and confusing because the test is different. There is no				
requirement in National Guidance to protect development 'conspicuous' from the green belt. In addition the policy lacks				
clarity because there is no guidance within the supporting paragraphs on how conspicuous would be interpreted. The				
policy is contrary to National Policy and not effective.				
Q5 Change Requested				
This policy should be deleted.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 300 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy GB2

Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number: 12					
ame: Christine Hunt Organisation: Priston Parish Council					
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy GB2					
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
GB2: Development in Green Belt Villages Priston Parish Council is concerned that the implication of this policy is that if a site is defined as infill, there is a presumption it may be developed. However, gaps within the built up frontage may often make a substantial contribution to the character of the village and to the openness of the Green Belt, and should be protected from development. Can we propose that the following is added at the end of the existing text: "provided the site to be infilled does not make a significant contribution to the character of the village and the openness of the Green Belt".					
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ igsqcup$					
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?					
Respondent Number: 222 Comment Number: 1					
Name: Nick Pollock Organisation: Duchy of Cornwall					
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:					
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes					
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 1 District Wide, Policy GB2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					

11 May 2016 Page 301 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Plan fails to respond positively to the opportunity for small scale development within Newton St Loe (Green Belt) currently outside the Housing Development Boundary (HBD) on sites that are well contained, available suitable and capable of being developed and would not conflict with the five purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF, paragraph 80). The Council has failed to give fair and proper consideration to representations submitted by the Duchy of Cornwall by letter dated 26 February 2015 in response to the BANES's consultation on HBDs. The three sites put forward for inclusion in the HBD are not inconsistent with the HBD Guiding Principles (as set out in the Council's "Placemaking Plan Housing Development Boundaries Review (December 2015)".

Furthermore DCLG's current "Consultation on proposed changes to national planning policy" (December 2015) states the Government's firm commitment "to making sure the best possible use is made of all brownfield land that is suitable for housing, to reduce the need as far as possible to release other land. This could potentially include some brownfield land that sits within the Green Belt that already has buildings or structures and has previously been developed." Accordingly there needs to be greater flexibility and a more reasoned approach to the re-use of brownfield land particularly where it is well related to the settlement as is the case at Newton St Loe.

Q5 Change Requested

The Plan should be amended to include specific allocations of land within Part 3 of the Placemaking Plan in accordance with the site boundaries proposed in the accompanying "Housing Development Boundary Review for Newton St Loe, January 2016" prepared by Aaron Evans Architects for the Duchy of Cornwall. Three sites should be included within the HBD which not cause harm or conflict with the five purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF, paragraph 80). The sites within Newton St Loe comprise:

- Land adjacent to No. 8 Church Lane;
- Land at Home Farm;
- Land at Newton Farm.

All three sites are self contained and afford limited or no views in and out of the sites and offer a very good opportunity for development through careful design in accordance with "A Pattern Book for Newton St Loe" and "A Pattern Book for Newton St Loe - Farmstead Analysis".

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 Inspector may find it helpful for the Duchy of Cornwall to amplify its representations.

	1 rganisation: gent Organisation:				
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes				
Does the respondent consider the document is legally conducted by Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	s unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy GB2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
The modification of the HDB to include site at Elm Farm Sta	anton Drew being rejected.				

11 Mav 2016 Page 302 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

The proposed alteration to the HDB would remain tightly drawn to the existing housing within the village as the site has well established housing to both sides and opposite and is not located on the edge of the village.

Furthermore the HDB in Upper Stanton was moved in approx 1990 to include Terra Cotta and Copplestone, two very large dwellings built on green belt land outside the HDB.

The proposed new line to the HDB is a straight continuation of the existing HDB and is still within the housing development at The Orchard to the east.

The depth of the site back from the road, Upper Stanton, is just 43 metres.

The net loss of agricultural and green belt land would be just 0.12 hectares.

Please see attached map showing existing HDB and also HDB pre 1990.

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

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

it falls within Green Belt as this is inconsistent with paragraph 89 of the NPPF.

Respondent Number: 6510 Comment Number: 1							
Name: Vicki Hamilton-Davis Organisation:							
Agent Name: Julie Laming Agent Organisation: Planning Ventures Ltd							
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes							
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐							
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy GB2							
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:							
Q4 Soundness Comment							
This rep focuses on the fourth test of soundness and the issue that certain aspects of the emerging Placemaking Plan							
(Part 2 of the Local Plan) are not 'consistent' with the National Planning Policy Framework and there are contradictions							
within the redrafted sections of the Core Strategy (Part 1) and the Placemaking Plan (Part 2).							
Specifically, we contend that the revised boundary for the Chay Magna Housing Dayslanment Boundary (HDD) is not							
Specifically, we contend that the revised boundary for the Chew Magna Housing Development Boundary (HDB) is not							
'sound' as it is not 'consistent' with the requirements of the NPPF. Our comments relate to the following policy: Policy GB2 Housing Development Boundary for Chew Magna							
This HDB has seen a marginal increase to include only part of the site area of Old North Chew Farm which is located in							
the northern section of the village. The area that is now included covers approximately ½ of the site and contains the							
main house and part of its garden. Whilst this marginal increase is a welcome gain it is not considered to be a sound							
alteration to the HDB and it should be redrawn around the full curtilage of the site for the following reasons:							
Although covered by Green Belt, the site has been confirmed as previously developed land by the Local Planning							

11 May 2016 Page 303 of 956

The entire site is situated at the entrance to the village and falls within the Chew Magna conservation area designation

Authority via a recent pre application response. As such the last bullet point of paragraph 89 of the NPPF is applicable, as this allows for the re-development of previously developed sites (brownfield land) providing this does not affect the openness of the Green Belt. It therefore appears illogical to continue to exclude the majority of the site on the basis that

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

(thus excluding the buildings from benefiting from Use Class Q of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. It is a highly prominent complex of buildings that comprises a house, business units and redundant rural buildings at the entrance to the village. It is a fundamental element of the street scene. It is not visually detached from Chew Magna, it does not sit separately from the rest of Norton Lane or the village and it is not within open countryside.

The area of the entire site met the tests for inclusion within the HDB as set out in the Placemaking Plan Options Document. It is not clear why the Council has chosen only to include a small part within a revised HDB. This does not accord with the approach to the drawing of the HDB around the village and other HDB's in the Authority area, which covers the entire curtilage of properties. A consistent approach must be taken.

The amendment to the HDB has created an illogical, artificial and arbitrary division of the site by drawing the line around the house and part of its garden. The family live and operate several businesses from the site, including a holiday let and a workshop and so the site operates as a whole, not as distinct parts and forms one planning unit. As such it is not a sound approach to artificially subdivide the site and create separate planning units.

The wider site area benefits from an extant planning permission to convert a further building into another holiday let and one more into a business unit. As such Old North Chew Farm is clearly a mixed use site.

Inclusion of this site within the HDB will not lead to future development that will have an unacceptable impact on the character and form of the village. But will enable development opportunities to significantly enhance the conservation area in accordance with paragraphs 131 - 132 of the NPPF and adopted and emerging Local Plan policy. The approach currently taken is inconsistent with these policies.

There are a range of policies within the emerging Placemaking Plan (Part 2 of the Local Plan) that allow for the re-use and/or re-development of the existing buildings within the site. It therefore is not sound practice to create a HDB that contradicts these policies. For example saved local Plan policy EC6 (which will be replaced by emerging policy RE6), allows for the re-use of existing rural buildings providing they are of substantial construction amongst other tests, outside of HDB's. In addition paragraph 307 of the emerging Placemaking Plan (Part 2 of the Local Plan) confirms that the NPPF takes a more flexible view to the replacement or rebuilding of existing buildings, not just dwellings, in the Green Belt providing the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than what it is replacing. As such the line of the HDB is inconsistent with the requirements of the NPPF as per paragraph 89 and relevant policies.

If the reason the HDB has been revised in the way it has is to include only the 'residential' element of the site, then this again is an inconsistent approach in light of NPPF guidance and other aspects of adopted and emerging Local Plan policy and the ability to re-use and redevelop 'buildings'. If this was the reason then it would be illogical to exclude the area of the site covered by the holiday lets, which as established by Gravesham Borough Council V SSE and Another 1982 P & CR 142 are also considered to be a residential use and so therefore should be included in the HDB.

All policies confirm that it would be acceptable to re-use and/or re-develop the buildings within the site curtilage and yet the HDB as redrawn continues to exclude the majority of the site. Thereby actually making it harder to facilitate development as per the requirements of the NPPF, specifically paragraph 14 and the golden thread of a presumption in favour of sustainable development that must run through both the plan making and decision taking process and paragraph 17's core planning principles.

Conclusion:

In summary there are a number of policies on the adopted and emerging Local Plan that allow for the re-use and/or redevelopment of brownfield sites and redundant rural buildings in the Green Belt. These apply to the site in question. The Local Planning Authority has drawn an arbitrary line across only a small part of a brownfield site for inclusion within the HDB. There is no logical reason for this and it is an inconsistent approach to the application of wider policy requirements. A sound approach would be to include the entire site in accordance with the over-arching objectives of the NPPF and its policies and other Local Plan adopted and emerging policies.

Q5 Change Requested

In summary there are a number of policies on the adopted and emerging Local Plan that allow for the re-use and/or re-

11 Mav 2016 Page 304 of 956

development of brownfield sites and redundant rural buildings in the Green Belt. These apply to the site in question. The Local Planning Authority has drawn an arbitrary line across only a small part of a brownfield site for inclusion within the HDB. There is no logical reason for this and it is an inconsistent approach to the application of wider policy requirements. A sound approach would be to include the entire site in accordance with the over-arching objectives of the NPPF and its policies and other Local Plan adopted and emerging policies.

Amend GB2 Chew Magna housing development boundary by redrawing it to include all of the Old North Chew Farm site as per the attached 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?

[No reason provided]

11 May 2016 Page 305 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 310

Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number: 4 Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 310 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
p128 310: scientific knowledge, by definition, is never "conclusive" (consider climate deniers).					
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?					

11 May 2016 Page 306 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy PCS1

Respondent Number: 245 Comment Number: 2					
Name: Mark Willitts Organisation: Environment Agency					
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy PCS1					
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
Water Supply, Wastewater and Water Quality The Agency welcomes and supports the plan's policy coverage in respect of the safeguarding of water resources, collution prevention and associated drainage issues. The Planning Authority may however, consider it appropriate to further review national planning guidance, to ensure the supporting text includes appropriate references to pertinent regulatory frameworks (including the WFD) and implementation e.g. the catchment-based approach: http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/water-supply-wastewater-and-water-quality/					
Q5 Change Requested					
<u> </u>					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ igsqcup$					
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?					
Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number: 5					
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation:					
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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy PCS1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					

11 May 2016 Page 307 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

The PCS1 policy wording is better using "unacceptable". The 'precautionary principle' is already a high bar without making it absolute.

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?

It appears that the quality of the evidence and the policies derived therefrom in respect of higher education as well as its relationship to economic evidence and industrial policy are the least competent in the draft Placemaking Plan and it might be necessary for me to present evidence which would better inform the Plan making process.

11 May 2016 Page 308 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy PCS2

Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 12					
lame: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd					
Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley					
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy PCS2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
Policy PCS2: Noise and Vibration As drafted this policy is not in accordance with prevailing policy within the Noise Policy Statement for England, or the NPPF and NPPG, as it fails to acknowledge that any impact needs to be "significant" in nature to result in development being restricted.					
Q5 Change Requested					
As such, the policy should be redrafted as follows: • "1 Development will only be permitted where it does not cause to unacceptable increases in levels of noise and/or vibration that would have an significant adverse effect on health and quality of life, the natural or built environment or general amenity unless this can be minimised or mitigated to an acceptable level." Without the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified, effective, or in accordance with government policy.					
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: 2429 Comment Number: 2 Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective					

11 May 2016 Page 309 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy PCS2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
p129 PCS2: typo "cause unacceptable"
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

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

11 May 2016 Page 310 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Policy PCS3 Volume: 1, District Wide Respondent Number: 262 Comment Number: Name: Justin Milward Organisation: Woodland Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy PCS3 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment We would like to see Policy PCS 3 Air Quality and supporting text (paras 314-318) reflect the role that trees can play in improving air quality. Indeed paragraph 272 (Trees & Woodland conservation) explicitly refers to this role. Trees improve air quality through the adsorption of particulates from vehicle emissions and other sources – such that it has been estimated that doubling the tree cover in the West Midlands alone would reduce mortality as a result of poor air quality from particulates by 140 people per year. (Stewart, H., Owen S., Donovan R., MacKenzie R., and Hewitt N. (2002). Trees and Sustainable Urban Air Quality. Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Lancaster University). The Woodland Trust has published a report on how trees can specifically help improve air quality – see Urban Air Quality https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2012/04/urban-air-quality/. Q5 Change Requested We would like to see this policy and text incorporate extra wording to read - "In considering the effects of the development on the local air quality, appropriately planted trees should be included in any proposal".

11 Mav 2016 Page 311 of 956

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?

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy PCS5

Respondent Number: Name: Mark Willitts Agent Name: Further Information avai	245 lable in t	Comment Number: the original comment	Organisation: Agent Organisa	ation:	t Agency nts sent with the comment	t? No
Does the respondent cor Does the respondent cor If the respondent consid Not Positively Prepared	nsider the E	e document is sound?	?	it because it	is (ticked where indicated) Not Effective	:
The representation relates The Site Reference (if app	sto: Vo		, Policy PCS5			
Q4 Soundness Comment						
plan would benefit from th incorporation of the follow Assessment (PRA) in respe	ie inclus ving links ct of site nce, in p id conta	ion of specific guidands, which detail the reques where contaminationarticular: 'Groundwa'mination (CLR11)' and	ce. Accordingly, juirement for de on is known or s ter protection: p	consideration co	_	egies must
Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish	to parti	cipate at the Examina	ntion (ticked if ye	es)?		

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

11 May 2016 Page 312 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 328

Respondent Number: 95 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: The Coal Authority
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 328
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Support – The Coal Authority supports the acknowledgement that Bath and North East Somerset has a history of surface and underground mineral extraction. It also supports the identification that development proposals which come forward within the defined Development High Risk Area should be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 313 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

1, District Wide Part: Policy PCS6

Volume:

Support – The Coal Authority welcomes and supports this policy and its approach towards land instability issues. Reason – Mining legacy in Bath and North East Somerset area is a sizeable and locally distinctive issue. The policy makes
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy PCS6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Support – The Coal Authority welcomes and supports this policy and its approach towards land instability issues. Reason – Mining legacy in Bath and North East Somerset area is a sizeable and locally distinctive issue. The policy makes
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy PCS6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Support – The Coal Authority welcomes and supports this policy and its approach towards land instability issues. Reason – Mining legacy in Bath and North East Somerset area is a sizeable and locally distinctive issue. The policy makes
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy PCS6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Support – The Coal Authority welcomes and supports this policy and its approach towards land instability issues. Reason – Mining legacy in Bath and North East Somerset area is a sizeable and locally distinctive issue. The policy makes
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Support – The Coal Authority welcomes and supports this policy and its approach towards land instability issues. Reason – Mining legacy in Bath and North East Somerset area is a sizeable and locally distinctive issue. The policy makes
Support – The Coal Authority welcomes and supports this policy and its approach towards land instability issues. Reason – Mining legacy in Bath and North East Somerset area is a sizeable and locally distinctive issue. The policy makes
Reason – Mining legacy in Bath and North East Somerset area is a sizeable and locally distinctive issue. The policy makes
plan users aware that unstable land is an important issue that requires consideration as part of development proposals. The Coal Authority considers that the policy accords with NPPF paragraphs 109, 120, 121 and 164.
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?
Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number: 13
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy PCS6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
PCS6: Unstable Land Priston Parish Council welcomes the need for the submission of a Risk Assessment in relation to unstable land.

11 May 2016 Page 314 of 956

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?

11 May 2016 Page 315 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy PCS7

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

Respondent Number: 245 Comment Number: 3 Name: Mark Willitts Organisation: Environment Agency 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy PCS7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment
Water Resources The inclusion of Groundwater Source Protection Zones as a potential development constraint is acknowledged. Whilst this is welcomed, the Agency must advise that consideration of any potential impacts on groundwater outside of the designated zones should be given greater prominence within the documentation, with specific reference to Principal and Secondary Aquifers within the district. This would serve to ensure relevant policy provisions achieve their stated purpose.
Q5 Change Requested Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

11 May 2016 Page 316 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 345

Respondent Number: 239 Comment Number: 1
Name: Roger Busby Organisation: Keynsham Civic Society
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 345 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Para 345: this does not make reference to the Universities providing additional student accommodation on their own property, thus allowing for the provision of more low cost housing for residents.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
The point I've made is self explanatory.

11 May 2016 Page 317 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP9

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 10
Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CP9 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
This policy needs to be fully reviewed to accord with the emerging Government policy on 'Affordable' Starter Homes being included within the definition of Affordable Homes (Housing & Planning Bill 2015/16).
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?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination

11 May 2016 Page 318 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy H1

Respondent Number: 2564 Comment Number: 3

Name: Simon Steele-Perkins Organisation: Strategic Land Partnerships

Agent Name: Joanna Lee Agent Organisation: Peter Brett Associates LLP

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

Not Consisten **✓**

Not Effective ✓

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')

Not Justified **✓**

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):

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy H1

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Not Positively Prepared ✓

Q4 Soundness Comment

The need to provide housing and facilities for the elderly is entirely appropriate to address the considerable need that exists. While policy H1 sets out criteria against which these will be assessed, it is considered that a more appropriate approach would be to allocate specific sites to meet the needs that are already known to exist, and are predicted over the plan period.

As such we consider that a new allocation for housing and facilities for the elderly, people with other supported housing or care needs should be identified at East and West Silver Street, Midsomer Norton. This site is entirely suitable for the development of a high quality, sustainable low carbon retirement village and care facilities. We understand that the permitted care home on the committed site West of Fosseway is unlikely to be delivered. The site has been marketed to numerous potential operators with no success, however, interest has been expressed in the land either side of Silver Street which offers much more scope to offer higher quality more spacious care facilities and a greater range of them potentially as part of a retirement village. This site also offers potential linkages through to the permitted Barratts development creating opportunities for improved permeability for pedestrian, cyclists and public transport.

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?

We wish to attend the examination to present these arguments and ensure that the Inspector is aware of the current up to date position in relation to the school particularly in relation to the preferred site in Mendip and to provide detailed evidence in relation to delivery issues.

Respondent Number: 6342 Comment Number: 1

Name: Organisation: McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd

Agent Name: Ziyad Thomas Agent Organisation: The Planning Bureau Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 319 of 956

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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the consultation papers for the aforementioned document. As the market leader in the provision of sheltered housing for sale to the elderly, McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd considers that with its extensive experience and expertise in providing a development of this nature it is well placed to provide informed comments on the BANES Draft Placemaking Plan insofar as it affects or relates to housing for the elderly.
The delivery of specialist accommodation for the elderly to meet the diverse housing needs of BANES' older residents will be challenging and the inclusion of a positively worded policy to this effect is commendable. My Client supports the inclusion of Policy H1 and its accompanying justification with both aspects of the Placemaking plan being positive.
Q5 Change Requested
Policy H1 would be improved if it were slightly more generic in scope as presently it is too focused on the delivery of Extra Care Accommodation. Whilst the delivery of this form of accommodation is undoubtedly critical, other forms of specialist accommodation will be required to meet the diverse needs of the elderly i.e. care homes, retirement housing (category II housing) and age restricted housing (category I housing).
Additionally there is significant merit in detailing the best practice standards for specialist development, however, consideration must be given to the difficulties in associated in bringing such development forward in BANES and which consequentially make achieving the HAPPI 12 best practice standards very challenging.
McCarthy and Stone's first Extra Care (Assisted Living) development is presently under construction in BANES (Ref: 15/00292/FUL). Prior to this, it had been historically very difficult to find suitable sites for such developments in the District. Sites are required to be of a sufficient size (circa 0.5 ha) and located in close proximity to shops and services - due to BANES' heritage, such locations tend to be highly developed, historic in nature and subsequently highly constrained. Often unviably so.
Bringing forward the recent Extra Care development was challenging for heritage, design, flooding and ecological reasons, however thanks to proactive working and a number of compromises with Council Officers we were able to bring forward what we feel is the correct scheme for this site. It is considered that the delivery of additional well located Extra Care and specialist housing schemes will be equally challenging in the future. A positive and flexible planning policy framework is required and to this effect wording that recognises the challenges of delivering specialist and Extra Care development in the B&NES urban environment would be beneficial.
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: 7146 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: St Monica Trust
Agent Name: John Sneddon Agent Organisation: Tetlow King Planning
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 320 of 956

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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Core Strategy lists Demographic Change as one of 6 Key Strategic Issues (1B 1.12). The part on demographic change
concentrates on the needs of older people.
This Plan does not do enough to see homes for older people delivered particularly those older people in need of specialist accommodation due to their health needs. The PPG says "The need to provide housing for older people is critical given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over accounts for over half of the new households (Department for Communities and Local Government Household Projections 2013)" Reference ID: 2a-021-20150326. This Plan does not reflect this or the Core Strategy.
Policy H1 is not in my view a policy seeking to encourage the provision of care accommodation to a degree which is responding to 361 where it says "the Council has identified that there is a significant shortfall in housing options for olde and frailer people who have identified care needs, but who wish to remain independent in a home of their own".
All H1 says in part A is that housing and facilities for the elderly with care needs will be permitted, where the use is compatible with the locality and existing/future uses in the locality, and does not create potential conflicts with existing uses. This is not active promotion or seeking to address the significant shortfall identified instead it is relying on care providers to compete with general house builders for a finite number of sites. We do not see the allocations for housing in the plan seeking supported housing on their allocations. In that situation supported housing and extra care will be excluded and lost in the rush to provide high value and much needed general housing. This document will not provide supported housing. I have been looking for a site in Bath and its surroundings for more than 10 years for a care village with a variety of clients and care operators. Others have been looking for much longer and no sites have come forward. This Plan will not assist in this. I have clients like St. Monicas ready and willing to invest large sums in providing care accommodation in BANES and Bath in particular. St. Monicas are very pleased with the opportunity at Somerdale but it is a drop in the ocean of what is actually required to address the identified "significant shortfall" and they would provide more if they could but this Plan is not supportive of that investment nor does it provide opportunities to find such sites.
Policy CP10 on the housing mix does not even mention older people.
The Plan should look to allocate sites for care villages particularly around Bath so they do not have to compete with general house-builders on general house allocations where they cannot compete. Coventry are promoting a policy of seeking 10% of large allocation to be supported extra care accommodation. BANES should look at something similar or seek new allocations to provide this accommodation.
Part B of policy H1 has no place in policy (particularly the part on defining a C2 use). The issues on the use class of any supported living scheme is not defined by a planning policy but by fact and degree. This is supporting text at best to a policy that was actually delivering care accommodation.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 321 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy H2

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 19
Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The intent and scope of the policy is supported in order to maintain effective control over the potential increase in
HMOs in certain areas the city where there is already a high concentration, and the problems that can arise from that.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 322 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy H4

Respondent Number: 7222 Comment Number:	: 5	
Name: Phil Rigg	Organisation:	
Agent Name: Claire Durbin	Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited	
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 Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy H4	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
Policy supports the principle of self-build and Councils have a duty to understand the demand/need for self-build housing. The Council states its support for self-build provision as part of development sites and also as part of rural exceptions sites for affordable housing and/or community land trust mechanisms in paragraphs 373-375 of the Draft Placemaking Plan. We support this overall approach in the draft Placemaking Plan and the direction of Policy H4, which states:		
-	d CIL will not be charged where the scheme meets the exception proposals are of sufficient design and sustainability merit, and in	
encourage self-build, although national policy inhibits a workable planning definition of selfbuild housing (intro Exemption/Relief mechanism and the Custom & Self Bu Build Register (August, 2014) which will assist in gatheri However, we believe that the Council could be more ex	the Plan provides the opportunity to develop a policy to policy which require self-build accommodation and refers to the duced via the Government's Community Infrastructure Levy ild Act 2015). 375. The Council has signed up to the Local Self ng evidence of demand/need for self-build housing in the district. plicit in its support for self-build and recognise that there are rd through the detailed allocations process such as land at Bridge	
OS Change Pequested		

11 May 2016 Page 323 of 956

Due to the complexity of these issues and the need to test evidence, we wish to participate at the oral examination.

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?

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 377

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 10		
Name: John Webb Organisation:		
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 Consisten Not Effective		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 377 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
Paragraph 377 covers "Moorings". It relies on information from CRT and quotes that there are 633 boats on the waterway in the B&NES area of which 250 are without a home mooring and presumably a further 33 are the subject of enforcement notices. Mention is made of CRT's Continuous Cruising Guidelines. The Council then conveniently ducks out by stating the need for more information so as to be able to better understand the problem. It is conveniently silent on the matter of those living on boats and having presumably a permanent residential mooring being liable for Council Tax despite identifying the need to provide services. The above distances itself from facilities for Gypsies and Travellers which are dealt with at Paragraph 390.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box		

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

11 May 2016 Page 324 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy H7

Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number: 9 Name: Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited Agent Name: James Millard Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide,Policy H7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Policy H7 also requires market housing to provide for enhanced accessibility standards and meet the optional technical standard 4(2) in the Building Regulations Approved Document M. The National Planning Practice Guidance states local planning authorities should clearly state in their Local Plan what proportion of new dwellings should comply with these requirements. Paragraph 388 confirms that the Council is "working to develop an enhanced evidence base" to demonstrate local need for accessible housing and that his could lead to a specific standard being applied to Policy H8 in relation to marketing housing. We express concern with this approach as it indicates that the policy as proposed is neither robust in its current form and may be subject to change as the evidence base is finalised. This creates uncertainty as it may result in revised standards that market housing will be required to provide for. The lack of detail at this stage in the preparation of the Placemaking Plan is considered to be a serious omission. Notwithstanding this, it is necessary for any policy which imposes standards on development to have regard to paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Q5 Change Requested Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Respondent Number: 301 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: South West HARP Planning Consortium Agent Name: Felicity Tozer Agent Organisation: Tetlow King Planning 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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 325 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy H7

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Through Policy H7 (Housing Accessibility), the Plan seeks to implement the Accessibility and wheelchair housing standards, as described in the PPG. Although the Placemaking Plan does not make any reference to the Internal Space Standards, we are aware that the Council published a note in December 2015 tating that the Nationally Described Space Standard replaced existing standards. We note that both the Accessibility and Internal Space Standards in BANES apply to new-build affordable housing only. We have concerns about the introduction of the Internal Space Standards in this way and the practical impact of the introduction of the Accessibility Standards.

The Written Ministerial Statement4 (WMS) by former Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government Eric Pickles (March 2015) introducing the Standards indicates that:

"The optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Guidance. Neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply the new national technical standards." (my emphasis)

With specific regard to the Internal Space Standards, paragraph 6 of the Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015) states:

"Relating internal space to the number of bedspaces is a means of classification for assessment purposes only when designing new homes and seeking planning approval (if a local authority has adopted the space standard in its Local Plan). It does not imply actual occupancy, or define the minimum for any room in a dwelling to be used for a specific purpose other than in complying with this standard." (my emphasis).

The Space and Access Standards were initially introduced in BANES through the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (April 2015), contrary to the explicit guidance of the WMS and PPG. A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) should only provide additional guidance to policies set out within a Local Plan. The introduction of both the Space and Accessibility standards through an SPD and then through a Briefing Note, are neither appropriate or in accordance with the national guidance.

Here, it is appropriate to note Bristol City Council's approach to implementing the Optional Technical Standards. As the Council had an extant policy on internal space standards within its adopted Local Plan (Policy BCS18), it was able to implement the new Standards through a Practice Note. The Council's procedure complied with the national planning guidance, and was therefore not obliged to produce the evidence in the PPG (below) before implementing the Standards. The Planning Practice Guidance states:

"Where a need for internal space standards is identified, local planning authorities should provide justification for requiring internal space policies. Local planning authorities should take account of the following areas:

- Need evidence should be provided on the size and type of dwellings currently being built in the area, to ensure the impacts of adopting space standards can be properly assessed, for example, to consider any potential impact on meeting demand for starter homes.
- Viability the impact of adopting the space standard should be considered as part of a plan's viability assessment with account taken of the impact of potentially larger dwellings on land supply. Local planning authorities will also need to consider impacts on affordability where a space standard is to be adopted.
- Timing there may need to be a reasonable transitional period following adoption of a new policy on space standards to enable developers to factor the cost of space standards into future land acquisitions." (Paragraph 020, Reference ID: 56-020-20150327)

As a result, we ask that BANES undertake an assessment of need for the introduction of the new Internal Space Standards, in line with national planning guidance.

An example of where this work has been successfully undertaken and the Standards have been appropriately justified is in South Gloucestershire. As part of the evidence base for its Policies Sites and Places DPD, the Council published a 'Housing Standards' assessment5 in November 2015.

11 May 2016 Page 326 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

In relation to the Accessibility and Wheelchair Housing Standards, the PPG establishes:

"Based on their housing needs assessment and other available datasets it will be for local planning authorities to set out how they intend to approach demonstrating the need for Requirement M4(2) (accessible and adaptable dwellings), and / or M4(3) (wheelchair user dwellings), of the Building Regulations. There is a wide range of published official statistics and factors which local planning authorities can consider and take into account, including:

- -The likely future need for housing for older and disabled people (including wheelchair user dwellings).
- Size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed to meet specifically evidenced needs (for example retirement homes, sheltered homes or care homes).
- -The accessibility and adaptability of existing housing stock.
- How needs vary across different housing tenures.

requirements of an SPD to Local Plan status.

- The overall impact on viability.

To assist local planning authorities in appraising this data the Government has produced a summary data sheet [on disability data]. This sets out in one place useful data and sources of further information which planning authorities can draw from to inform their assessments. It will reduce the time needed for undertaking the assessment and thereby avoid replicating some elements of the work." (Paragraph 007, Reference ID: 56-007-20150327)

In summary, if the Council wishes to implement the Accessibility Standards as it is presented in Policy H7, it must do so following the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance.

As noted above, BANES intends to introduce the Standards for new affordable housing only. We make reference to Paragraph 1 of the Nationally Described Space Standard document which states that the new Standards are "suitable for application across all tenures" (our emphasis). We encourage the Council to apply the new Standards across both market and affordable housing, as in Bristol and North Somerset.

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?
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number: 6 Name: Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn 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 1 District Wide , Policy H7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy as drafted is not justified and could not be effectively implemented.

11 May 2016

Page 327 of 956

Policy H7 requires enhanced accessibility standards to an unspecified proportion of market houses. It is recognised in paragraph 388 that the Council does not have sufficient evidence to identify the appropriate proportion. As such, the

Policy H7 Housing Accessibility seeks to attribute weight to a future Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which will not have been through a detailed examination in order ^ to justify this weight. It is considered unsound to elevate the

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 11 Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy H7 also requires market housing to provide for enhanced accessibility standards and meet the optional technical standard 4(2) in the Building Regulations Approved Document M. The National Planning Practice Guidance states local planning authorities should clearly state in their Local Plan what proportion of new dwellings should comply with these requirements. Paragraph 388 confirms that the Council is "working to develop an enhanced evidence base" to demonstrate local need for accessible housing and that his could lead to a specific standard being applied to Policy H8 in relation to marketing housing. We express concern with this approach as it indicates that the policy as proposed is neither robust in its current form and may be subject to change as the evidence base is finalised. This creates uncertainty as it may result in revised standards that market housing will be required to provide for. The lack of detail at this stage in the preparation of the Placemaking Plan is considered to be a serious omission. Notwithstanding this, it is necessary for any policy which imposes standards on development to have regard to paragraph 173 of the NPPF.
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?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 13 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 legally compliant: (rick 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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 328 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy H7 also requires market housing to provide for enhanced accessibility standards and meet the optional technical standard 4(2) in the Building Regulations Approved Document M. The National Planning Practice Guidance states local planning authorities should clearly state in their Local Plan what proportion of new dwellings should comply with these requirements. Paragraph 388 confirms that the Council is "working to develop an enhanced evidence base" to demonstrate local need for accessible housing and that his could lead to a specific standard being applied to Policy H8 in relation to marketing housing. We express concern with this approach as it indicates that the policy as proposed is neither robust in its current form and may be subject to change as the evidence base is finalised. This creates uncertainty as it may result in revised standards that market housing will be required to provide for. The lack of detail at this stage in the preparation of the Placemaking Plan is considered to be a serious omission. Notwithstanding this, it is necessary for any policy which imposes standards on development to have regard to paragraph 173 of the NPPF.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 26 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy H7 - Housing Accessibility Firstly the policy includes a reference to the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document which is inappropriate in a statutory policy. The Council cannot use SPDs to introduce additional costs or require policy requirements not included within the Local Plan. Secondly, it is not appropriate to require wheelchair access to be provided on all market houses. This will have impacts
on density, design and the viability of development. Any requirements for wheelchair housing within market housing

Q5 Change Requested

policy is not justified or effective.

should be based on an assessment of need and be subject to viability considerations. Thirdly, it is not necessary to refer specifically the standards in the Building Regulations in a statutory planning policy as these will apply in any event. This

11 May 2016 Page 329 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

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

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 Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it be	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Consiste	n Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
This policy is unclear and ineffective. Policy H7 appears to require all marked access. Presumably this is not the intention of the policy as this would be used impact on the overall scheme in terms of viability, density, design etc. The based on local needs and is deliverable. For example the adopted Swindon provision of wheelchair accessible housing (2% of dwellings for proposals of as currently worded.e with revised Government policy.	innecessary and potentially have an adverse Council should consider a policy which is Local Plan includes a requirement for the
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 Examina	ition?
Respondent Number: 7150 Comment Number: 8 Name: James Proyer Organisation: Per Agent Name: Agent Organisation	rsimmon Homes (Wessex)
	Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it be	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consiste	n Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	

11 May 2016 Page 330 of 956

This policy is unclear and ineffective. Policy H7 appears to require all market housing to accommodate wheelchair

access. Presumably this is not the intention of the policy as this would be unnecessary and potentially have an adverse impact on the overall scheme in terms of viability, density, design etc. The Council should consider a policy which is based on local needs and is deliverable. For example the adopted Swindon Local Plan includes a requirement for the provision of wheelchair accessible housing (2% of dwellings for proposals over 50 dwellings). PHW objective to policy H7 as currently worded.

provision of wheelchair accessible housing (2% of dwellings for proposals over 50 dwellings). PHW objective to policy H7 as currently worded.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 331 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy H8

Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 7 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation 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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
It is not obvious if the Council's proposals on accessibility set out in Policy H8 have been viability tested.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 4	
Name: Organisation: Curo Group	
Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy H8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Policy H8: Affordable Housing Regeneration Schemes	

11 May 2016 Page 332 of 956

Curo Group submitted representations to the Placemaking Options Plan requesting that a policy be introduced to provide a positive approach and supportive stance to the potential social, economic and environmental benefits that could arise from the regeneration of existing housing estates.

Draft Policy H8 is intended to provide this positive policy stance to support the regeneration of existing housing estates and is therefore welcomed in principle.

We do however have concerns relating to specific elements of the policy.

Introduction text states "There is a general presumption to support the redevelopment of social housing where the following criteria can be demonstrated"

We support this principle, however, the wording is currently specific only to areas of social housing. Whilst the majority of the areas that are likely to benefit from regeneration will be predominantly social housing, as a result of the 'right to buy', very few areas are exclusively social housing. To limit the extent of the policy support to solely areas of social housing greatly limits the scope of the areas to which this policy can apply. It should be recognised within the policy that such regeneration schemes should not be limited to only areas of affordable housing.

We also consider that it is not necessarily the most appropriate approach, when considered against all reasonable alternatives, to introduce a presumption against the net loss of affordable housing. Whilst we fully acknowledge the importance of provision and safeguarding of affordable housing in most circumstances (particularly as Curo are the largest provider of social housing in B&NES), this policy seeks to actively promote the regeneration of the areas that suffer from social and/or environmental problems.

In many cases these social and environmental problems are a result of the high concentration of social housing within small areas. This fails to create a mixed and balanced community and instead concentrates problems arising from households with high levels of deprivation.

Whilst physical regeneration of areas creates some benefits, without social problems also being addressed it is unlikely to achieve permanent improvements to these areas. To do so requires a greater mix of housing types and tenures that would not be achieved by protecting against a net loss of affordable housing. For this reason, the social balance consideration is critical, but it is unlikely to ever be appropriate or possible to preserve the same amount of social housing as exists whilst still allowing for the creation of a mixed and balanced community, which is critical to the long-term success of any regeneration scheme.

Furthermore, whilst we acknowledge that there is currently an acknowledgement that the position on affordable housing would be subject to viability, we consider that the current wording does not recognise how unlikely that it would be for such a regeneration scheme to remain viable if it were to retain the same number of affordable homes.

Planning Practice Guidance provides clear advice on how viability should be assessed in plan-making:

"Viability assessment should be considered as a tool that can assist with the development of plans and plan policies. It should not compromise the quality of development but should ensure that the Local Plan vision and policies are realistic and provide high level assurance that plan policies are viable.

Development of plan policies should be iterative - with draft policies tested against evidence of the likely ability of the market to deliver the plan's policies, and revised as part of a dynamic process.

Evidence should be proportionate to ensure plans are underpinned by a broad understanding of viability. Greater detail may be necessary in areas of known marginal viability or where the evidence suggests that viability might be an issue - for example in relation to policies for strategic sites which require high infrastructure investment."(ID: 10-005-20140306). We are not aware of any viability work that has been undertaken to test whether the proposed policy could be viable in any situation and as such it conflicts with the requirements of Planning Practice Guidance and the NPPFs Test of Soundness for the policy to be justified. In order to address this issue, re-wording of the policy is required to increase the prominence given to ensuring the viability of such proposals. This is critical if such projects are to proceed.

11 Mav 2016 Page 333 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

To address the issues outlined above we recommend the following changes to Policy H8: "There is a general presumption to support the redevelopment of social housing where the following criteria can be demonstrated to be met:

- i. The physical condition of the housing stock is poor (i.e. the dwellings are substandard, or demonstrably not fit for purpose in the short-medium term or similar); and/or
- ii. There is a site specific socioeconomic justification for redevelopment led regeneration, considered alongside alternative options for re-modelling or refurbishment; and
- iii. If there is a loss of amenity space, policy LCR5 should be met.

Where the principle of redevelopment is accepted, loss of affordable housing should be minimised, whilst ensuring the redevelopment remains viable and able to create a mixed and balanced community."

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: 301 Comment Number:	2			
Name: O	rganisation	South West	HARP Planning Consortium	
Agent Name: Felicity Tozer A	gent Organi	sation: Tetlov	v King Planning	
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally co	mpliant? (T	ick if indicated	d 'yes') 🗌	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?				
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is	s unsound, i	s it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Cor	sisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , I	Policy H8			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

We note a typographical error in paragraph 389 which states that "Policy H9 below will apply". This should refer to Policy H8.

The Prime Minister announced on the 10th and 11th January 201612 to transform the country's worst housing estates with safe and attractive homes. In order to help achieve this, a new Estate Regeneration Advisory Panel will be set up and will publish an Estates Regeneration Strategy (before the Autumn Statement). A £140 million funding will also be made available to 'jump-start' regeneration projects.

The Prime Minister noted the potential to create more properties within the regeneration process. In his speech on 11th January, he noted that "developers will rebuild often at a higher density, increasing housing supply throughout the country". Consequently, there is an opportunity within this national programme to create more affordable dwellings where design permits. This is particularly important in light of the proposed local introduction of the Accessibility Standards, which may reduce achievable development densities and increase overall costs.

As acknowledged by the Placemaking Plan, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment estimates that around 36 percentoverall housing requirement – approximately 4,680 new affordable homes – need to be provided between 2011 and 2031. The net loss of affordable dwellings through the regeneration of existing residential estates should be avoided, except where because of viability issues or in the delivery of more mixed and balanced communities.

11 May 2016 Page 334 of 956

We support the inclusion of this new Plan policy supporting the regeneration of existing affordable housing estates. As set out in the policy, there is a presumption against the net loss of affordable housing, but consideration of viability and other social balance issues are equally important as the regeneration of any scheme is not undertaken by any Registered Provider without serious consideration of financial cost and the social and economic benefits that arise from it. The first two criteria set out within the policy should not therefore be overly restrictive and consider practical implementation, as affordable housing providers are unlikely to undertake any regeneration without considering these factors. The policy as drafted should not become any more restrictive, to allow the Council to take a proportional approach to requiring justification for proposals for regeneration of either large estates or smaller areas managed by Registered Providers.

justification for proposals for regeneration of either large estates of smaller areas managed by negistered Providers.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 Mav 2016 Page 335 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR1

Respondent Number: 163 Comment Number: 1
Name: Ross Anthony Organisation: The Theatres Trust
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Theatres Trust supports the amendments made to Proposed Policy LCR1 as it reflects guidance on cultural facilities in the NPPF.
Paragraph 156 and 70 of the NPPF require the local plan to include polices to promote and protect cultural facilities. In
particular, Para 70 states that to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services that the community
needs, planning policies and decisions should guard against unnecessary loss of valued facilities. Also to ensure that
established facilities and services are retained and able to develop for the benefit of the community.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 336 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR2

Respondent Number:	7126 Comment Number:	2				
Name:	C	Organisation:	Education Fur	nding Agency		
Agent Name: Kevin Hunt	Д	gent Organis	sation: Jones L	ang LaSalle Ltd		
Further Information availa	able in the original comment?	No	Attachmen	ts sent with the	comment?	No
Does the respondent cons	sider the document is legally co	No			ndicated).	
Not Positively Prepared	rs the Draft Placemaking Plan i Not Justified	Not Cons		Not Effective	_	
The representation relates The Site Reference (if applie	to: Volume 1 District Wide ,	Policy LCR2				
Q4 Soundness Comment						

Land located between Fosseway South and Silver Street

It is the EFA's position that the land between Fosseway South and Silver Street is more appropriate in responding to the local education needs. It provides the best opportunity in the area to deliver the infrastructure and facilities needed to support an outstanding school, due to lack of significant site constraints, availability and being of sufficient size.

Unlike Site 5 (Land at Silver Street, Midsomer Norton), opportunities to deliver good pedestrian connectivity are available. This would be delivered through footpath links to the adjoining housing development to the north and along the Fosseway South.

Crucially, the site is available and consequently deliverable within the timescales that points to the clear need for an additional primary school from September 2017 (see accompanying Summary Statement on Education Need and the Case for Norton Hill Primary School).

The location of the local authority boundary should not affect deliberations relating to the assessment of the most appropriate location for educational infrastructure. Instead an emphasis on appropriate and sustainable locations should be the focus. This is especially pertinent in relation to Midsomer Norton where the BANES / Mendip authority boundary runs immediately adjacent the southern section of the existing built area of the town. The NPPF is clear that the duty to cooperate (paragraph 178/179) applies in this instance.

Summary

These Representations have been submitted by JLL, on behalf of the EFA, with the express intention of seeking to ensure that the educational needs of pupils in BANES and Mendip can be met.

The EFA has undertaken an extensive assessment of sites which may be suitable to meet the needs of Norton Hill Primary School, a school that has been specifically supported by BANES. It has been concluded that the land at White Post is the preferable location to deliver the school. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that the land that BANES propose to safeguard for education (Site 5 LCR3) uses may not be accessible, and may not be deliverable – indeed it is considered that the proposed policy is flawed having regard to guidance contained in the NPPF.

The EFA urges BANES to support the development of the land at White Post, and contends that the Placemaking Plan should not seek to safeguard an inadequate site simply to hinder the development of a superior site at White Post,

11 Mav 2016 Page 337 of 956

because the preferred site is located within Mendip, not BANES.
The EFA and JLL would be pleased to discuss these Representations in more detail in due course.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 338 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 408

Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 4
Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson
Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills
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 1 District Wide , Para 408
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 408 states 'In Bath an additional primary school is being provided as a result of the need generated by and as
part of the Crest element of the Bath Western Riverside development. Additional homes built in the remainder of Bath Western Riverside'
For clarification, the outline planning permission for BWR (06/01733/EOUT) permits either up to 675 student bedrooms
and associated communal areas (Class C3), or up to 345 student bedrooms (Class C3) and a primary school (Class D1).
The statement at paragraph 408 must be supported with evidence to identify how the existing Bath Western Riverside
development has generated the need for a new primary school. Furthermore, the exact location for any new primary
school must be subject to ensuring comprehensive development is achieved (as sought by the BWR SPD and
Placemaking Plan Policy SB8), particularly as the location for the primary school falls, in part, on land within the Lower
Bristol Road area under separate land ownerships. It is therefore, essential that the Council works with Crest Nicholson to ensure the masterplan is delivered, including the residential, infrastructure and primary school.
to ensure the masterplan is delivered, including the residential, infrastructure and primary school.
Policy LCR3: Land Safeguarded for Primary School Use identifies 12 sites safeguarded for educational purposes, but this
does not include land at Bath Western Riverside. It is unclear why a potential new primary school at Bath Western
Riverside is referred to in this part of the Plan, as it is in any instance, already identified at Policy SB8(3).
Q5 Change Requested
We object to Paragraph 408 and suggest the following changes should be made:

- 1)The entirety of Paragraph 408 should be deleted and removed from this section as the land at Western Riverside is not safeguarded and its provision is already shown at Policy SB8 (3). Or
- 2)This paragraph should be replaced to state that it is the aspiration of the Council for the delivery of an additional primary school at Western Riverside to meet the needs generated by new residential development.

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?

There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.

11 May 2016 Page 339 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR3

Respondent Number: 2564	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Simon Steele-Perkins	Oı	ganisation: Strate	egic Land Partnerships		
Agent Name: Joanna Lee	Ag	gent Organisation:	Peter Brett Associates L	.LP	
Further Information available i	n the original comment?	No Att	achments sent with the	comment?	Yes
Does the respondent consider	the document is legally co	mpliant? (Tick if in	dicated 'yes') \square		
Does the respondent consider	the document is sound?	No			
If the respondent considers the	e Draft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is it bec	ause it is (ticked where i	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓	Not Justified 🗸	Not Consisten	✓ Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to:	Volume 1 District Wide ، F	Policy LCR3			
The Site Reference (if applicable	e) is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Council are right to acknowledge the need for a school to the south of Midsomer Norton in its latest draft of the Placemaking Plan, however, we object to the wording of the policy LCR3 which identifies a site (number 5) at Silver Street, Norton Hill, Midsomer Norton as safeguarded for primary education. We understand that there is a considerable need for additional primary education in the Somer Valley, with a need for 82 new pupil places per annum in this location based on 2015 data. We are aware that JLL are making representations on behalf of the Education Funding Authority (EFA) and are seeking to provide a school on land at White Post between Fosseway and Silver Street in Midsomer Norton, which although located in Mendip administrative area, will primarily meet the need from BANES. There are no 'outstanding' Ofstead rated primary school in the Midsomer Norton area and there is a significant support for a new free school specialising in science, technology, engineering, maths and outdoor pursuits. This is set out in more detail in the JLL report; 'Statement of Educational Needs and the Case for Norton Hill Primary School' (see attached at appendix 1).

The NPPF (para 72) is very clear that the Government attaches "great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities". While we welcome BANES taking a proactive approach, the framework also recognises that there is a need for a collaborative approach and work with applicants. The Governments policy statement planning for schools states that: "It is the Government's view that the creation and development of state-funded schools is strongly in the national interest and that planning decision-makers can and should support that objective, in a manner consistent with their statutory obligations. We expect all parties to work together proactively from an early stage to help plan for state-school development and to shape strong planning applications. This collaborative working would help to ensure that the answer to proposals for the development of state-funded schools should be, wherever possible, "yes"."

However, while we recognise the need and the importance of providing a school, and support the Council in their consideration that the site can and should be developed, it should be noted that there is no evidence provided by the Council to demonstrate that a school could be delivered on the site. BANES have not taken into account any deliverability issues when identifying this site as no contact, consultation or engagement has taken place with the landowner or developer. It is therefore highly unlikely that this site will be achievable for a primary school. Consequently the allocation fundamentally fails the test in the NPPF (paragraph 173) that plans should be deliverable. We would encourage the Council to work with the landowner and developer to

provide comprehensive development in this part of Midsomer Norton which would facilitate a range of uses and address the deliverability issues and a wide range of benefits including pedestrian access to the rugby club.

11 Mav 2016 Page 340 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The Council do not acknowledge the need for infrastructure necessary to facilitate delivery in their policy and the lack of a pedestrian/cycle footway along Silver Street is a further fundamental obstacle to achieving its delivery. This is essential for the provision of a school and a prerequisite for safe and convenient use to encourage safe walking and cycling routes. At present this connection cannot be achieved and is a major shortcoming in the allocation of this location for the school. It is not clear whether the Council have started discussions with the numerous landowners involved and therefore how the Council will achieve the essential connectivity between this part of Midsomer Norton and the town centre.

While we are aware of the considerable need for a school site, we are not convinced that this is the best location. The Council have provided no evidence of why the Silver Street site has been chosen. The Placemaking Plan and background documents provide no evidence about why this site has been selected, what the justification is for it and what other reasonable alternatives have been considered. Consequently the allocation fails the fundamental test of the NPPF at paragraph 182 that to be sound a plan should be justified. The Sustainability Appraisal purely considers the Policy LCR3, the safeguarding of sites, but fails to consider the sustainability of the specific site chosen against any of the other options. We are aware that the EFA have submitted an Alternative Site Assessment Report (see attached at Appendix 2) which concludes that the land at White Post is the preferable location to deliver the school.

In addition BANES have undertaken mapping to show which areas of Midsomer Norton are well served by the existing primary schools. This shows large gaps in the provision to the south of the town which would not be catered for by the Silver Street site but the land at White Post is well located to meet. A brief look at the site also suggests fewer houses and hence children within walking distance of this Silver Street site than for a school on the land at White Post. We are aware that representations supported by the EFA have been submitted to the Mendip Local Plan Part 2 Sites and Policies Issues and Options Consultation for a proposal for the erection of around 188 dwellings and a new primary school together with highway access, public open space, allotments, landscaping and associated infrastructure works. A draft masterplan is attached at Appendix 3 and an application is currently being prepared. It is understood that this school needs to be delivered as soon as possible to meet the considerable needs that exist and to meet the EFA deadline to open by September 2017. Consequently there is considerable urgency required to deliver this school.

In line with the proposal submitted to Mendip we do not consider that a school at Silver Street is also required, and consider that the site at White Post would be better located and could meet the need that exists. Indeed as part of a comprehensive development of housing, it can be delivered in partnership with the EFA to meet their requirements and deadlines. However, in order to ensure that the plan retains flexibility and to ensure the need is met, we suggest the Council engage fully with the landowners and work with the EFA as well as Mendip and Somerset Education Authority to understand how the preferred location for a school can be most effectively delivered.

The Council have a duty to work collaboratively and plan strategically across local authority boundaries. The provision of schools is a strategic issue and paragraph 179 of the NPPF is clear that joint working is required to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual local plans. Consequently, it is not clear that BANES are working with Mendip and Somerset County Council to deliver a positively prepared, justified and effective plan. The Council acknowledge by safeguarding the site for development that the site at Silver Street is suitable for development. It is adjacent to the settlement boundary, will have no significant adverse impact on the landscape and is in close proximity to the town centre. As such it is highly suitable for development. It is encouraging that the Council also see that this area is an appropriate extension of the town. Midsomer Norton is a large settlement and the principle market town for the Somer Valley. As such it is highly appropriate, suitable and sustainable for accommodating additional development needs. The town has a range of services and facilities including supermarkets and a range of employment and retail opportunities which will be enhanced with the regeneration of the town centre. We recognise that the Council are seeking to bring forward employment space in Midsomer Norton and the Government's recent announcement to extent the Midsomer Norton enterprise zone will help foster new employment space in the town. Indeed the land at Silver Street has considerable potential for development and should be considered comprehensively for a mix and range of uses to meet the needs that exist. The development of the site should however not be considered in isolation and should be properly considered together with land to the east and also the potential at White Post.

11 Mav 2016 Page 341 of 956

Previous representation on behalf of Strategic Land Partnerships (reference 21655) submitted on 29 January 2015 promoted the site for:

"mixed use residential development catering primarily for the elderly to include a retirement village, with affordable housing and care home, including a small number of high quality residential dwellings in keeping with the character and form of this part of Silver Street. The western part of the site will be laid out as open space, including either allotments and/or a community garden of remembrance. The development of this site will be dependent on the delivery of pedestrian and cycle links along Silver Street to increase accessibility and connectivity with Midsomer Norton Town Centre, as well as with other residential development and public footpaths surrounding the sites. Proposals will be developed to the highest standard and incorporate latest low carbon technology, and should respond to the needs of the town as identified in the neighbourhood development plan". This is certainly still the case that the site should be developed comprehensively. The land along Silver Street, both east and west of the road provides opportunities to provide a number of other community facilities such as allotments and a community garden of remembrance, as well as the opportunity to improve accessibility and connectivity into the town centre with the provision of a cycle and footway, and improve bus circulation and permeability by linking into the existing commitment at Fosseway as well as improving safety by moving the 30mph limit south to the BANES/MENDIP boundary. There are other benefits which could also be achieved including the improvement in broadband speeds, provision of additional parking for the rugby club and the opportunity to link into the railway line footpath and improve the use of this recreational resource.

We therefore consider that the site should be safeguarded for development, because it is suitable for development, but that the policy is amended to recognise that this site should be planned as part of a comprehensive development of the rest of the area which would provide considerable additional benefits for this part of Midsomer Norton. In addition this would acknowledge the likelihood that the need for the school site will be met on a more preferable site as identified by the EFA. In the event that the school is provided elsewhere, the policy should recognise that site would still be suitable for development, and that the site should be developed for uses that meet the needs of the community over the plan period, whether this is

housing, care home, allotments etc.

Conclusion

The Placemaking Plan is predicated on an out of date housing figure which means the context of the plan is flawed and the provision identified does not meet the full objectively assessed needs that exist. In order to more properly plan for the needs of the area, and to provide appropriate flexibility additional development should be identified. This includes making allocations in policy H1 and also adopting a more flexible approach to the safeguarded school site in policy LCR3 to recognise that an alternative preferred site exists and that if this more suitable school site is developed to meet the needs, the site at Silver Street should continue to come forward to meet the needs of Midsomer Norton. This would ensure the plan is deliverable, justified and

flexible and is sound in accordance with the NPPF.

The sites at Silver Street represent highly sustainable, suitable, available and achievable locations for a mix of development which must be planned comprehensively to ensure that development to meet the needs of the town is provided. Consequently it is recommended that the policy is amended to recognise that if the school does not come forward, the land should be developed for other uses. We wish to attend the examination to present these arguments and ensure that the Inspector is aware of the current up to date position in relation to the school particularly in relation to the preferred site in Mendip and to provide detailed evidence in relation to delivery issues.

Q5 Change Requested

Change required to policy LCR3 Land Safeguarded for Primary School Use

The policy safeguarding the site at Silver Street for primary school use is not sound as it does not recognise that a preferred site exists elsewhere in Midsomer Norton. Therefore the policy should be amended to acknowledge that if an alternative site is provided elsewhere, the land will be allocated to meet the housing and elderly care development needs of the town. In addition to the school site the whole of the land at Silver Street, both east and west, as shown on the attached plan at appendix 4, should be allocated for comprehensive development. This should be included in

11 May 2016 Page 342 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

amended policy wording and explained in additional

supporting text and also included as a specific allocation within Policy H1. We suggest the wording should be as follows:

5. Land at Silver Street, Norton Hill, Midsomer Norton

Land to facilitate primary school provision which if not required for a school will be released together with the adjacent land to meet the housing and elderly care development needs of the town

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 wish to attend the examination to present these arguments and ensure that the Inspector is aware of the current up to date position in relation to the school particularly in relation to the preferred site in Mendip and to provide detailed evidence in relation to delivery issues.

Respondent Numbe	r: 7126	Comment Number:	1				
Name:		C	rganisation:	Education Fu	nding Agency		
Agent Name: Kevin	Hunt	А	gent Organi	sation: Jones I	Lang LaSalle Ltd		
Further Information	available in	the original comment?	No	Attachmer	nts sent with the	comment?	No
			l: .2/=				
Does the responder	it consider th	ne document is legally co	ompliant? (1)	ck if indicated	'yes') \square		
Does the responder	t consider th	ne document is sound?	No				
If the respondent co	nsiders the	Draft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is	s it because it	is (ticked where i	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepa	red 🗹	Not Justified 🗸	Not Con	sisten 🗹	Not Effective	✓	
The representation re	elates to: Vo	olume 1 District Wide ,	Policy LCR3				
The Site Reference (i	applicable)	is:					

Q4 Soundness Comment

I write on behalf of the Education Funding Agency (EFA), an executive agency of the Department for Education, and Norton Hill Primary School to make Representations in respect of the provision of new education facilities in Midsomer Norton having regard to the Placemaking Plan.

Norton Hill Primary School was encouraged to proceed with its application to the EFA following discussions with BANES in respect of the education needs within the local area. There is a need for additional primary education provision in the Somer Valley, with a need for 82 new pupil places per annum in this location based on 2015 data. This need arises from both Mendip and BANES local authority areas, but primarily from BANES. There are no 'outstanding' Ofsted rated primary schools in the Midsomer Norton Area and there is significant parental support for a new free school specialising in science, technology, engineering, maths and outdoor pursuits. A Statement on Educational Needs & the case for Norton Hill Primary School is attached. The EFA is currently in advanced discussions to secure land to deliver a new primary school on land located between Fosseway South and Silver Street, in Midsomer Norton.

The land is situated within the administrative area of Mendip District Council and abuts the boundary of the Bath and North East Somerset (BANES). As will be set out in more detail below, it is considered that the identified site is the optimum site to deliver the new school having regard to a number of factors including:

- -Availability and deliverability of the land;
- -Accessibility to sustainable modes of transport;
- -Achieving the schools aspirations in terms of its location and credentials.

11 Mav 2016 Page 343 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

An Alternative Site Assessment has been prepared, and is submitted alongside these Representations, which summarises the search for potentially suitable sites for the primary school. The ASA concludes that the land at White Post is preferable and supports the position set out in this Representation.

Whilst a potential alternative school site is safeguarded in the Placemaking Plan, which BANES contend is responding to the identified need, these Representations will demonstrate that the approach taken by the Placemaking Plan is flawed in that regard.

It is critical to recognise that whilst the preferred site is located in Mendip the school will principally meet an identified need for new education facilities of Midsomer Norton which is within BANES.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF and the Ministerial Statement on the delivery of schools both provide strong support, indeed they apply great weight, to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. They advise that Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education.

The NPPF contains a number of relevant paragraphs to the production of new Local Plans. This guidance is crucial in guiding and ultimately assessing the soundness of Local Plans and should be afforded significant weight. In relation to the comments below, the following national guidance is pertinent:

Paragraph 154 – "Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic..."

Paragraph 155 – "Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential...!"

Paragraph 177 – "It is equally important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion..."

Paragraph 182 – "The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

- Positively prepared the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- -Justified the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- -Consistent with national policy the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework."

Of particular relevance in paragraph 182 is the need for the Plan to be effective. Policies and site allocations need to be deliverable and supported by effective cross boundary working and cooperation.

The NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) outline the requirements for Local Planning Authorities in relation to the duty to cooperate and how it relates to the Local Plan test of soundness. The PPG states that:

"Planning for infrastructure is a critical element of strategic planning. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 162) makes clear that local planning authorities should work with other local planning authorities and providers to assess the quality and capacity of a range of infrastructure types. This will ensure that key infrastructure such as transport, telecommunications, energy, water, health, social care and education, is properly planned." (emphasis added by author)

This clearly supports the importance of robust co-operation in delivering educational infrastructure. As such, BANES Council is respectfully asked to give full consideration to the site being promoted by the EFA in Mendip to respond to the need in their district. It is a more suitable site and can be delivered within the timeframe required.

Paragraph 156 of the Framework requires that local planning authorities set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. Those strategic priorities should deliver, inter alia:

-the homes and jobs needed in the area,

11 May 2016 Page 344 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

-the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities.

It is considered that the allocation of land for education purposes would comprise a 'community facility' and as such, the provision of education can be taken to be a strategic priority as defined by the NPPF.

In the light of the above one is directed to paragraph 178 of the NPPF which states that public bodies have 'a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priorities set out in paragraph 156'.

It is therefore clear that the NPPF directs that the duty to co-operate relates not only to the provision of housing, but also to all strategic priorities, which in turn indicates that the duty to co-operate would apply in relation to community facilities and therefore the provision of education. Paragraph 178 goes on to state that the Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities.

Paragraph 179 of the Framework goes on to enforce the position set out in paragraph 178 stating that joint working (amongst local authorities) should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own area – one example given is because of a lack of physical capacity to make such provision.

The case in this instance demonstrates that there is not capacity within Bath & North East Somerset to accommodate the needs of Norton Hill Primary School (on the basis that the one site safeguarded in the Placemaking Plan is inadequate and not available). In the light of this information, it seems that there is an onus on Mendip District Council and BANES to work together to provide facilities to meet the needs of Norton Hill Primary School.

Policy LCR3: Land Safeguarded for Primary School Use / Land at Silver Street, Midsomer Norton (Site Allocation)
Policy LCR3 seeks to define specific parcels of land to safeguard for primary educational purposes. The supporting text states:

"The NPPF places emphasis on ensuring that there is a sufficient choice of school places available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. It goes on to state that local planning authorities should take 'a proactive positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that would widen choice in education.' It places much importance on 'the need to create, expand and alter schools.'."

Within draft policy LCR3 'Site 5 (Land at Silver Street, Midsomer Norton)' is safeguarded for "4.7 ha. To facilitate primary school provision". The text in the Somer Valley section of the draft Placemaking Plan states:

"Land at Silver Street is safeguarded for education purposes under Policy LCR3 to facilitate the provision of increased primary school capacity in the Somer Valley.

Proposals for development of this land will need to meet the requirements of the Development Management Policies set out in the District-wide chapter, including the need to minimise landscape and visual impact and ensuring satisfactory vehicular access can be provided."

The EFA supports the Council's recognition that the provision of increased primary school capacity is required. However, there are site specific issues in relation to Site 5 which indicate that the land is not suitable for the education use, and therefore that the safeguarded status that BANES propose is inappropriate. JLL would note at this point that the need to provide a new primary

school has been discussed directly with Officers from BANES, and furthermore, the inadequacies of Site 5 have been clearly expressed.

Site 5 has never been promoted for educational purposes by the landowner. It is our understanding that BANES has not sought to directly contact the landowner or developer in relation to the site and therefore BANES cannot be certain that the site is available for education uses.

Pedestrian connectivity to the site is currently substandard. Silver Street has no pedestrian footpath between the proposed allocation site and the town centre to the north. This is a significant deficiency in the site. Any new footpath would need to be located on third party land which is not under the ownership of the Council or the site owner. This again provides great uncertainty as to the ability to provide a sustainable access to a primary school, which is essential and relevant to this type of development in the required timeframes. This is especially pertinent as the draft Placemaking Plan contains Parking Standards (schedule 2 – page 229) which states that "educational establishments are

11 Mav 2016 Page 345 of 956

expected to discourage use of cars by students and staff." Pedestrian connectivity is a key part of a range of sustainable transport modes to limit the reliance on private motor vehicles on users of the facility.
For the above reasons, the soundness of the safeguarded land (Site 5 LCR3) is severely doubted; it is contended that the policy is not reasonable and that it fails the tests of para 182 of the Framework.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 346 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR3A

Respondent Number:	3094	Comment Number:	1			
Name:		C	Organisation: P	Purnell Prop	perty Partnership	
Agent Name: Neil Rowl	ey	A	Agent Organisa	tion: Savill	S	
Further Information ava	ailable in t	the original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is legally co	ompliant? (Tick	if indicate	d 'yes') \square	
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is sound?	No			
If the respondent consi	ders the [Oraft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is i	t because it	t is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	✓	Not Justified 🗹	Not Consis	sten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relate	es to: Vo	olume 1 District Wide,	Policy LCR3A			
The Site Reference (if ap	olicable) i	s:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

We act for the Purnell Property Partnership which owns the non-residential land at Paulton Print Works.

Outline planning permission was granted on 1 July 2010 for the redevelopment of the former Polestar/Purnell print works for offices, industrial, residential, continuing care retirement community, pub/restaurant, community building, open space, associated infrastructure, landscaping and access roads (LPA Ref: 07/02424/EOUT). The residential land is in the course of being developed but the remaining (non residential) land is still awaiting operator and tenant interest.

That planning application included a Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC) on the northern edge of the proposed development, between the main access road and the open space to the north. This part of the development comprised of a purpose built complex catering for the needs and nursing care of retired people. However, despite being marketed since 2009, no operator has come forward for the land. Therefore, the Purnell Property Partnership approached the Council through a pre-application advice request in December 2014 (reference 14/05675/PREAPP) to discuss the possibility for residential development on the 'CCRC site'. In short, the Council advised (in its response dated 5th August 2015) that residential development was unlikely to be acceptable due to a shortage of school places in Paulton. The site in question is shown on the enclosed plan.

The National Planning Practice Framework states at paragraph 72, that The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education.

In that light, our representations on the Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation are as follows:

Policy LCR3A: Primary School Capacity states that "Residential development will only be acceptable where there is a school within a reasonable distance* that has sufficient spare capacity or is able to be expanded to create additional capacity to accommodate the pupil needs arising from the development."

This policy does not suggest a proactive, positive or collaborative approach to meeting the requirement for schools. It simply suggests an approach that no more residential development is acceptable in areas where schools are full. This is an anomaly in a time where many schools are, of course, full. It prevents local areas from building up the critical mass needed to generate the need for a new school.

11 Mav 2016 Page 347 of 956

There is no suggestion within Government guidance that there should be a moratorium on school places when there is
an issue with local school capacity.
The Plan is therefore not considered to be Consistent with National Policy as there is no policy justification for restricting development on the basis of a lack of school places. Indeed Government policy requires quite the opposite approach (at paragraph 72 of the NPPF) of being proactive, positive and collaborative.
For the reasons above we consider that the Plan is not 'positively prepared' as it does not take a positive approach to meeting educational requirements. It simply takes an alternative and restrictive approach that seeks to stymie development in the absence of a positive approach to providing infrastructure.
The Plan is not justified as there is no proper justification for the strategy restricting otherwise acceptable development sites in the absence of available education places, particularly in the light of the release of Green Belt sites elsewhere.
Q5 Change Requested
Proposed Change: We therefore consider that Policy LCR3A should be deleted.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 348 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR5

Respondent Number: 274 Comment Number: 3 Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☑
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 74. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: - an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or - the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or - the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. We question the need for Policy LRC.5 when its repetition of already established national planning policy as set out above. Q5 Change Requested
Delete policy LRC5 and replace with a direct reference to para 74 of the NPPF regarding protection of open space, sport and recreation.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 6 Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

11 May 2016 Page 349 of 956

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
The Site Neterence (ii applicable) is.
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy LCR5: Safeguarding existing sports and recreational facilities
Although our clients do not object to the policy wording per se, as it largely replicates Saved Local Plan policy, we object to the proposed ongoing annotation of the whole of the Recreation Ground under this policy. It is apparent that there is conflict between this policy and site specific policy SB2, in that the latter facilitates the development of part of the Rec to "enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure stadium". As has been explained earlier in these representations, clarity is emerging on the Charity Commission status and
'Scheme' at the Rec, and it is envisaged that over the coming months a new lease may be granted to the Rugby Club on an enlarged site, in order to further facilitate the PMP proposals. As such, it is considered that it is appropriate to amend the Proposals Map accordingly to reflect the emerging proposals for the site.
Q5 Change Requested
We therefore request that pursuant to this policy, the Proposals Map is updated to remove that area of land shown within the Plan enclosed at Appendix 1.
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: 304 Comment Number: 20
Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment

LCR5 both in relation to safeguarding playing fields and recreational open space and to prevent an unnecessary restriction on appropriate development in the District. In doing so it does not reflect the qualitative approach of the NPPF (para. 70) that seeks to 'guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities' or 'ensure an integrated approach

The draft map that supports this policy is unclear and this lack of clarity impacts on the ability to effectively apply Policy

11 May 2016 Page 350 of 956

to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services'. Whilst the University supports the overarching principle to seek to protect playing fields and recreational open space to ensure adequate provision across the District, the map appears to incorporate areas of the campus that are considered within the site-specific policies within the PMP (notably Policy SB.19) as appropriate for potential future development subject to the specific circumstances of the development proposed. The policy, therefore, conflicts with the specific campus-related policies that allow for development within the campus and the need to base planning policy robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities proposed in para. 73 of the NPPF. As such, Policy LCR5 is not justified or effective as a means of safeguarding playing fields and recreational open space within the University campus and this should be specifically excluded from this policy and the associated map.

O5 Change Requested

Claverton Campus should be specifically excluded from this policy and the associated map.
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: 828 Comment Number: 17 Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey 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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The policy appears substantially to repeat national policy (NPPF para 74). Reiterating national policy is contrary to NPPG guidance (paragraph 10).
Q5 Change Requested
Edit policy simply to cross-refer to national policy and set out only requirements particular to Bath and North East Somerset
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: 1544 Comment Number: 1 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 Mav 2016 Page 351 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed				
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No				
If the respondent considers the	Draft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸	Not Justified 🗸	Not Consisten 🗸	Not Effective 🗸	
The representation relates to: Volume The Site Reference (if applicable)		Policy LCR5		

Q4 Soundness Comment

Land occupied by Bath Tennis Club located on Park Lane, Weston Bath, BA1 2XQ. This community tennis club, is located immediately to the west of Victoria Park – with 6 courts.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Requirements

The NPPF contains a number of relevant paragraphs to the production of new Local Plans. This guidance is crucial in guiding and ultimately assessing new Local Plans for soundness and should be afforded due weight. In relation to the above referenced sites, the following national guidance is pertinent:

Paragraph 73 – "Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities...The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area"

Paragraph 74 – "Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location"

Paragraph 150 – "Local Plans are the key to delivering sustainable development that reflects the vision and aspirations of local communities"

Paragraph 154 – "Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development" Paragraph 155 – "Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential"

Paragraph 157 – "Local Plans should allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate" Paragraph 182 – "The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

- Positively prepared the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- -Consistent with national policy the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework."

Of particular relevance in paragraph 182 is the need for the Plan to be consistent with national policy.

Bath Tennis Club

St John's Hospital owns the freehold interest in the Bath Tennis Club site.

Policy LCR5 (Safeguarding Existing Sport and Recreational Facilities) provides protection to existing sport and recreational facilities which are considered to be important local assets. This policy provides the framework to resist inappropriate development and it is recognised that the policy is broadly in line with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF. It is clear

11 May 2016 Page 352 of 956

however that the development of sports facilities is permitted pursuant to LCR5, subject to a number of criteria, including if suitable replacement facilities of at least equivalent quality, quantity and community value are provided in locations accessible by sustainable transport modes.

As such, it is considered to be imperative to ensure that the identification of the Bath Tennis Club as protected recreational space (LCR5) does not lead to any impediment of growth for this valuable community facility.

St John's Hospital would therefore contend that the policy wording (LCR5 and LCR6) must retain the flexibility to allow sports and recreational sites to be redeveloped where such proposals will also provide replacement facilities of at least equivalent quality and quantity. Indeed, the proposed inclusion of policy LCR6 is supported by St John's Hospital.

Conclusions

Q5 Change Requested

BANES Council is respectfully asked to consider the wording of the relevant policies and retain a sufficient level of flexibility to bring appropriate and sustainable development forward, in line with the guidance outlined in the NPPF.

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

why does the Respondent	t feel it is necessary to participate	at the Exam	ination?			
Respondent Number:	6536 Comment Number:	1				
Name: Simon Messent	Or	ganisation:				
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:					
Further Information avai	ilable in the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No		
Does the respondent cor	nsider the document is legally cor	npliant? (Tic	k if indicated 'yes')			
Does the respondent cor	nsider the document is sound?					
If the respondent conside	lers the Draft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where indicated):			
Not Positively Prepared	☐ Not Justified ☐	Not Consi	isten Not Effective			
The representation relates The Site Reference (if appl	es to: Volume 1 District Wide,Policable) is:	olicy LCR5				
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Our land has a designation private land	n we don't understand, SE of timsl	bury referrin	ng to amenity, what is this please because it's	;		
Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish	n to participate at the Examination	n (ticked if y	es)?			
Why does the Respondent	t feel it is necessary to participate	at the Exam	nination?			

11 May 2016 Page 353 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR6

Respondent Number:	274	Comment Number:	6				
Name: Gary Parsons		(Organisation:	Sport Englar	nd		
Agent Name:		,	Agent Organis	ation:			
Further Information ava	ilable in t	he original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the o	comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is legally o	ompliant? (Ti	ck if indicated	d 'yes')		
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is sound?	No				
If the respondent consid	ers the D	Praft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where in	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	✓	Not Justified 🗹	Not Cons	sisten 🗸	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relate	s to: Vo	lume 1 District Wide ,	Policy LCR6				
The Site Reference (if app	licable) i	s:					

Q4 Soundness Comment

Sport in the Green Belt

The NPPF covers what the Government Policy is on acceptable uses of land in the Green Belt (paras 79-92 of the NPPF). By virtue of its location adjoining urban areas and comprising essentially open land, the Green Belt makes an ideal location for outdoor sports facilities and can accommodate a wide range of sports close to major centres of population. The NPPF recognises outdoor sport as an appropriate land use in the Green Belt and advises that new buildings which provide essential facilities for outdoor sport, including changing rooms and small spectator accommodation, may be developed.

Sport England will promote policies and practices that:

- encourage the provision of outdoor sport facilities in the Green Belt which help to sustain community life;
- identify suitable sites for outdoor strategic sports facilities where there is a clearly identified demand for such facilities and where no suitable site exists elsewhere in the locality;
- set out criteria against which ancillary built facilities will be considered; and
- recognise that there may be circumstances where floodlit facilities are appropriate in the Green Belt subject to satisfactory management arrangements.

As pressure increases on open land in urban areas, many sports clubs which have outgrown their current homes are looking to the Green Belt for space to expand. Sports which require extensive areas of land, such as golf, have little chance of finding large enough sites in built up areas. In many parts of England the Green Belt offers the nearest available open land. Outdoor sport can also play a part in keeping the Green Belt open, act as a buffer between urban uses and agricultural land and help to regenerate brownfield land.

Whilst there is a general presumption against built development in the Green Belt a special exception is made for essential ancillary facilities. They should be acceptable as long as they are unobtrusive, small in scale and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.

Q5 Change Requested

Sport England would encourage new sport facilities and uses in the Green Belt in line with Government Policy and Sport England objectives .

11 May 2016 Page 354 of 956

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: 1544 Comment Number: 3 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Land occupied by Bath Tennis Club located on Park Lane, Weston Bath, BA1 2XQ. This community tennis club, is located immediately to the west of Victoria Park – with 6 courts. St John's Hospital owns the freehold interest in the Bath Tennis Club site. (See also comment on Policy LCR5)
This is followed by Policy LCR6 (New and Replacement Sports and Recreational Facilities) which confirms that, subject to various criteria, new or replacement sport and recreational facilities will be permitted within or adjoining a town or settlement. Bath Tennis Club has no immediate plans to relocate, however, it is apparent that the scope to improve and/or expand
the existing facilities is extremely limited by the physical constraints of the site. As such, it is considered that flexibility is required to ensure that the club can thrive, including in particular the ability to respond to increased participation in the sport which is a key objective of the Lawn Tennis Association in the short - medium term1.
St John's Hospital would therefore contend that the policy wording (LCR5 and LCR6) must retain the flexibility to allow sports and recreational sites to be redeveloped where such proposals will also provide replacement facilities of at least equivalent quality and quantity. Indeed, the proposed inclusion of policy LCR6 is supported by St John's Hospital.
Conclusions BANES Council is respectfully asked to consider the wording of the relevant policies and retain a sufficient level of flexibility to bring appropriate and sustainable development forward, in line with the guidance outlined in the NPPF.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 355 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR6A

Respondent Number:	300	Comment Number: 12	!			
Name:		Org	ganisation:	Curo Group		
Agent Name: Peter Robei	rts	Ago	ent Organisa	ation: Barto	n Willmore	
Further Information avail	able in t	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent con	sider th	e document is legally con	npliant? (Tic	k if indicated	d 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent con	sider th	e document is sound?	No			
If the respondent conside	ers the D	Praft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared [Not Justified 🗹	Not Cons	isten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates	to: Vo	lume 1 District Wide, Po	olicy LCR6A			
The Site Reference (if appli	cable) is	s:				

O4 Soundness Comment

We note the omission from the consultation document of Curo land at Hill Crest in Peasedown St John which was previously nominated as a LGS for consideration, and would appreciate clarification on this. If the site is nominated, we uphold our objection to the nomination. The site is a narrow strip of buffer land between housing and Bath Road and has no demonstrable significance – there are no signs that it is used actively by the local community and there are no established play spaces or benches that would suggest otherwise. In addition, the site is in close proximity to the other identified LGS at Frederick Close.

We support the removal of the following Curo sites from designation as a LGS:

- 1. Camely Green, Twerton, LGBND18
- 2. The western portion of Redland Park Redlands Park Play Area West, Twerton, LGBN28
- 3. Woodview Terrace Allotments / Woodland Terrace Allotments, Twerton
- 4. Newton Road Green Space, Twerton, LGBND24
- 5. Loxton Drive Open Space, Twerton, LGBND23
- 6. Chestnut Grove Green Space, Oldfield Park, LGBND16
- 7. Cleeve Green, Twerton, LGBND19
- 8. Dover House Open Space, Walcot, LGBND31
- 9. Haycombe Green, Southdown, LGBND38
- 10. Holcombe Green, Weston, LGBND33
- 11. Inman House, Walcot, LGBND30
- 12. Sherwood Green, Keynsham, LGKND14
- 13. Cranmore Avenue, Keynsham, LGKND8
- 14. Ragland Walk, Keynsham
- 15. Welton Green, Midsomer Norton, LGS8
- 16. Overdale in Tunley / Tunely Recreation Ground, LGRND13
- 17. Wick Road Allotments, Saltford, LGRND61
- 18. Hasselbury / Saselbury, Saltford, LGRND59
- 19. Broadway, Saltford, LGRND58

Conclusion

As stated at the outset the objections raised by Curo are intended to maintain the flexibility to review and if appropriate

11 Mav 2016 Page 356 of 956

consider the development or redevelopment of these areas at some point in the future, should the need arise. This would ensure the long term sustainability of surrounding homes and the neighbourhoods in which they are located, and therefore the continued provision of much needed affordable housing in Bath and North East Somerset.

I trust that you will consider the specific comments raised here about the nominated sites, which are based on detailed site inspections undertaken by Curo. These comments demonstrate a clear need for reappraisal and further clarification of the suitability of the nominated sites.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$ Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7071 Comment Number: 1 Name: Cllr Karen Walker Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
I support the five designated green spaces nominated by Banes for Peasedown st John. I also request the wording of the Local Green Spaces to be more accurate. 'Land between Pippin Close and Russett Way' should be changed to 'Land on Orchard Way between Frenchfield Road and Russett Way' Beacon Hall Play Area should be changed to 'Beacon Field Public open Space'.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 3 Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 357 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: N/A
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Council should confirm that the 100 or so Local Green Spaces proposed under Policy LCR6A are consistent with the definitions set out in paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF. It is interesting to note that Cheltenham Borough Council is carrying out a similar consultation on Designated Local Green Spaces as part of its Cheltenham Plan Issues and Options consultation however the number of proposed designations amounts to only 29 areas which questions if there is a disproportionate number of proposed allocations in BANES. As stated in paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open spaces because any areas designated as Local Green Spaces must be demonstrably special to a local community and be of particular local significance because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value. The NPPG (ID 37-009-20140306) emphasises that Designated Local Green Spaces must be demonstrably special to the local community and therefore this special nature must be evidenced. The NPPG also advises that where land is already protected by designations such as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Site of Special Scientific Interest, Scheduled Monument or conservation area, consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space (ID 37-011-20140306). Designated Local Green Space should be local in character as opposed to an extensive tract of land as stated in the NPPG (ID: 37-015-20140306) the blanket designation of extensive tracts of land and open countryside adjacent to settlements is not appropriate. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF confirms that managing development within a Designated Local Green Space should be consistent with national policy for Green Belts. Therefore Designated Local Green Spaces should not be proposed to achieve by stealth what could be seen as the designation of a new localised Green Belt around smaller settlements.
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?
Respondent Number: 1415 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Peasedown St John Parish Council 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 considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: N/A

11 May 2016 Page 358 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
We request the wording of the Local Green Spaces in Peasedown St John to be more accurate: 'Land between Pippin Close and Russett Way' should be changed to 'Land on Orchard Way between Frenchfield Road and Russett Way'. 'Beacon Hall Play Area' should be changed to 'Beacon Field Public Open Space'.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6467 Comment Number: 1
Name: Simon Barnes Organisation:
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SBA
Q4 Soundness Comment
I was unable to view the diagram on page 125 in sufficient detail on my home computer to see precisely which parts of the undeveloped green areas at the northern edge of the campus were designated as clear zones. However, it would appear that the areas of green space between the developed part of the campus and its northern boundary with the golf course/Bathampton Camp monument are all clear zones. If not then they should be for the reasons which follow. The green space on the northern boundary of the campus is vital both for wildlife such as bats of the SAC, and for people. Students and children from Westwood nursery use these areas for recreation all year round and it should be protected from any development. I submit that it should be designated as Local Green Space because it meets the criteria in the NPPF. Specifically, it lies in close proximity to the student and local communities of Woodland Grove, Copseland etc. It is demonstrably special as the objections to the recently refused planning application for a surface level car park (14/05793/FUL) show, it is an important foraging area for bats of the SAC, has been recognised by Historic England as important to the setting of the Bathampton Camp SAM (see their comments on the car park application) and borders the AONB and the Skyline walk. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. In short, it is eminently suitable for designation as Local Green Space.
Q5 Change Requested
I submit that in order for policy SB19 to be effective, the land should be designated as Local Green Space. For the same reason, I would also urge the Council to make it clear within the Area Specific Development Principles on page 129 that the land is important Green Infrastructure and must remain undeveloped - the recent car park application shows that pressure to expand the University makes it vulnerable to development proposals
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 359 of 956

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 15 Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SSA
Q4 Soundness Comment
Silver Street Nature Reserve was not submitted as part of the GSD assessments in error – we wish to this be added at this stage.
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? As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town
Demondent Number 4052 C 1 1 1 2
Respondent Number: 1052 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Cameley Parish Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA
Q4 Soundness Comment
I attach two requests for Green Space Designation from Cameley Parish Council.
Q5 Change Requested
Green Space Reference:

11 May 2016 Page 360 of 956

Parish ward: Cameley Parish Council
Address of Site: The Green, Main Road, Temple Cloud, BS39 5BW. Bordered by A37 and Cameley Road.
Is the owner aware of the potential designation? Owned by Cameley Parish Council. Owner is aware of potential designation.
Does the owner support the potential designation? The owner fully supports designation
Planning History: None
1 It will rarely be appropriate to designate spaces that are the subject of planning permission. There are no planning applications in place. We know of no planning applications in the past
2 It will not be appropriate to designate spaces that are allocated or proposed for development in the local or Neighbourhood Plan. The Green is not allocated or proposed for development in the local or neighbourhood plan.
3 The space must not be an extensive tract of land and must be local in character The Green is relatively small and is where the Village Cross used to stand previously.
4 The space must be within the community it serves. It is within the village and next to the Doctor's surgery.
 5. The space must be demonstrably special to the local community 5.a. Beauty 5.b. Historic The Green is owned and looked after by the Parish Council. The old Village Cross stood on the Green in bygone days. 5.c. Recreational value Laid to lawn with several benches, the area is used by residents to relax. 5.d. Tranquillity Whilst close to a busy trunk road, the Green acts as an island for residents.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 1052 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: Cameley Parish Council 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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 361 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
I attach two requests for Green Space Designation from Cameley Parish Council.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Green Space Reference:				
The Recreation Ground				
Parish ward:				
Cameley Parish Council				
Address of Site:				
The green is bounded by Cameley Primary School BS39 5BD and Ham Close Temple Cloud BS39 5DY				
Is the owner aware of the potential designation? Owned by Cameley Parish Council. Owner is aware of potential designation.				
owned by carrierey rainsh council. Owner is aware of potential designation.				
Does the owner support the potential designation?				
The owner fully supports designation				
Planning History: None				
1 It will rarely be appropriate to designate spaces that are the subject of planning permission.				
There are no planning applications in place. We know of no planning applications in the past				
2 It will not be appreciate to designate appearathet are allocated as appeared for development in the local or				
2 It will not be appropriate to designate spaces that are allocated or proposed for development in the local or Neighbourhood Plan.				
The recreation ground is not allocated or proposed for development in the local or neighbourhood plan.				
3 The space must not be an extensive tract of land and must be local in character				
The recreation ground contains two football pitches and a childrens play area. It is next to the Primary School and the				
village hall.				
4 The space must be within the community it serves.				
It is next to the Primary School and the village hall. It is in the community it serves.				
5. The space must be demonstrably special to the local community				
5.a. Beauty				
5.b. Historic				
The Recreation Ground was bought by the Parish Council in the 50's.				
5.c. Recreational value Laid to lawn with several benches, the area is used by residents to relax.				
5.d. Tranquillity				
5.c. Wildlife				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 362 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Respondent Number: 225 Comment Number: 1 Name: Virginia Williamson Organisation: Bath & North East Somerset Allotments Associati 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGB21
Q4 Soundness Comment Re:Westmoreland ward: Lansdown View former private allotments This site was nominated for Local Green Space designation by both Cllr. June Player and Bath & North East Somerset Allotments Association. The Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound because: i.The application is not listed within the table 'Site Summary – Bath, nominations by ward' (p 5) ii.It is listed in Appendix 1, but with the justification for exclusion that it is not currently an allotment and therefore not used by the community. Local residents state that it is full of wildlife and old fruit trees and therefore they use it and appreciate it as any piece of wild, uncultivated land.
iii.In Appendix 2, the private owners state that "Poor access means the site is not suitable for use as allotments. The site cannot be seen from the street and there is no discernible public sentiment towards to the site justifying its inclusion as an LGS. The site is identified in the SHLAA as potentially suitable for housing, so to include it could reduce the council's ability to maintain a five year supply of housing land."
Unsuitable access: The existing access lane is used by local residents, who include allotment tenants and by B and NES Council to maintain the adjacent statutory allotment site, King George's Road. The site was allotments from the early 20th century, through to 2001 when the private allotments were sold to the current owners. Even in 2003 there was informal cultivation on the Lansdown View site, for which we have photographic evidence. The site was protected from development under the Adopted Local Plan 2007 (see attached)
Not visible from street: This is ideal – the site is tucked away from the street, it is quiet, but overlooked by housing which gives a measure of security against vandalism.
No discernible public sentiment: There was a great deal of public sentiment against an application to develop the site in 2013, with local residents stating how much they appreciated the site for its peacefulness and wildlife and how they wished it was still available as allotments.
Housing supply: At the developers' appeal hearing (August 2014) against planning permission refusal, B and NES Council stated that, with the adoption of the Core Strategy, it had sufficient housing land available without the need for this site to be developed. Please see the original application for full details, including photographic evidence.
Q5 Change Requested
Lansdown View former allotment site should be given Local Green Space designation.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 363 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 5 Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes					
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGB42					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
Following a review of the Local Green Space Designations Recommendations Report December 2015 we note that further to our previous representations, a number of the previously nominated Curo sites are not being taken forward for designation as LGS, although several sites do still appear. We set out in the table below a summary of the assessment of each of the Curo sites and our recommendation.					
Redlands Park Play Area, Twerton, LGB42					
The eastern portion of the play area is designated for recreational and wildlife value reasons.					
This responds to our previous representations which partly opposed the nomination on the basis that only the eastern portion of the site was suitable for nomination. Our representations set out that: - This is another of the green spaces proposed as part of the seemingly blanket approach to the designation of LGS					
within this part of Twerton. - The wooded (eastern) part of the site contains a number of mature trees which lend it a distinctive character in a way that makes it stand out from other areas of green space within this area. Curo would not oppose the designation of this part of the site.					
- By contrast, the open (western) part of the site is of a character that is similar to many other local open spaces. There is nothing that marks out this part of the site as demonstrably special or of particular local significance. Furthermore, if regeneration of this part					
of Twerton were in future to be considered, this open area could be reconfigured or re-provided elsewhere without diminution of local amenity or character; there is nothing that marks it out as distinct. It is therefore considered that this part of the site should not be designated.					
We are satisfied that the revised nomination which only allocates the eastern portion of the site adequately addresses our previous objection and we therefore do not object to this nomination.					
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box					
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?					

11 May 2016 Page 364 of 956

Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 6
Name: Organisation: Curo Group
Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGB52
Q4 Soundness Comment
Following a review of the Local Green Space Designations Recommendations Report December 2015 we note that further to our previous representations, a number of the previously nominated Curo sites are not being taken forward for designation as LGS, although several sites do still appear. We set out in the table below a summary of the assessment of each of the Curo sites and our recommendation.
Midsummer Buildings Open Space, Larkhall, LGB52
Designated for beauty; recreation (including as a playing field) and tranquillity reasons.
We did not oppose the designation of this site as LGS. This is a small site located at the bottom of Midsummer Buildings which slopes steeply to both the east and the north. It is set back from the highway and above road level by approximately 1.5-2 metres, accessible to pedestrians by steps from the north and east. The space could be viewed as a place of beauty/tranquillity if considered for the view that is visible from the north east of the site. We uphold our position in not objecting to this nomination.
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?
Respondent Number: 7121 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Messrs Betts and Perry Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 ☐

11 May 2016 Page 365 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGB55

Q4 Soundness Comment

The representations object to the Council's proposed Green Space Allocation, and seek to promote the site for a mixed-use development comprising housing (possibly in the form of self or custom-build housing) and allotments taking principal vehicular access from Ringwood Road.

We have set out comments below against the three planning policy criteria for designation of greenspace as set out in Paragraph 77 of the NPPF in so far that it relates to Council owned land that is proposed for designation:

Community Proximity

- While the subject site is located within Bath's urban area the site does not benefit for good accessibility. There is only a narrow foot path access with no suitable vehicular access for maintenance, or access to support any possible future allotment use.
- The poor vehicular accessibility combined with the lack of any viable use compatible with a greenspace allocation leads us to conclude that the community proximity criteria is not met.

Demonstrably special or of particular local significance

- The site does not have any kerbside presence and is largely concealed from public view points by existing surrounding properties.
- The Council land contains rubble for WW2 bomb damage and is contaminated. There is no safe vehicular access or water provision.
- The site is poorly managed and does not make any contribution towards visual amenity.
- There is no discernible positive community sentiment towards this land that would merit a green space allocation, nor any realistic prospect that the site could be beneficially and safely used as a publicly accessible green space.

The retention of land as local green space would require expenditure of capital resource to decontaminate the site and provide appropriate infrastructure for allotment use.

Local in character not part of an extensive tract of land

- It is agreed that the land is not in conflict with this criterion.

The proposed allocation of the Council owned land is not justified against criteria 1 and 2 of Paragraph 77 of the NPP NPPF: 77. Given that BANES needs to have additional flexibility built into its Placemaking Plan and other delivery documents, the combined sites, as illustrated in Appendix A, could make a contribution towards housing supply whilst also providing allotments and open space.

The land in our clients' ownership, which extends to circa 03ha, has been undeveloped and from records supplied by the previous owner of the site, we have deduced that it was used for a maximum of 12 No. private allotments during the period 1971-1999. At the time of our client's acquisition of the site in 2001 the number of private allotments reduced to 2 No. users and the site was vacated shortly thereafter. The former site did not have a water supply and nor did it benefit from a vehicular access suitable for allotment use. The site is now overgrown with scrub and self-seeded trees and fulfils no beneficial purpose.

The role of the Placemaking Plan is outlined in the Introduction to the Pre-Submission Version. It is the Council's intention that the Placemaking Plan will complement the strategic planning framework provided in the Council's Core Strategy which was formally adopted by BANES in July 2014 and will deliver the housing and employment requirements

11 May 2016 Page 366 of 956

established in the Core Strategy and its strategic objectives. The Council's Placemaking Plan focuses more on the specifics, including detailed design principles and development aspirations and updating the planning policies used in determining planning applications. It should be noted that for some locations the Placemaking Plan will be complemented by more detailed neighbourhood planning initiatives.

Q5 Change Requested				
We therefore respectfully request that the proposed allocation of the Council owned land under Policy LCR6A is deleted from the proposal map set out in the Draft PMP, Volume 6, Appendix titled 'New Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (Bath)'.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 7				
Name: Organisation: Curo Group				
Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore				
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGK20				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Following a review of the Local Green Space Designations Recommendations Report December 2015 we note that further to our previous representations, a number of the previously nominated Curo sites are not being taken forward for designation as LGS, although several sites do still appear. We set out in the table below a summary of the assessment of each of the Curo sites and our recommendation.				
Park Road, Keynsham, LGK20				
Designated on the basis of community value and recreational value.				
We did not oppose the designation of this site as LGS. The large field is suitable for informal sporting activities such as five a side football and there is onsite basketball net and teenage recreational equipment. This open space is in close proximity to large open space with children's play facilities and playing fields off Ludlow Close to the north west.				
We uphold our position in not objecting to this nomination.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 367 of 956

,	t Number: 1	Duran auto Datla I	the and Carilla at LC		
Name: Valerie Vivian	Organisatio	n: Property Bath	Ltd and Saviles LLC		
Agent Name:	Agent Orga	nisation:			
Further Information available in the original	comment? No	Attachments	s sent with the comme	ent? No	
Does the respondent consider the document	t is legally compliant?	(Tick if indicated 'y	'es') 🗆		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No					
If the respondent considers the Draft Placem	naking Plan is unsound	, is it because it is	(ticked where indicate	ed):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸 Not Justif	ied ✓ Not C	onsisten 🗸	Not Effective ✓		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 Dist	trict Wido Policy I CE	6.4			
·	.rict volue , Policy LCR	.OA			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR2					
Q4 Soundness Comment					

It does not comply with government directives regarding land adjoining a Highway being a highway verge and an existing legal access driveway giving rise to permitted development rights being unsuitable for designation as green space. Please refer to the Representations, Planning Statement and documents attached for all the reasons in detail, why this land does not comply with the government criteria for green space.

Q5 Change Requested

Removing the undesignated land within the development boundary lying to the west of Miller Walk from the proposed designation as green space and removing the retained access-way land containing the existing concrete driveway access to the land to the west from the proposed designation as green space. This land and its retained access driveway is suitable for sustainable development and is the subject of planning applications and appeals in accordance with all existing policies including, the Adopted Local Plan, Core Strategy, the NPPF and the NPPG. Please refer to the Representations, Planning Statement and documents attached for all the reasons in detail, why this land does not comply with the government criteria for green space.

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?

Please refer to the Representations, Planning Statement and documents attached for all the reasons in detail, why this land does not comply with the government criteria for green space. Please be aware that Banes website gave an error when trying to upload supporting document files well within their 20 mg limit, so I have had to email the submission with supporting documents to Banes Placemaking Plan directly for attention of the Planning Inspector. Please collect all my submissions to Banes objecting to this land, at Miller Walk and its legal retained access, being proposed as green space.

Respondent Number: 7077 Comment Number: 2

Name: Valerie Vivian Organisation: Property Bath Ltd and Saviles LLC

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 368 of 956

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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR2				

Q4 Soundness Comment

LANDOWNER'S AND DEVELOPER'S REPRESENTATIONS TO BANES PLACEMAKING PLAN OBJECT to Land at Miller Walk and Access right of way land being proposed as Green Space Volume 5 - Rural Areas - Bathampton, Green Space Policy, Paragraph 26, Diagram 1

The purpose of these representations is to object to the proposed designation as green space. These representations seek to ensure that any proposed Local Green Space designation is not applied to the land to the west of Miller Walk, Bathampton or the access right of way to this land or the existing concrete driveway on the access-way. The proposed designation has not been positively prepared, is not justified, was originally inaccurate, is not effective and above all is not consistent with National Policy of presumption of sustainable development of undesignated land within the development boundary for four self build houses.

WHY TWO SEPARATE AREAS OF LAND IN BATHAMPTON R1 VILLAGE ARE CONSIDERED NOT SUITABLE FOR DESIGNATION AS LOCAL GREEN SPACE. Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.

Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.

Local Green Space designation will rarely be appropriate where the land is the subject of planning permission for development.

The green area will need to meet the criteria set out in paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework:-The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- -where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- -where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and
- -where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

LAND AREA ONE, MILLER WALK. Location map attached as A.

ROADSIDE VERGE AND EXISTING DRIVEWAY OFF MILLER WALK HIGHWAY.

- 1. It is considered that this narrow strip of retained access-way land is not demonstrably special and does not hold a particular local significance for its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife, because:-
- -It has no special significance in terms of wildlife habitat, confirmed by the professional Ecology Reports by Nicholas Pearson Associates Preliminary LVIA and extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey attached as B and C and therefore tranquillity or richness of its wildlife does not apply.
- -It has no recreational value as a playing field, being a narrow strip of private land with a 7 metre wide legal access-way for vehicles running through it as a private driveway. There is a footpath alongside the private driveway to the open field to the north. The objective of the green space designation is to protect demonstrably special and significant areas from development but in this case, the development has already been completed. There is no room on this narrow strip of access-way land for any further development other than the access-way driveway that already exists and was given planning approval in 1994, so why does this strip of land need protection, when it is already fully developed with the nine houses and the private driveway access, built as the Miller Walk development in 1994? The point is that, apart from

11 Mav 2016 Page 369 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

a new surface of block-paviour stones to the existing private driveway (allowed under Part 9 Class E of GPDO 2015 Attached E), this access-way land will not change, because there is no room for further development (See Attachment H page 13, apart from the driveway the rest of the access-way is landscaped with trees including a protected tree). The objective is already achieved. In any event, this narrow roadside verge and private driveway access is not demonstrably special and does not hold a particular local significance.

-To an observer, there appears to be no historic significance to this access-way land strip. The conservation area boundary is several metres away from the new southern boundary of Court Leet, which was only established in 1994. The access-way strip is separated from the conservation area by several metres deep of the extant and considerable tree and tall hedge growth on the southern boundary of Court Leet, which is a listed building but it cannot be seen from the access-way land and vice versa. Attachment H page 4 shows the position of the Listed buildings and the boundary of the conservation area in relation to this access-way strip of land outlined in blue in the Design and Access statement prepared by Aaron Evans Architects.

-It is not demonstrably special and does not hold a particular local significance for its beauty, being a legal right of way and access-way strip surrounded by houses and it is actually a legal access-way and private driveway for vehicles, with all ancillary and incidental rights, including permitted development rights.

In addition to the reasons above, why this access-way strip of land does not comply with the Government criteria of paragraph 77 of the NPPF, there are other important reasons, why this access-way strip of land does not comply:- 2. The criteria for designating green space states: "Highway land/roadside verges would not normally be suitable for designation. This is because national guidance states that the local green space must be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Land adjoining an existing highway is the subject of 'Permitted Development' rights, which could be used to bring forward development that may be contrary to a Local Green Space designation, but would not require planning permission to be granted. Highway land may also be utilised in bringing forward future highway/transport schemes. Therefore, highway land/roadside verges would not normally be suitable for designation." This small strip of access-way land adjoins a highway and is a highway roadside verge with an existing, legal, private driveway leading off the highway (Miller Walk road) and through this small strip of access-way land. Land adjoining an existing highway is the subject of 'Permitted Development' rights, as in this case and therefore, this access-way land does not comply with the criteria, as stated above by the Government.

- 3. This small, narrow strip of land is owned by the management company of the residents of the properties of Miller Walk but there are retained legal rights of way for a driveway over a 7 metre wide access strip, through this small narrow access strip of land. This gives rise to permitted development rights over the 7 metre width of driveway land. A planning appeal has been lodged APP/F0114/W/15/3136906 for a new block-paviour surface to the existing driveway and right of way. In any event, permitted development rights exist to construct the new surface to the existing driveway under Part 9, Class E of the General permitted Development Order 2015 and the Court of Appeal decision of LI Evans and others. This evidence is attached as D for the Legal Rights for all vehicles at all times for all purposes and for all services over the existing driveway access strip, E for GPDO 2015 and F for the Court of Appeal decision.
- 4. Paragraph 65 of the Framework states, "Planning permission should not be refused for buildings and infrastructure that promote high levels of sustainability, because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design." is material.
- 5. In this instance, it is believed that the local people are using the green space designation as a way of trying to prevent sustainable development by the back door. Something the Government Directives warned about that should not happen. This strip of access-way land is the legal driveway access to undesignated land within the development boundary, with a presumption in favour of sustainable development and is the subject of a planning application for four self-build houses (Reference 15/04009/FUL) and a pre-application will be submitted shortly for change of use for 6 to 8 holiday lodges. Any green space designation should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. The NPPF states that Local Green Space designation will rarely be appropriate, where the land is the subject of a planning permission for sustainable development.
- 6. This small strip of access-way land (approx. 00.04 hectares) is enclosed by houses, walls, tall trees and tall hedges and is not protected as a landscaped area and it cannot be seen in wider views and has no special significance in terms of wildlife habitat. The access-way land is not in a conservation area and has no historic significance and is actually a vehicular access-way strip for an existing driveway off the highway in a small, established residential cul-de-sac. Repair, maintenance, alteration and construction work to the driveway, within the legal parameters of 7 metres width, is imminent to remove all the grass off the existing concrete driveway, so that it is useable for vehicles in accordance with

11 May 2016 Page 370 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

the legal rights of way and to improve the surface of the driveway with block-paviour stones and an appeal has been lodged for the latter.

- 7. It is an established principle that a landowner who grants rights "cannot take away with one hand that which has been given with the other." This is the principle of non-derogation from grant. Hence, a landowner who grants easements, cannot thereafter act in a way that prevents the exercise of the right granted. It should be noted that an express easement is granted together with "all ancillary and incidental rights to make the grant effective".
- 8. In the absence of any designation of this access-way land as an "area of open character or green space" in either an adopted or emerging Development Plan document, it is appropriate to consider what basis the Council has for defining the site as such an area?
- 9. Banes council did not follow the recommendations of the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector, so to date the council has not provided any criteria to allow for proper consideration of when policy BH15 is appropriate to be applied or any criteria for determining what constitutes open amenity land or VIOS. Dealing with the unknown is an unfair disadvantage for any person applying for planning permission. This was recognised by the Local Plan Inspector, who recommended a fair solution in an attempt at transparency but her recommendations have apparently been ignored by the Banes council and no criteria has been set for policy BH15.
- 10. The green space proposed designation on this existing driveway access is just to try to stop the permitted development rights of improving the existing surface of the existing driveway with block-paviour stones, which is sustainable infrastructure with retained legal rights. The basic character of the site is a highway verge and retained access-way land with the main purpose and objective of providing retained legal access to the land to the west within a seven metre wide strip. Every retained access-way is open land, otherwise it could not be used as an access. To suggest that, because this access driveway is currently green, it must lose its original legal purpose, character and retained legal rights to be an effective, fit for purpose, access driveway suitable for all vehicles at all times and for all purposes does not make legal or planning sense and conflicts with the long established Laws regarding easements and rights of way.
- 11. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.

Accordingly and for all the reasons above, the landowner respectfully requests that this access-way strip of land is not designated as green space in the Placemaking Plan.

LAND AREA TWO, LAND TO THE WEST OF MILLER WALK. Location map G.

UNDESIGNATED LAND WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY OF BATHAMPTON WITH A PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.

- 1. It is considered that this enclosed, private land (0.499 hectares) is not demonstrably special and does not hold a particular local significance for its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of its wildlife, because:-
- It has no special significance in terms of wildlife habitat, confirmed by the professional Ecology Reports by Nicholas Pearson Associates Preliminary LVIA and extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey attached as B and C and therefore tranquillity or richness of its wildlife does not apply.
- It has no recreational value as a playing field or any other recreational use by the general public, because it is private, enclosed land not open to the public and with no public access. The previous Appeal Inspector commented that "this land is now almost completely hidden from public view".
- -There is no historic significance to this land, which is outside of the Conservation Area but the western boundary is adjacent to the Conservation Area. There are listed buildings in the Conservation Area and Court Leet (to the north east) is the closest to this land but it cannot be seen and vice versa. Attachment H page 4 shows the position of the Listed buildings and the boundary of the conservation area in relation to this undesignated land outlined in red in the Design and Access statement prepared by Aaron Evans Architects.
- -It is not demonstrably special and does not hold a particular local significance for its beauty. In fact, many people in the village, the parish council and the council complain about the incongruous Leylandii trees and that is why replacing the incongruous Leylandii trees with ready-grown native trees and hedging of more appropriate and varied heights is planned in the comprehensive landscaping scheme and wildlife corridor, prepared by Nicolas Pearson Associates for the proposed development of four self-build houses on this land. The land is not protected as a landscaped area. The previous 2007 Appeal Inspector commented that "this land is now almost completely hidden from public view". This enclosed, private land cannot be demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance, if it cannot even be seen, as confirmed by the Appeal Inspector. To be demonstrably special it first needs to be seen. In addition to being seen, it needs to hold a particular local significance, but it does not. The 2007 Appeal Inspector stated

11 May 2016 Page 371 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

"I consider the introduction of Leylandii trees has devalued the contribution the appeal site makes to the locality". Consequently, it does not comply with the criteria for designation as local green space.

In addition to the reasons above, why this undesignated land does not comply with the Government criteria of paragraph 77 of the NPPF, there are other important reasons, why this land does not comply:-

- 2. This land has a planning history of planning applications for development and was accepted by the LPA as Housing Land in accordance with the 1988 Inquiry Inspector's decision. In 2007 an outline planning application was refused by the Appeal Inspector for reasons, which included that the Inspector did not have sufficient detail before him but he stated that "in principle, I consider that residential use of the site could be acceptable". This land is now the subject of a full, detailed planning application with a comprehensive landscaping scheme of ready-grown, native trees and hedges to provide a deep and wide wildlife corridor, screening the land from view with trees that can be protected, which was not before the previous Appeal Inspector. Only one-third of the land is proposed for development of four self-build houses and two-thirds of the land will remain open and landscaped with native trees and hedges.
- 3. In light of the NPPF, the NPPG, the changes in circumstances since the 2007 appeal decision on an outline application for development (whereas this is a full planning application with a comprehensive landscaping scheme of native trees and hedges) and the Local Plan Public Inquiry Inspector's decision that this land was not VIOS (visually important open space) or open amenity, the professional planning team is of the opinion that the proposed development, being undesignated land within the development boundary, complies with the planning policies and the adopted Local Plan and so a full planning application has been submitted on 07-09-2015 (Reference 15/04009/FUL) for the phased development of four self-build houses on the retained land, which is surrounded by housing on three sides.
- 4. Also, as an alternative, a pre-planning application will be submitted shortly for change of use for 6 to 8 mobile holiday lodges, which will be screened from view by the existing Leylandii hedges. The landowner has been informed, by professionals in the Holiday Lodges business, that the LPA is likely to look more favourably on non-permanent structures, which are not considered as development and would only require change of use permission and which would have a beneficial effect on the local economy with regard to increased tourism and local jobs. A copy of this pre-application will be submitted to the Placemaking Plan team shortly.
- 5. Two Inquiry Inspectors and one Local Plan Inquiry Inspector have confirmed this land is not VIOS (visually important open space) or open amenity and one Inspector in 1988 confirmed it as housing land and this was accepted by the LPA. The land remains undesignated in the adopted Local Plan.
- 6. Paragraph 65 of the Framework states, "Planning permission should not be refused for buildings and infrastructure that promote high levels of sustainability, because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design." is material.
- 7. In this instance, it is believed that the local people are using the green space designation as a way of trying to prevent sustainable development by the back door. Something the Government Directives warned about that should not happen. The NPPF states Local Green Space designation will rarely be appropriate, where the land is the subject of a planning permission for sustainable development.
- 8. In the absence of any designation of this enclosed, private land as an "area of open character or green space" in either an adopted or emerging Development Plan document, it is appropriate to consider what basis the Council has for defining the site as such an area?
- 9. Banes council did not follow the recommendations of the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector, so to date the council has not provided any criteria to allow for proper consideration of when policy BH15 is appropriate to be applied or any criteria for determining what constitutes open amenity land or VIOS. Dealing with the unknown is an unfair disadvantage for any person applying for planning permission. This was recognised by the Local Plan Inspector, who recommended a fair solution in an attempt at transparency but her recommendations have apparently been ignored by the Banes council and no criteria has been set for policy BH15. Consequently, policy BH15 can be given little, if any, weight in view of the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector's recommendation.
- 10. The private site is not in a Conservation Area and is undesignated land within the development boundary in the adopted Local Plan, with a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The site was accepted by the LPA as housing land in previous years and Inquiries. There are no land use or policy objections to the principle of residential development of this private site. There is no specific provision or land use designation in the established policies, which denotes this private site as an important gap or open space or visually important open space and there is no other landuse, policy or technical justification for concluding anything other than the site is appropriate for development. At present, the private site is now almost completely hidden from public view. The development will not harm the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area or the other residential properties in the vicinity of the site. The site is not protected

11 Mav 2016 Page 372 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

as a landscaped area and has no special significance in terms of wildlife habitat. For these reasons the development will not frustrate the planning objectives, which the established policies are designed to promote. In conclusion, taking the proposed development on its merits, having regard to the established planning policies and other material considerations, the scheme for four self-build houses is an acceptable use of this private land site, consistent with national and local planning and housing policies and development would not detract from the amenities enjoyed by local residents and would both preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

- 11. Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.
- 12. Local Green Space designation will rarely be appropriate where the land is the subject of planning permission for development

Accordingly and for all the reasons above, the landowner respectfully requests that this private land is not designated as green space in the Placemaking Plan.

In addition to all of the above representations from a non-professional, there are important professional representations attached as a "Planning Statement to Support Representations to the Draft Placemaking Plan", by Alder King Planning Consultants I, which objects to these two areas of land being designated as local green space and forms an important part of this submission as a whole.

\cap	Chang	- D	~c+	~~
U.S.	CHAIL	ze Ke	uuesi	eu

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?

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

Please refer to the Representations, Planning Statement and documents attached for all the reasons in detail, why this land does not comply with the government criteria for green space. Please be aware that Banes website gave an error when trying to upload supporting document files well within their 20 mg limit, so I have had to email the submission with supporting documents to Banes Placemaking Plan directly for attention of the Planning Inspector. Please collect all my submissions to Banes objecting to this land, at Miller Walk and its legal retained access, being proposed as green space.

space.
Respondent Number: 143 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Bathampton Parish Council 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR3
Q4 Soundness Comment
I am writing to confirm that Bathampton Parish Council fully supports the designation of Bathampton sites S2 and S3 as local open green spaces.
Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 373 of 956

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

Comment Number: 4

270

Respondent Number:

weight in National Parks and the Broads.

Name: Simon Tofts	me: Simon Tofts Organisation: Blue Cedar Homes				
Agent Name: Des Dunlop	Agent Or	ganisation: D2	Planning Ltd		
Further Information available in the original comm	nent? No	Attachn	nents sent with the	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is leg	gally compliant	:? (Tick if indicat	ed 'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document is so	ound? No				
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking	g Plan is unsou	nd, is it because	it is (ticked where	indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗹 Not Justified 🕟	Not	Consisten 🔽	Not Effective	V	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District W	Vide ,Policy L0	CR6A			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR16					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
Objections are lodged to the designation of the land Space. The NPPF states at paragraph 77 that: -	d north of Ashv	vood, Church La	ne, East Harptree a	is a Local Green	
The Local Green Space designation will not be approonly be used:	opriate for mos	st green areas o	r open space. The o	designation sho	uld
-where the green space is in reasonably close proxir	mity to the con	nmunity it serve	25;		
-where the green area is demonstrably special to a l					
significance, for example because of its beauty, history tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and	oric significanc	e, recreational	value (including as a	a playing field),	
-where the green area concerned is local in characte	er and is not ar	n extensive trac	t of land.â€		
The NPPG paragraph 12 states: -					
Different types of designation are intended to achie then consideration should be given to whether any Green Space.â€	•	•			٦,

Planning permission should be refused for major development in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

The site lies within the AONB and there has been no explanation as to what additional land benefit would be given by this designation. The NPPF is clear on the protection given to the AONB in paragraphs 115 and 116 which states: -

Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great

the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other

11 Mav 2016 Page 374 of 956

wav:	and
wav.	anu

any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

Clearly the same test of exceptional circumstances exists and the objectors see no benefit in the additional designation.

The only justification of the designation was set out in the 4 bullet points at paragraph 1.385 of the previous version of the Placemaking Plan. These do not amount to a justification for designating the site as a Local Green Space as follows: -

- i. Whilst the openness of the site contrasts with the surrounding housing this could equally be said of a number of similar sites in the settlement for example proposal SR6. Indeed, the appeal Inspector specifically recognised that this site was not identified as an important open space in the adopted Local Plan.
- Ii. An appeal being dismissed is not a justified reason to designate a site a Local Green Space. The appeal was dismissed on the effect on the character of the AONB. As stated earlier, where such designations exist there should be additional justification to designating a site as a Local Green Space.
- lii. The site is not of ecological importance. Indeed the appeal Inspector highlighted the fact that the Council had withdrawn its concerns in respect of trees, habitat loss and ecology.
- Iv. The fact that the site is presently open does not justify an additional designation especially given the AONB designation.

Indeed, it is particularly interesting to note that not all of the site is identified within the Local Green Space Designation. Part of the site nearest the primary school is excluded from the designation but all of the above comments equally apply to that part of the site. Clearly the Council concludes that part of the site does not comply with the above criteria and that can equally be applied to the remainder of the site.

In view of the above, strong objections are made to the proposed local green designation on the site on the basis that it is not justified over and above the AONB designation.

Q5 Change Requested

Delete the Local Green Space designation for the 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 issues are complex and need to be the subject of debate as part of the oral Examination.

Respondent Number: 1162 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: East Harptree Parish Council
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 \(\Boxed{\omega} \) Not Justified \(\Boxed{\omega} \) Not Consisten \(\Boxed{\omega} \) Not Effective \(\Boxed{\omega} \)
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR16

11 Mav 2016 Page 375 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
PARKERS MEAD.
This area represents the only remaining open space within the centre of the village and adjoins the school, church and public house. Areas to the south and east of Parkers Mead have been developed over the years leaving the space as an important buffer between the new and historic parts of the village and the conservation area which abuts the northern boundary. The site is within the AONB. Previous planning applications have been refused with the site considered to be environmentally sensitive and a visually important open space.
The space is elevated and sloping to the north giving good views out of the village toward the lake and is a prominent site when viewed from outside the village. The space gives good views of the church and out across the conservation area. There is the possibility of archaeological remains within the site area and a public footpath connects the church with Middle Street. The land has been identified as contaminated with heavy metals.
The space is designated as grassland and provides an important wildlife corridor across the village and has been identified as a feeding ground for bats, a nesting site for birds and has reptiles within its area. There is evidence of territory marking by badgers. The space is surrounded by hedgerows with mature trees and contains dilapidated structures which are also useful to wildlife.
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?
Respondent Number: 6511 Comment Number: 2
Respondent Number: 6511 Comment Number: 2
Name: Chris Head Organisation:
Name: Chris Head Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Name: Chris Head Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Name: Chris Head Organisation: 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')
Name: Chris Head 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?
Name: Chris Head 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 Consisten Not Effective
Name: Chris Head 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
Name: Chris Head 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR16
Name: Chris Head 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR16
Name: Chris Head 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR16

Designating this site as a LGS therefore runs counter to NPPF as it effectively sterilises the adjoining land identified in the

consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and

development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be

other essential services.

11 May 2016 Page 376 of 956

Core Strategy from ever becoming available for its designated use as it would not be released by the owner as part of the granting of any planning permission for the remaining part of the site.

The allocation of the site as a LGS is therefore contrary to the realisation of other policies already within the adopted Core Strategy.

If the southern two thirds of the Parkers Mead site has passed the designation test for a LGS why is the northern third suitable for development as a school playing field which would inevitably mean development and landscaping (including re-levelling). There is currently no existing delineation on the site between the two designated areas.

re-levelling). There is currently no existing defineation on the site between the two designated areas.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$ Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6998 Comment Number: 1 Name: Mr & Mrs C Jarvis Organisation:
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR16
Q4 Soundness Comment
We have owned the land at Church Lane. East Harntree (referred to as Parkers Mead in the draft Placemaking Plan) since

We have owned the land at Church Lane, East Harptree (referred to as Parkers Mead in the draft Placemaking Plan) since 1976. We note that it is proposed for designation as local green space. We understand that the reason for its designation is wildlife and historic value. The land is, of course, already within the AONB.

We note that, on 25 September 2015, the Council notified us of the proposal to designate part of the land as local green space. On 28 October 2015 representations were sent to the Council objecting to the proposed designation. The Council's letter confirmed that we would be able to comment again in a formal capacity following publication of the draft Placemaking Plan (this consultation).

Whilst the land has been used by us in the past for the rearing of pigs (until about 1987), and beef cattle, the rearing of cattle has ceased more recently following the introduction of more frequent testing of cattle for bovine tuberculosis (there is currently no facility for corralling animals for testing on the land). However, the grass is cut back from time to time, and brambles cleared, and it is likely that the land will be brought back into productive use by us shortly.

Given its past and future use, we do not accept that the land meets the nationally defined criteria for the designation of local green space as set out in the Council's letter dated 25 September 2015. In particular, we do not consider that the land is 'demonstrably special to the local community'. Nor, in our view, is it of 'particular significance' in terms of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquility or richness of wildlife.

We would also add that this land is part of a larger field which was partly developed for housing in the 1980s (Ashwood).

11 Mav 2016 Page 377 of 956

We do not consider that the Council has demonstrated that the land has any historic, wildlife, or other, value which justifies its designation as local green space, and do not accept that its designation would bring any benefits to the area or the local community above those afforded by its current AONB designation.

Delete local green space designation at Parkers Mead as its proposed designation will bring no benefit to the area, and

Q5 Change Requested

the land is of no particular value to the local community.

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 Council has not, in our view, adequately justified its reasons for the proposed designation and we wish to have the opportunity to discuss the matter in more detail at the examination in due course.
Respondent Number: 1162 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: East Harptree Parish Council 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR17
Q4 Soundness Comment
THE ORCHARD. This area represents a surviving remnant of the farming way of life which prevailed in the village before more recent developments and expansion of the village. Located to the east of Water Street, the space adjoins the conservation area and has views across it. The space also adjoins open countryside and is bounded by hedgerows.
The site is elevated and can be viewed from the higher lands to the south. The retention of the area as an orchard is important both as a link to the villages past and as an important site for wildlife. The space is designated as and remains an orchard with mature trees growing in rows. It provides an important area for
wildlife at the edge of the village and has bats, a nesting birds and has reptiles within its area. The space represents an important area at one end of the wildlife corridor across the village.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 378 of 956

Respondent Number: 7002 Comment Number: 1
Name: Clive Lower Organisation:
Agent Name: Rosalyn Trotman Agent Organisation: Thrings
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') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR18
Q4 Soundness Comment
1. Background and Enclosures
Peter Lower. Our client informs us that the Land has been disused for a number of years but was previously part of his late uncle's property which was sold separately from the Land in 2009. Prior to the sale of his uncle's dwelling, the Land was used as a garden for chickens and growing potatoes. Photographs of the Land in its current I recent state are enclosed for ease of reference.
1.2 FPC has subsequently sought to allocate the Land, amongst other green spaces in Farmborough, as a Local Green Space for the purposes of the B&NES Placemaking Plan. We enclose FPC's undated Local Green Space Nomination document which we will refer to within this objection.
1.3 We are instructed that individuals in Farmborough appear to have taken it upon themselves to enter the Land without our client's permission of permission of Peter Lower, in order to cut the grass and store items on the Land. Our client is currently considering the appropriate action to take to address these acts of trespass.
1.4 We understand from B&NES's website that the Placemaking Plan is due to be drafted and consulted on from November 2015 and therefore Local Green Space Designations and any objections to such proposals will need to be considered prior to submission to the Secretary of State in Spring 2016.
2. Objection to the Designation of the Land as a Local Green Space
2.1 As B&NES is aware, the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") provides the criteria for determining the appropriateness of land for such designation. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF is set out here for ease of reference and provides as follows:
(a) The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:
(i) where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; (if) where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local signtffcance, for example because of its heauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or

consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a

2.2 The National Planning Practice Guidance ("NPPG") states that designating any Local Green Space will need to be

(iii) where the green area concerned Is local In character and is not an extensive tract of land. (With our emphasis added).

richness of its wildlife; and

11 Mav 2016 Page 379 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

way that undermines this aim of plan making (Paragraph 007).

- 2.3 The NPPF makes clear the intention of the government to limit the overuse of Local Green Space designations in Its statement that most green areas and open space would not be appropriate (Paragraph 77). Despite this, FPC has submitted proposals for the designation of most of its green and open spaces. FPC appears to be abusing the Local Green Space designation to undermine development within Farmborough.
- 2.4 It is of relevance that one of FPC's members lives next to the Land. It would appear that this person has used their position within FPC to include the Land despite its lack of value to the community. This, in our submission, is wholly inappropriate and not as intended by the government within the NPPF. This particular FPC member also misuses the Land to store a trailer, without any right of access. It is somewhat contradictory that the Land is claimed to FPC despite there being no lawful right of access. It is noted that the use of the Land for unlawful ancillary storage appears to have been omitted from FPC's submission.
- 2.5 In respect of FPC's proposal, the following points are noted:
- (a) It is accepted by FPC that the Land has no historical significance.
- (b) FPC acknowledges that there is no recreational value to the Land.
- (c) FPC's reference to its use as a cottage garden is inaccurate as the Land has been disused for the last 6 7 years and has not formed part of a garden for that time.
- 2.6 Turning to the NPPF criteria, FPC has, in our submission, failed to adequately demonstrate, as required by the NPPF, how the Land is demonstrably special to the local community and how the Land is of particular significance. In applying paragraph n of the NPPF, we note the following points:
- (a) Although the NPPG allows for private land to be designated, it makes clear that local value in that land should be shown giving specific examples of green areas which are valued because of their wildlife, historic significance and/or beauty.
- (b) It is clear from visiting the Land that there is no wildlife of any noteworthiness. FPC's description of the Land states "grasses and other meadow flowers support an abundance of insects and consequently many common birds" which suggests an attractive site. We encourage B&NES to visit the Land again to see that there are no meadow flowers (except perhaps common weeds), and there are no more insects or common birds than any other area of disused grassland. A more accurate description of the Land would be an unattractive, disused, grassy site with none of the qualities of a garden or public area without any particular features.
- (c) The Land is not a tranquil place for passers-by as FPC state. There is however a large green space at the top of Church Lane by the Church that does provide tranquillity to local people as well as a recreational area for children.
- (d) As stated above, individuals appear to have taken upon themselves to cut the grass without our client's permission, therefore the photographs within FPC's submissions are not a true reflection of the condition of the Land once issues of trespass are addressed by our client.
- (e) The NPPG explains that management of land designated as Local Green Space will remain the responsibility of its owner. If the features that make a green area special and locally significant are to be conserved, how it will be managed in the future is likely to be an important consideration (Paragraph 021). However, as stated above, there are no special features. Our client has no intention to grant any locals access to the Land, and therefore the Land will remain as a disused and unattractive site (subject of course to any subsequent planning permission for development deemed appropriate).
- (f) The NPPG confirms that designation does not in itself confer any rights of public access over what exists at present. Any additional access would be a matter for separate negotiation with owners, whose legal rights must be respected (Paragraph 017).
- (g) FPC, in their submissions, refer to comments of an Inspector and Planning Officer in two previous applications; one of which was refused at appeal and the other withdrawn by our client. It is commonly known that the aforementioned member of FPC is opposed to development on the Land, however, the planning application process provides sufficient avenue for objectors without the need to mould the Land to the Local Green Space designation criteria. In particular FPC's comments on openness can be considered should an application for development of the Land be submitted in the future.

11 Mav 2016 Page 380 of 956

3. Summary

Q5 Change Requested

3.1 In summary, FPC has in our submission, failed to demonstrate the local importance of the Land as required by paragraph 77 of the NPPF. It is clear, in our view that FPC are seeking to over-use the Local Green Space designation to pursue the personal agendas of those FPC members that live in the neighbouring properties, rather than properly considering community value of their proposals. It is evident from visiting the Land that it is a disused and unattractive piece of Land with little value to the local community. Any local concerns about development of the Land can be properly considered and addressed through the planning application process if any applications are made in future.

The land adjacent to Bramble Cottage, Church Lane in Farmborough be removed from designation as local green space

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

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the E	xamination?		
Respondent Number: 6411 Comment Number	: 5			
Name:	Organisatio	n: Emergy Ltd		
Agent Name: Georgina Tibbs	Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore			
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	? No nn is unsound		is (ticked where indicated):	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR26	Policy LCF	86A		
Q4 Soundness Comment				

We object to the proposed designation as Local Green Space (LGS) of Land south of Lower Road, Hinton Blewett.

The B&NES Local Green Space Designations Recommendations Report (December 2015) identifies that Land south of Lower Road (LGR26) has been nominated because of historic significance, richness of wildlife and beauty. The Recommendations Report erroneously does not record an objection from the landowner to LGR26, despite our having submitted objections to its nomination in response to the previous consultation on the Placemaking Plan Options Document.

The reasons for the proposed designation of Land south of Lower Road as LGS are not expanded upon in the Draft Placemaking Plan nor, it appears, in any of the updated list of evidence base documents.

We set out below why we consider that Land south of Lower Road does not meet the criteria for designation as a LGS and therefore why its proposed designation is not sound.

We do not consider that Land south of Lower Road meets the criteria for LGS set out in paragraph 77 of the NPPF because (amongst other reasons) it is not demonstrably special to the local community and does not hold particular local significance. In the table below we have set out our responses to the reasons suggested for designation of the land. Because the draft Placemaking Plan and its evidence base do not provide any detail to support the reasons for the proposed designation, we have based the responses upon the reasons cited in the November 2014 Placemaking Plan

11 May 2016 Page 381 of 956

Options Document (the version of the plan previously consulted upon).

Historic significance - contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area:

It is unclear why this land is specifically identified for its contribution to the Conservation Area's setting ahead of other land surrounding the Conservation Area, such as the land to the east of the core of the Conservation Area, which is crossed by public footpaths and the Conservation Area Appraisal (2014) identifies as being the site of key views into the area. The Conservation Area Appraisal's selection of "important views" was, in response to our clients' planning application, altered from draft versions to include viewpoint 3 which is not on a public right of way and overlooks our clients' site. We believe this change was made to overemphasise the contribution of our clients' land to the setting of the Conservation Area and to contrive evidence for use in opposing our clients' planning application.

We enclose a built heritage assessment, which provides an assessment of the contribution of the land to the setting of designated heritage assets including the Conservation Area.

However, it should be kept in mind that land within the setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas is already afforded protection by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, through national policy and through the adopted Core Strategy. It is simply not appropriate to use the LGS designation as a "belt and braces" designation to further support these existing designations.

Historic significance - Medieval banked boundary hedge to north:

The LGS designation is not an appropriate designation to use to protect historic hedgerows which already benefit from separate legislative protection.

We enclose an archaeological desk based assessment which shows that the land has limited archaeological potential.

Historic significance - helps to define the separation and the linear edge of the planned mediaeval village/historic landscape setting:

The reference to the site forming "part of the historic landscape setting" is misleadingly vague, and would apply equally to all open land around the village. In relation to the linear edge of the planned medieval village, the Conservation Area Appraisal (2014) notes that Upper Road and Lower Road remained free of development until the 1950s, indicating that considerable change to the mediaeval village pattern in the vicinity of Land south of Upper Road has already occurred.

Richness of wildlife - meadow used for animal grazing supporting rich flora and fauna:

No evidence is provided in support of these assertions. In fact, we have evidence which suggests quite the opposite. An ecological survey was undertaken in relation to our clients' land in May 2014 (copy enclosed) which records that: "Overall, it is considered that the habitats within the Application Site are of low ecological value.

However, the hedgerows are of some importance, mainly for the foraging and shelter opportunities they offer faunal species (see below)". Generally, the recent ecological survey does not support the assertion that the site supports "rich flora and fauna", less still that it is demonstrably special in this regard.

Beauty - an intrinsically beautiful space:

The land is not unattractive, but we consider that the significance of its beauty has been overstated. In contrast to other areas of green space around the village, there is no public access.

Beauty - Part of the agricultural landscape across Cam Valley and to the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and beyond and provides a connection to the countryside:

The observations that the site is part of an agricultural landscape and provides a connection to the countryside would apply equally to all undeveloped agricultural land surrounding Hinton Blewett and indeed all other settlements in

11 Mav 2016 Page 382 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

B&NES. This does not demonstrate any special quality or significance. In relation to proximity to the AONB, the AONB boundary is to the north and west, not to the south, of the village and so it is difficult to understand the reference linking this land on the southern edge of the village to the AONB.

For these reasons, we do not consider that the land south of Lower Road, Hinton Blewett is demonstrably special and of particular local significance.

Further, we consider that Land south of Lower Road is unsuitable for designation as a LGS because it is an extensive tract of land. The Planning Practice Guidance offers no guidance on what is and is not to be regarded as an extensive tract of land. However, the PPG advises that the LGS designation "should not be proposed as a 'back door' way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name". We consider that by proposing the designation of the strip of land south of Lower Road as LGS, the intention is to create a de facto Green Belt to the south of the village. Furthermore, we consider that what is and is not an extensive tract of land needs to be assessed in its context. In the context of the small village of Hinton Blewett, we consider that the proposed LGS, which adjoins much of the southern boundary of the village, is an "extensive tract".

Finally, the proposal to designate land south Lower Road as a LGS needs to be seen in the context of our clients' recent planning applications for residential development of part of that land (application references (13/05272/OUT and 14/02403/OUT). Seen in this context, the impression is that the LGS designation is being proposed not because of the special or local significance of this land, but instead as a means to frustrate any future development proposals in this location.

If it was not for the applications for planning permission, we suspect the land would not have been identified as proposed LGS. In this regard, it is relevant to note that paragraph 76 of the NPPF states that identifying land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development. The decision to designate LGS must also be made in the context of the overarching duty in section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to exercise plan-making functions with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. We consider that, contrary to the NPPF and the duty, Land south of Lower Road is proposed as LGS not in the interests of contributing to sustainable development but in order to block future options for the development of small-scale market and affordable housing to meet local needs.

The NPPF advises that the LGS will not be appropriate for most green areas and (as noted above) the PPG warns that it should not be used as a back door route to create new Green Belt. For the reasons set out above, we consider that its proposed designation is not a result of its special local significance but of a desire to create a de facto Green Belt and block any future planning applications on the land.

Summary

In summary, the proposed designation of land south of Lower Road, Hinton Blewett is not sound on a number of grounds, including:

- •It is inconsistent with national policy because the land does not meet the criteria for designation in that it is not demonstrably special and is an extensive tract of land.
- •It is not justified because the evidence, including the technical reports submitted with these representations, shows that the reasons for the proposed designation do not withstand scrutiny.
- •It is not positively prepared since it is a reactive attempt to block future options for development to meet local housing needs.
- •It is not consistent with national policy or the legislative framework in that it seeks to block local planning for sustainable development.

Q5 Change Requested

For the reasons outlined in our response to question 4 above, paragraph 129 of Volume 5 (on p.37) of the draft Placemaking Plan is not sound and should be amended to delete the reference to Land south of Lower Road. Consequential amendments should be made to Diagram 17 to remove Land south of Lower Road.

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 represent the owner of the land and there are significant issues which merit consideration at examination.

11 Mav 2016 Page 383 of 956

Respondent Number: 1253 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Hinton Blewett Parish Council	
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes	38
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR27	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Your request in respect of Local Green Space nominations to our Clerk refers. The attached is our response to provide stronger support and more robust evidence in respect of the three nominated Locally Important Green Spaces. At the present time, in order to meet your deadline of 3rd February, it is one document plus attachments	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
willy does the Respondent reent is necessary to participate at the Examination:	
Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 11	
Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 11 Name: Organisation: Curo Group	
·	
Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore	lo
Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore	0
Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	0
Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore 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')	0
Name: Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Curo Group Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore 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	lo
Name: Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Curo Group Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore 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):	lo
Name: Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore 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	lo
Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N 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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A	lo
Name: Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore 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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR47	

11 May 2016 Page 384 of 956

Designated for its community value and recreational value. Our previous representations did not oppose this nomination.
We uphold our position in not objecting to this nomination.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 16
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGS6
Q4 Soundness Comment
The land immediately to the south of the Staddlestones GSD (which is outside the HDB and an extension of the river corridor), currently the subject of a Planning Application, should be added to the agreed boundary of this GSD to the north of the road.
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?
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town
Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 9
Name: Organisation: Curo Group
Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore
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 ☐

11 May 2016 Page 385 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGS8
Q4 Soundness Comment
Following a review of the Local Green Space Designations Recommendations Report December 2015 we note that further to our previous representations, a number of the previously nominated Curo sites are not being taken forward for designation as LGS, although several sites do still appear. We set out in the table below a summary of the assessment of each of the Curo sites and our recommendation.
Welton Green, Midsomer Norton, LGS8
Designated for historic significance and wildlife value. Our previous representations did not oppose this nomination.
We uphold our position in not objecting to this nomination.
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?
Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 8 Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore 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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGS12
Q4 Soundness Comment
Following a review of the Local Green Space Designations Recommendations Report December 2015 we note that further to our previous representations, a number of the previously nominated Curo sites are not being taken forward for designation as LGS, although several sites do still appear. We set out in the table below a summary of the assessment of each of the Curo sites and our recommendation.
Frederick Close or Frederick Avenue / Albert Avenue, Peasdown St John, LGS12

Frederick Close or Frederick Avenue / Albert Avenue, Peasdown St John, LGS12

Designated for recreational value and community value.

Our previous representations objected to this nomination. It is unclear why just this small part of this larger area of green space has been nominated. While the site has benches and a small maze, it is not clear why it is said to be demonstrably special in its recreational value in way that marks it out from most similar sites.

11 May 2016 Page 386 of 956

The site is in close proximity to the other identified LGSD at Hill Crest			
We uphold our position in objecting to this nomination.			
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?			
To fully explore the reasons for the proposed designation of land at Frederick Close, Peasedown St John as local green			
space.			
Respondent Number: 6434 Comment Number: 6			
Name: David Webb Management Ltd Organisation: David Webb Management Ltd			
Agent Name: Kay Mann Agent Organisation: Phoenix Land Solutions Ltd			
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGS17			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
19. Proposals for allocating the area identified as Whitelands Batches is not supported on the grounds that it fails to			
meet the criteria as set out in NPPF Policy at paragraph 77. Here it states, The Local Green Space designation will not be			
appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:			
 where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for 			
example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or			
richness of its wildlife; and			
- where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.			
20. It should also be noted that the only public access on the site is limited along a public right of way (footpath CL24/80).			
Q5 Change Requested			
21. In line with the above the land labelled as Whitelands Batches should be removed from the Local Green Spaces map.			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			

11 May 2016 Page 387 of 956

Respondent Number:	7215	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Graham Wall		(Organisation:	Whitelands	and Tyning Greenspace Group	
Agent Name:		A	Agent Organi	sation:		
Further Information ava	ilable in	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent co Does the respondent co If the respondent consider	nsider th	ne document is sound?			d 'yes') is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Con	sisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation related The Site Reference (if app			Policy LCR6	4		

Q4 Soundness Comment

In 2015, the Whitelands and Tyning Greenspace Group suggested a LGS in the form of a collection of separate, linked spaces serving the communities of Whitelands, Tyning, Springfield and Lower Writhlington (it included Lower Writhlington batch, which is readily accessible on foot from Lower Writhlington) and accessible to other Radstock communities. We considered that this area formed a character area surrounding the historic Lower Whitelands cottages that was also important to Radstock as a whole, due to the remarkable concentration of historic landscape features of rural and cultural value. This proposal was well received by Radstock Town Council and B&NES complimented the justification the group provided. It was, we were informed, considered not to meet the definition of LGS due to its size and to its nature, which was not considered to relate in particular to Radstock.

"The sites that you named, the Green Batch and the Tyning Pithead and Batch are recommended for designation. The remaining site cannot be designated a local green space nomination as it is not in accordance with the criteria sets out in paragraph IT of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF states that to be designated as a Local Green Space Designation, a site must be: 'local in character' and 'not an extensive tract of land'. The site has been assessed and the site has been described as being an extensive tract of agricultural land outside the housing development boundary which relates to the wider countryside rather than to Radstock and is therefore not suitable for designation."

The Authority has chosen to recommend two small areas that form the backdrop to Tyning on one side (from the town) and Whitelands on the other (towards the town) and it has also recommended for designation Tyning Allotments.

The group is alarmed by the entries in the B&NES Local Green Space Recommendations Report December 201 5, which is part of the Evidence Base for the Placemaking process. This document outlines a variety of spaces proposed and the designation outcome is presented as either red for not recommended or green for recommended. The document claims that "Mr Graham Wall and the Whitelands Residents Association and Dr. Virginia Williamson" nominated "The Tyning Allotments" and that "Mr Graham Wall and the Whitelands Residents Association" nominated "Whitelands Batches" for Local Green Space designation and that both have been recommended for designation. This is not true.

The Whitelands and Tyning Greenspace Group nominated a much larger proposal that represented a small-scale local character area that the group had identified on the northeast periphery of Radstock. This area was proposed as a collection of spaces for Local Green Space designation, spaces A, Upper Whitelands, B, Rural backdrop, and C Mining Heritage Area. The group did not propose the Tyning Allotments and is not called the Whitelands Residents Association. We are unaware that such a named Residents Association exists. The batches that B&NES refers to are the Tyning batches, not the Whitelands batches. B&NES has omitted to provide a map for the LGS proposed by the Whitelands and Tyning Greenspace Group in the report and, in fact, has left out all the mapping of nominated spaces in Radstock. Our original nomination and full submission is in Appendix 10. There is material in that document pertinent to this submission, in particular the analysis of the value and local importance of the local landscape setting within which

11 May 2016 Page 388 of 956

Whitelands sits.

Excerpts from the B&NES Local Green Space Designations report (December 2015).

We were informed that it was the best justified space that B&NES had received, but we can find no report that sets out how the nomination we sent was assessed. We have asked for a full officer assessment of our nomination, but have received nothing. There is no evidence in the Greenspace Recommendation Report of any assessment of the nomination we submitted.

We think that there may be a mapping error regarding designation of areas that do not together constitute the whole of the twin Tyning batches, called "Whitelands Batches" in the Placemaking Plan, Vol 4, Setting the Agenda, para 7, and in the Local Green Space

Recommendations report. The designation indication in the report is green (positive) for the batches. We were informed by B&NES that "The sites that you named, the Green Batch and the Tyning Pithead and Batch are recommended for designation." In addition there is a discrepancy between the current B&NES mapping and the map we provided showing the area we named the Green Batch (Appendix A of our 201 5 proposal (see Appendix 1 0). The text of the Placemaking Plan also suggests that the entire batch is recommended for designation. We consider that all the criteria that apply to the portion of the Green Batch recommended for designation by B&NES also apply to the entire batch.

Regarding the reference to the Tyning batches as Whitelands batches in the plan text, we would like to emphasise that Whitelands is, and always has been, a residential settlement, built for miners. There was no Whitelands Pit. The batches are composed of the spoil from Tyning pit and later also took spoil from Ludlows pit and Middle pit, which are in other parts of Radstock.

Map of area.

Regarding the reason we were given for the decision not to designate more of the three conjoined areas we proposed, we do not agree that Upper Whitelands fits the description of "agricultural land outside the housing development boundary which relates to the wider countryside rather than to Radstock". It is not agricultural land, but was in mining-related ownership and has been in private non-agricultural ownership since then (sold by the Coal Board), was used by Whitelands Residents as a recreation area, including play equipment into the 1980s and may have been maintained as a play area by Wansdyke District Council up to that time, when the equipment (bought by residents) was removed (see Appendices 1 1 and 1 2). It was sold on again in recent years and now appears to be part of a private property portfolio. We consider that a more detailed look at the area in the context of the new policy on Local Green Space throws up considerations further to those that have been examined in the past and that these show it to be undeniably of local character and inextricably related culturally to Whitelands specifically.

We consider that the portion of farmland we now propose has cultural and historic links specifically with Whitelands and also makes a significant contribution to the setting of Lower Whitelands (a special and historic feature in its own right), in addition to its contribution to the wider green setting of Radstock.

The total area of the three spaces we proposed in 201 5 was some 1 00 hectares, which is small in terms of a local character area and is also a small land unit in landscape terms. We now propose a much smaller area for designation than that proposed in 201 5 and consider that what we now propose fits the LGS criteria laid out in NPPF policy 77. We have gathered further information and consider that designation is supported by this additional information and by examination and adoption of adopted Local Green Spaces elsewhere.

Regarding the suitability of the site within a sustainable development framework, we note that there is an expectation that "Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services."

We argue that designation as Local Green Space ticks the right sustainability boxes, helps rather than hinders the local planning of sustainable development and does not compromise investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential

11 Mav 2016 Page 389 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)
services, and particularly with reference to the supply of market and affordable housing.
Q5 Change Requested
The Group objects to the B&NES recommendation for Local Green Space designation LGS1 8 on the basis that it appears incomplete and we believe it needs to be expanded in order to provide the benefits expected by the local community for a Local Green Space.
We propose that the recommended Local Green Space designation, LGS1 8, is amended by: A. designating the "Green Batch" in its entirety as Local Green Space, and B. increasing the size and scope of the Local Green Space designated in line with what we propose in this submission, which is supported by accompanying documents.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 10
Name: Organisation: Curo Group
Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGS19
Q4 Soundness Comment
Following a review of the Local Green Space Designations Recommendations Report December 2015 we note that further to our previous representations, a number of the previously nominated Curo sites are not being taken forward for designation as LGS, although several sites do still appear. We set out in the table below a summary of the assessment of each of the Curo sites and our recommendation.
Shakespeare Road Play Area /Shakespeare Close, Play Area, Westfield, LGS19
The reason given for designation is 'B&NES'. This is unclear and needs to be removed.
Our previous representations stated that we may not oppose the designation of this site as LGS. However, it needs to be clarified why just this section of a larger adjacent green spaces has been singled out for designation. The site includes a play area and forms an
extension of the existing Midsomer Norton Skate Park and a large area of established open space.
We uphold our position that we may not oppose this nomination. We seek further clarification on this nomination – particularly why just this section of a larger adjacent green space has been designated, and the justification for the

11 May 2016 Page 390 of 956

designation as the document simply states 'B&NES'.

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?
Respondent Number: 7067 Comment Number: 1 Name: Danielle Ross Organisation: 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGSNDBA
Q4 Soundness Comment
At previous stages of the consultation the Whitewells Public Open Space was put forward for consideration as a Local Green Space. This area meets the criteria for designation as it is not an extensive tract of land and is of significant local amenity value and used extensively by the local community. Despite this the LGS Assessment document appears not to have considered or assessed this site. This should be rectified in the final Plan and as well as being identified for protection as existing recreation land it should also be identified as Local Green Space. The space provides a value local function as the nearby Larkhall Recreation Ground which has been identified for LGS designation. Q5 Change Requested
Assess and identify the Whitewells Public Open Space for Local Green Space designation.
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: 29 Comment Number: 1 Name: Sheila Youd and Margret Youd Organisation: 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

11 May 2016 Page 391 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of 76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! Will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

-We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

-We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;

-We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

-We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

-We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately percent of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as

11 Mav 2016 Page 392 of 956

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 201	L5.		
Q5 Change Requested			
To make it sound, the Placemaking Plan narrative and polici reassessed in the light of properly prepared evidence and, or, better, to positively allocate land, including removing land necessary, to meet the needs of both universities and of including removes.	either leav nd from o	re market forces to determine which use has ne	eed
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	•	•	
Respondent Number: 31 Comment Number: 3	1		
Name: Mr and Mrs Kemp Or	ganisatio	1:	
Agent Name: Ag	ent Organ	isation:	
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally cor Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	mpliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	

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

Not Justified ✓

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

Not Positively Prepared

Placemaking Plan consultation: Land at Beechen Cliff, Bath: Local Green Space

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of p76-77 of the NPPF.

If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):

Not Consisten 🗸

Not Effective

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by

the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters). However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan.

We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community involvement (at 2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations

11 Mav 2016 Page 393 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure

- 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (132) and AONBs (115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own

policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

- -We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 39 Comment Number: 1 Name: R A Sackett Organisation: Greenway! Stakeholder Residents Forum 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):

11 Mav 2016 Page 394 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

I submit that the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset is unsound in that it omits a proposal for open land behind Beechen Cliff in the City of Bath to be designated as Local Green Space in terms of p76-77 of the NPPF This is inconsistent with national policy.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space.

This proposal was supported by over 400 local residents/ the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the widespread and active community use of this green space from residents living across the Beechen Cliff/Lyncombe/ Widcombe residential area of Bath. This included its role as a direct footpath link from the south/ Bath skyline walk through Lyncombe Farm fields and Beechen Cliff; as well as its inherent amenity and heritage importance. (A summary of the key conservation issues has been submitted by local residents associations).

Despite this substantial input by local and City bodies, the green space allocation sought has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. Your process seems at fault.

It is widely understand that the decision;

was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access. Notice was not given to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, that information would be disseminated widely, advertised in good time, and Residents Associations used as a way of disseminating information,

was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use. There is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework.

was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools". The NPPF however also gives similarly "great weight" to heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): The Council did not show that it had given careful consideration to the balance between these "great weight" considerations, and thereby failed to meet this obligation.

Council advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular importance"

was made on the basis of advice from officers to Councillors without reference to substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

was influenced by an astonishingly incorrect statement that "approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway".

The decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces in the plan is not justified, it is inconsistent with national policies. The decision appears partial and biased.

11 May 2016 Page 395 of 956

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 40 Comment Number: 1 Name: Andrew and Eileen Vickers Organisation: 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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of p76-77 of the NPPF.
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

11 May 2016 Page 396 of 956

Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:
- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted

about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- -We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?	

Respondent Number: 44 Comment Number: Name: Peter & Caroline Laws Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Attachments sent with the comment? Further Information available in the original comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

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

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

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the

11 Mav 2016 Page 397 of 956

draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

11 May 2016 Page 398 of 956

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January	/ 2015.		
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici		?	
Respondent Number: 45 Comment Number	: 1		
Name: Annabelle Petter	Organisation:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:		
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attac	chments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared □ Not Justified ✓	? No	use it is (ticked where indicated):	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	Policy LCR6A		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11			

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of p76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. I have the following concerns:

-I understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish

11 Mav 2016 Page 399 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- -I understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- -I understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- -I understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): this means, I think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- -I understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- -I understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.
- I therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. I believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

set out in the proposal put to the council on 14 January 2013.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 47 Comment Number: 1 Name: William Robertson Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment

11 Mav 2016 Page 400 of 956

We should like to ask you to add our names to the many hundreds of people and several relevant organisations who

have asked that the Lower Playing Field at Beechen Cliff S	chool is made a Local Green Space.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinati	on (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participat	te at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 79 Comment Number:	1
Name: Tracey Lee	Organisation:
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 co	ompliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \square
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 1 District Wide ,	Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of p76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:
-We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

11 Mav 2016 Page 401 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

-We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

-We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;

-We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

-We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

-We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous. We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate a	at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 94 Comment Number: 1				
Name: Peter Nobes Org	anisation:			
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □				

11 May 2016 Page 402 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of 76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents.

It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan.

We have the following concerns:

- -We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at 2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (132) and AONBs (115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- -We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We

11 Mav 2016 Page 403 of 956

believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 137 Comment Number: 1
Name: I C G Stratton Organisation:
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') $\ \ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the
draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-
77 of the NPPF.
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North
East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared
in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the
Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose
setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage
importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including
evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:
- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of
Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations
and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information

11 Mav 2016 Page 404 of 956

about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and

advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

Respondent Number: 158 Comment I	Number: 4		
Name: Margarida Dolan and Mark O'Sullivan	Organisation:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organisat	tion:	
Further Information available in the original co	omment? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	Yes

11 May 2016 Page 405 of 956

Does the respondent consider the	ne document is legally co	ompliant? (Tick if indicate	d 'yes') \square
Does the respondent consider th	ne document is sound?	No	
If the respondent considers the	Draft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified 🗸	Not Consisten 🗸	Not Effective
The representation relates to: Vo The Site Reference (if applicable)		Policy LCR6A	
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Beechen Cliff: Local Green Space			

We submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a copy of the full application is below).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

-We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that (leaving aside that reconfiguration is not mentioned in the NPPF) this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the various "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

 -We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

-We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately percent of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We

11 Mav 2016 Page 406 of 956

believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies. We therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
, and a superior of the superi
Respondent Number: 206 Comment Number: 1
Name: Paul Hayward Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
I understand that the proposal to include the lower playing field of Beechen Cliff School was turned down on a technicality. As a resident of Bear Flat I ask that this is rectified and the playing field is made a Local Green Space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
willy does the Respondent reel it is necessary to participate at the Examination:
Respondent Number: 207 Comment Number: 1
Name: Richard Harvey Organisation: Entry Hill Drive Residents' Association
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') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 407 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
We write to confirm our support for the Beechen Cliff playing fields including the lower field to be designated a Local Green Space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
and the respondent reer to hecessary to participate at the Examination.
Respondent Number: 207 Comment Number: 1
Name: Susan Hayward Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
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 Consisten Not Effective
Not rositively repared Not sustined Not consistent Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
We write to confirm our support for the Beechen Cliff playing fields including the lower field to be designated a Local
Green Space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 211 Comment Number: 1
Name: Elizabeth Glasbey Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 408 of 956

Does the respondent consider th	e document is legally co	ompliant? (Tick if indicated	l 'yes') 🗌
Does the respondent consider th	e document is sound?		
If the respondent considers the I	Oraft Placemaking Plan is	s unsound, is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Consisten	Not Effective
The representation relates to: Vo		Policy LCR6A	

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

11 Mav 2016 Page 409 of 956

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?

	1 rganisation:		
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:			
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attach	nments sent with the comment? No	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is	No s unsound, is it becaus	se it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , F The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	Policy LCR6A		

Q4 Soundness Comment

Placemaking Plan consultation: Land at Beechen Cliff, Bath: Local Green Space

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of 76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum, a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and I understand that

11 Mav 2016 Page 410 of 956

Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. I have the following concerns: -I understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at 2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

-I understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond.

-I understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework -I understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (132) and AONBs (115): this means, I think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

-I understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space

-I understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

Q5 Change Requested

I therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. I believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Does the Respondent wish	to participate at the	Examination	(ticked if ye	s)? L
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------	---------------	-------

١	Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
	Respondent Number: 6023 Con	mment Number: 1			
	Name: Dr Michael Rowe	Orga	nisation:		
	Agent Name:	Ager	nt Organisat	ion:	
	Further Information available in the or	iginal comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 May 2016 Page 411 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)
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 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
I write to register my objection to the decision not to protect this green space from development. (Lower Field Beechen Cliff)
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?
Respondent Number: 7099 Comment Number: 1
Respondent Number: 7099 Comment Number: 1 Name: Lisa Oestreicher Organisation:
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

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

Not Justified

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

O4 Soundness Comment

Not Positively Prepared

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):

Not Consisten 🗸

Not Effective

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage

11 Mav 2016 Page 412 of 956

importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- •We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- •We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

_

11 May 2016 Page 413 of 956

Respondent Number: 7100 Comment Number	r: 1
Name: David Kennedy	Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	nt? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legal Does the respondent consider the document is soun If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking P	
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wid The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	e,Policy LCR6A

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset:

In summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of section 76-77 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!) submitted a proposal to Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. I have the following concerns:

-I understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at 2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- -I understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- -I understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- -I understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (132) and AONBs (115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and

11 Mav 2016 Page 414 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

-I understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

-I understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 5% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

I therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

M	Change	Requested

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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: 710	O1 Comment Number:	1			
	Name: Eric & Juliet Taylor	(Organisation:			
	Agent Name:	ļ	Agent Organi	sation:		
	Further Information available	e in the original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
_						
	Does the respondent consider	er the document is legally co	ompliant? (T	ick if indicate	d 'yes') \square	
	Does the respondent consider	er the document is sound?	No			
	If the respondent considers	the Draft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, i	s it because if	t is (ticked where indicated):	
	Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified 🗹	Not Con	isisten 🗹	Not Effective	
_						
	The representation relates to:	: Volume 1 District Wide ,	Policy LCR6	4		
	The Site Reference (if applicat	ole) is: LGBND11				

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including

11 May 2016 Page 415 of 956

evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- •We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- •We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- •We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Respondent Number:	7102	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Helen Peter		(Organisation:		
Agent Name:		,	Agent Organisat	ion:	
Further Information ava	ailable in t	he original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 Mav 2016 Page 416 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')					
Does the respondent consider the do	ocument is sound? N	0			
If the respondent considers the Draft	Placemaking Plan is ur	nsound, is it because it is	(ticked where indicated):		
Not Positively Prepared ☐ No	ot Justified 🔽	Not Consisten 🗸	Not Effective		
The representation relates to: Volume The Site Reference (if applicable) is: L		icy LCR6A			

Q4 Soundness Comment

Placemaking Plan consultation: Land at Beechen Cliff, Bath: Local Green Space

I have lived near and walked through these playing fields for 40 years and am appalled that you would even consider allowing any building on them. They complement the green space on the other side of the valley, already in the National Trust, and are an essential part of what makes Widcombe and the south of Bath green, pleasant and a world heritage site.

This land belongs to us, the people of Bath, not the school to build boarding houses for Rich Chinese students. This open space is used daily by hundreds of residents, students of the school, dog walkers, visitors and locals and it must remain a public open space. The views from this land and of this land are spectacular and should be enjoyed by us all, not by the privileged few.

If you let this slip, then before long it will be a concreted car park with boarding houses, walkways, further classrooms and probably more buildings. The cherished green space will be lost forever and the Skyline forever blighted and changed. Please, consider the long term and the need for green open spaces and put this before short term greed.

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of 76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at 2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

11 Mav 2016 Page 417 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

-We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (132) and AONBs (115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

-We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50 percent of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

Q5 Change Requested

77 of the NPPF.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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

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

	1 Organisation:						
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:						
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent v	vith 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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not E	ffective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A							
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11							
Q4 Soundness Comment							

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-

11 Mav 2016 Page 418 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 419 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 7106 Comment Nu	umber: 1		
Name: Gail Wilkinson	Organisation:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organi	sation:	
Further Information available in the original cor	mment? No	Attachments sent with the	comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is	legally compliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is	sound? No		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemak	ing Plan is unsound, is	s it because it is (ticked where	indicated):
		sisten \(\square \) Not Effective	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified		Sisteri	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District		_	

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. The Forum has the following concerns:

- Understanding that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- The Forum understands that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- The Forum also understands that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy

11 Mav 2016 Page 420 of 956

Framework, nor any similar;

- It is understood that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- The Forum understands that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- The Forum also understands that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

Due to the facts above, I believe that the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces appears to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?	
Respondent Number: 7108 Comment Number: 1 Name: Bryony Miles Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11 Q4 Soundness Comment	

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also

11 Mav 2016 Page 421 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?	

11 Mav 2016 Page 422 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 7155 Comment Number: 1 Name: Penny Wheeler Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any

11 Mav 2016 Page 423 of 956

~ 1	mi	1	· •

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?

Respondent Number: 7156 Comment Number: 1	1
Name: Rupert Taylor Org	ganisation:
Agent Name: Ag	ent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally condoes the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not residively reparedNot sustined	Not consistent
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy Po	olicy LCR6A
OA Soundness Comment	

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

11 May 2016 Page 424 of 956

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as

11 May 2016 Page 425 of 956

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January	y 2015.	
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	nation (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 7157 Comment Number:	r: 1	
Name: Marina Beare	Organisation:	
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No)
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	?t	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	e,Policy LCR6A	_
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11		

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents

11 Mav 2016 Page 426 of 956

were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7158 Comment Number: 1
Name: Ruth Gairns & Stuart Redman Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

11 Mav 2016 Page 427 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We

11 May 2016 Page 428 of 956

believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?
Respondent Number: 7159 Comment Number: 1 Name: Roger & Alex Chapman Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF. The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information

11 May 2016 Page 429 of 956

about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and

advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

Respondent Number:	7160	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Catriona Rowe		Or	ganisatio	n:	
Agent Name:		Ag	gent Orga	nisation:	
Further Information ava	ilable in	the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 May 2016 Page 430 of 956

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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
I write in support of the proposal to designate the lower playing field at Beechen Cliff School a Local Green Space and its inclusion in the Placemaking Plan. I hope that the Council will re-consider its current decision with respect to this remarkable open space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7161 Comment Number: 1 Name: Jenny Newbury Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

11 May 2016 Page 431 of 956

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage

importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 Mav 2016 Page 432 of 956

Respondent Number: 7162	Comment Number: 1	L			
Name: Roland & Antonia Robe	ertson Or	ganisation	:		
Agent Name:	Ag	ent Organ	isation:		
Further Information available	n the original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider	G ,	npliant? (¯	Fick if indicate	d 'yes')	
If the respondent considers th	e Draft Placemaking Plan is	unsound,	is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Co	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: The Site Reference (if applicable)		olicy LCR6	A		

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters

11 Mav 2016 Page 433 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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

' '	'	•	' '		
Why does the Respondent feel it is	s necessary to participate	at the Exa	mination?		
Respondent Number: 7163 Name: Seemah & Dan Burgess	•	ganisation			
Agent Name:	Age	ent Organi	sation:		
Further Information available in	the original comment?	No	Attachmer	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the Does the respondent consider the	- ,	npliant? (T	ick if indicated	'yes') 🗌	
If the respondent considers the I	Oraft Placemaking Plan is (unsound, i	s it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Con	isisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Vo	olume 1 District Wide,Po	olicy LCR6	A		

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q5 Change Requested

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared

11 May 2016 Page 434 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 435 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

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

Respondent Number: 7165 Comment Number: 1				
Name: Christopher Davies Organisation:				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
This is a representation on the draft B&NES Placemaking Plan, specifically an objection to the decisions made so far to omit designation of open land behind Beechen Cliff in Bath as Local Green Space.				
It appears that Councillors' decisions on this matter were based on advice and information which was partial and potentially inaccurate, for example giving undue weight to certain parts of the National Planning Policy Framework, without also recognising other parts which support a contrary decision. In particular, the apparent failure to recognise the great weight given to heritage and amenity considerations in the NPPF renders the decision, as it currently stands, potentially unsound, and therefore open to objection and review. The fact that Councillors were apparently informed that "50% of the site is also part of the highway" is patently erroneous, as any local resident or local councillor could have informed the committee.				
The decision to not designate the Beechen Cliff site as Local Green Space appears to have been based on incomplete or erroneous information, and also to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure which is expected of decisions on such matters. The current Plan, and decisions taken to approve it, therefore lack soundness, as they are insufficiently justified and inconsistent with overall national policies.				
I therefore urge the Inspector to find the draft Placemaking Plan unsound, and find that the lower part of Beechen Cliff School playing fields be classified as Local Green Space in the new Local Plan.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 7166 Comment Number: 1				
Name: Mara Kalnis Organisation:				
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:				
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No				

11 May 2016 Page 436 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

11 May 2016 Page 437 of 956

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested		

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

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

Respondent Number: 7167 Comment Number:	1				
Name: Claire Barnes Or	rganisation	ı:			
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:					
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally conducted by Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	unsound,				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, P The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	olicy LCR6	A			
OA Soundness Comment					

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage

11 Mav 2016 Page 438 of 956

importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 Mav 2016 Page 439 of 956

Respondent Number:	7168	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Barbara Oatley		0	rganisatio	n:		
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:						
Further Information ava	ilable in	the original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	onsider th		·		, ,	
ii the respondent consid	ders the L	Drait Placemaking Plan is	s unsouna,	is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Co	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation related The Site Reference (if app			Policy LCR6	δA		

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters

11 Mav 2016 Page 440 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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

Respondent Number:	7169	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Michael Lee		Or	ganisation:			
Agent Name:		Ag	ent Organisa	ition:		
Further Information av	ailable in t	he original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent of	onsider the	e document is legally cor	mpliant? (Tic	k if indicated	d 'yes') 🗆	
Does the respondent of	onsider the	e document is sound?				
If the respondent cons	iders the D	raft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is i	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
	d 🗌	Not Justified		sten 🗌	Not Effective	

Q4 Soundness Comment

Q5 Change Requested

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared

11 Mav 2016 Page 441 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 442 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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: 7170 Comment Number: 1 Name: Sara & Nick Loxton Organisation: 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') \qed
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF. The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association. Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents; - We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

11 May 2016 Page 443 of 956

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?

Respondent Number: 7171 Comment Number: Name: Annemarie Osmond	1 Organisation:			
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:			
Further Information available in the original comment?	P 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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11				
Q4 Soundness Comment				

11 Mav 2016 Page 444 of 956

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a

proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

11 May 2016 Page 445 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?				
Agent Name:	Organisation: Agent Organisat		s sont with the som	mont? No.
Further Information available in the original comment?	P No	Attachment	s sent with the com	ment? 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 Consis	ten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide of The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	, Policy LCR6A			

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of 76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:
-We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations

would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district,

11 Mav 2016 Page 446 of 956

residents of Bath are not represented by either	Town or Parish Councils,	and that extra effort is n	eeded to reach these
residents;			

- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- -We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50 percent of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous. We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 7173 Comment Number: 3				
Name: Geoffrey and Alexandra Dart Organisation:				
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11				

11 Mav 2016 Page 447 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of p76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

-We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at p2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (p132) and AONBs (p115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- -We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- -We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50 percent of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as

11 May 2016 Page 448 of 956

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 7174 Comment Number: 1			
Name: Catherine Smith Organisation:			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the			
draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a			
proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.			
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared			
in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also			
supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the			
Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.			
setting the green space is situated) and the somerset Playing Fields Association.			
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage			
importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including			
evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).			
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:			
- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted			

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents

about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish

Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

11 Mav 2016 Page 449 of 956

Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information

were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?

Respondent Number: 7175	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Christopher Smith	Or	ganisation:		
Agent Name:	Ag	ent Organisatio	n:	
Further Information available in th	ne original comment?	No A	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 Di	raft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is it b	ecause it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Consiste	n Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11				

11 Mav 2016 Page 450 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We

11 May 2016 Page 451 of 956

believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the

lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 7176 Comment Number: 1 Name: Mr & Mrs SJ Gobley Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11			
Q4 Soundness Comment			

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and

11 May 2016 Page 452 of 956

advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.
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?

Respondent Number: 7177	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Joanna Day & Mervyn H	eard	Organisa	ation:	
Agent Name:		Agent O	rganisation:	
Further Information available in	the original comment?	? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 May 2016 Page 453 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed				
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 \(\square\)	Not Justified	Not Consisten	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11				
0.4.5				

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

11 Mav 2016 Page 454 of 956

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested	

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

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

Respondent Number	r: 7178	Comment Number: 1	-				
Name: Mario Pavan Organisation:							
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:							
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachme					nts 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 Consisten Not Effective							
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11							
OA Soundness Comme	nt						

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage

11 May 2016 Page 455 of 956

importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 Mav 2016 Page 456 of 956

Respondent Number: 7179	Comment Number: 1	-			
Name: Jeremy & Lorraine Vivian	Orę	ganisation	:		
Agent Name:	Age	ent Organ	isation:		
Further Information available in t	he original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the	σ,	npliant? (1	ick if indicated	d 'yes') 🗆	
If the respondent considers the D	raft Placemaking Plan is	unsound,	is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified \square	Not Co	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective \square	
The representation relates to: Vo The Site Reference (if applicable) is		olicy LCR6	A		

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters

11 Mav 2016 Page 457 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to parti	icipate a	at the Exam	ination?			
Respondent Number: 7180 Comment Numb	er: 1					
Name: Peter & Lyn Ward	Org	anisation:				
Agent Name:	Age	nt Organisa	tion:			
Further Information available in the original comme	ent?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the o	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legal	•	pliant? (Ticl	k if indicate	d 'yes') 🗌		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking F	Plan is u	nsound, is i	t because i	t is (ticked where in	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared $\ \square$ Not Justified $\ \square$		Not Consi	sten 🗌	Not Effective		
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Win The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	de , Po	licy LCR6A				

Q4 Soundness Comment

Q5 Change Requested

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared

11 Mav 2016 Page 458 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 459 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order) Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

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

Respondent Number: 7181 Comment Number: 1 Name: Maria Christina Lopez Garcia Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF. The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association. Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including
evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

11 May 2016 Page 460 of 956

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested		

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

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

Respondent Number: 7182	Comment Number: 1	1			
Name: Sue & John Menage	Or	ganisation	:		
Agent Name:	Ag	ent Organ	isation:		
Further Information available in	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Danatha wasan danta a maidant	h - d	!:+2 /3			
Does the respondent consider t	he document is legally cor	npliant? (1	ick 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 Cor	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: V	olume 1 District Wide,P	olicy LCR6	A		
The Site Reference (if applicable)	is: LGBND11				
Q4 Soundness Comment					

11 May 2016 Page 461 of 956

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a

proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

11 May 2016 Page 462 of 956

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as

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?
Respondent Number: 7183 Comment Number: 1 Name: C M Hayward Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF. The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations. Residents' Associations

11 Mav 2016 Page 463 of 956

and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information

about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish

Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi
alteram partem; - We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any
similar; - We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.
We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.
I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7184 Comment Number: 1
Name: Eugenia Viu Organisation:
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') $\ \ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 464 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the

11 Mav 2016 Page 465 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)
highway", which was factually erroneous.
We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.
I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7186 Comment Number: 1 Name: Ben Sandbrook Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the

Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association. Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that

Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of

11 May 2016 Page 466 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Set out in the proposal put to the country of 1 1 Juniary 2013.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

		_			
Respondent Number:	7187	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Prof. Charles Lees	5	0	Organisation:		
Agent Name:		А	Agent Organisa	tion:	
Further Information available	lable in t	the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 Mav 2016 Page 467 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed						
Does the respondent consider	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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐					
The representation relates to: The Site Reference (if applicable)		Policy LCR6A				

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

11 Mav 2016 Page 468 of 956

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal. - We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous. We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies. I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015. 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? Respondent Number: 7188 Comment Number: 1 Name: Nina Peregrine-Jones Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$

Does the respondent consider the document is sound?

Further Information available in the original comment?

If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):

No

Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not Effective

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage

11 Mav 2016 Page 469 of 956

importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 Mav 2016 Page 470 of 956

Respondent Number:	7189	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Irene Macias		C	rganisation:			
Agent Name:		А	gent Organi	sation:		
Further Information avai	ilable in th	ne original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent con Does the respondent con If the respondent consid	nsider the	document is sound?			I 'yes') is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Con	sisten 🗌	Not Effective	
		4 5:	n !:			
The representation relate The Site Reference (if app			Policy LCR6	1		

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters

11 Mav 2016 Page 471 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?

Respondent Number: 7190 Comment Number:	1					
Name: Rebecca Aldous C	Organisation:					
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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11						
O4 Soundness Comment						

77 of the NPPF. The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-

East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared 11 May 2016

Page 472 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 473 of 956

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

why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	ate at the Exam	ination?		
Respondent Number: 7191 Comment Number:	1			
Name: Tim & Lesley Kemp	Organisation:			
Agent Name:	Agent Organisa	ition:		
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Attachment	s sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally		k if indicated '	yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	?			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	n is unsound, is i	it because it is	(ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consi	sten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	, Policy LCR6A			

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

11 Mav 2016 Page 474 of 956

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7192 Comment Number: 1 Name: Karen & Trevor Aldous Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
04 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a

11 May 2016 Page 475 of 956

proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

11 May 2016 Page 476 of 956

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box					
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?					
Respondent Number: 7193 Comment Number: 1					
Name: Brendan Sweetman Organisation:					
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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A					
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
I have received information from the Greenway residents assoc. that the lower playing field at Beechen Cliff school has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan as a designated green space.					
I understand this was agreed at a private meeting of councillors based on a private objection by the school based on a mistaken view that the National Planning policy framework ref. educational use does not allow school property to be designated a green space.					
The way this decision was reached flies in face of the Councils' express wish to ensure full involvement of local residents in the formulation of the Placemaking Plan - surely holding a meeting to discuss a private intervention in private as part of an open and involved community activity is an oxymoron.					
Given that the basis for this decision also lead to the private meeting ignoring issues related to the stated need to consider Heritage assets and accepting an erroneous statement that 50% of the 4.5 Acres is highway, make it imperative that this issue is discussed allowing public access and with a view to making a properly informed decision.					
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box					
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?					

11 May 2016 Page 477 of 956

Respondent Number: 7194 Comment Number: 1					
Name: Fiona Sweetman Organisation:					
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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
The lower field at Beechen Cliff is a valuable and valued amenity used by both pupils at the school and members of the public, local and visiting; a really useful, relatively flat area which becomes even more useful in conjunction with Beechen Cliff and the Two Tunnels via the Bloomfield Road open space. I would like to see it continue with its present use and object very strongly that the council's previous decision to include it as such in their Local Plan has been overturned at the request of the school. As I understand that the grounds for the school's objection is based on a misrepresentation of the facts I would ask the council to reconsider and take into account a more democratic view of the situation. If the school intend to continue using it as at present they would not need to stop its inclusion in the Local Plan as Local Green Space; one can only conclude that they wish to develop it in spite of the fact that OFSTED has previously noted the school's own need for outdoor space. Once built on the open space will be gone for ever. It is also worrying that the school saw fit to approach the Council for a private meeting which excluded debate with the general public. Is this because they felt their facts to be erroneous? Inclusion as open space in the Local Plan validates Council policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site but does not exclude the school from using the open space for their own activities.					
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?					
Respondent Number: 7195 Comment Number: 1 Name: Yvonne Elston & Mark Thompson Organisation: 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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Consisten \(\square\) Not Effective \(\square\)					

11 May 2016 Page 478 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the

11 Mav 2016 Page 479 of 956

highway", which was factually erroneous.
We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent win national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

·	t feel it is necessary to participate	,	•		
Respondent Number: Name: Claudia Huckle		1 rganisation:			
Agent Name:		gent Organisat	tion:		
	ilable in the original comment?	No		sent with the commer	nt? No
Does the respondent con	nsider the document is legally consider the document is sound? Hers the Draft Placemaking Plan is				d):
Not Positively Prepared	-	Not Consis		Not Effective	,
The representation relates The Site Reference (if appl	es to: Volume 1 District Wide,F dicable) is: LGBND11	olicy LCR6A			
Q4 Soundness Comment					
draft Plan is unsound, on the	n the draft Placemaking Plan for E the grounds that it is not justified ehind Beechen Cliff in the city of	and not consi	istent with nation	onal policy, in that it o	mits a
East Somerset Council on 1 in the Placemaking Plan as supported by the Widcomb Ramblers' Association, the	ents' Forum (Greenway!), a resid 14 January 2015 a proposal that I s a Local Green Space. The propo be Association, the Bath Preserva e Federation of Bath Residents' A situated) and the Somerset Playin	land at Beeche sal was suppo ation Trust, th ssociations, th	en Cliff used by orted by over 40 e National Trus ne Cotswolds Co	Beechen Cliff School b 30 local residents. It w st, the Bath branch of t	be declared was also the
importance (a summary of Greenway! will be submitti	rovided of the active community of the key conservation issues high ting in evidence a copy of the full nunity importance, health and ot	nlighted is app application as	ended to this le	etter, and we understa	and that

11 Mav 2016 Page 480 of 956

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:
- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2013.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

				·	
Respondent Number:	7197	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Clare Holloway		Or	ganisatio	n:	
Agent Name:		Ag	gent Orga	nisation:	
Further Information ava	ilable in	the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 Mav 2016 Page 481 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box						
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 Consisten	Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11						

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar:
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

11 Mav 2016 Page 482 of 956

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

 We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately EOV, of the site is also part of the
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked i	fyes)?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	oate at the Exa	amination?	
Respondent Number: 7198 Comment Number:	: 1		
Name: Charlotte Randall	Organisation	n:	
Agent Name:	Agent Organ	isation:	
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally			
boes the respondent consider the document is regard	compliant? (Fick if indicated 'yes') \square	

If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):

Not Consisten

Not Effective

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

Not Justified

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

Not Positively Prepared

Q5 Change Requested

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage

11 Mav 2016 Page 483 of 956

importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 Mav 2016 Page 484 of 956

Respondent Number:	7199	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Sarah Lynott		Or	ganisatio	n:		
Agent Name:		Ag	ent Orgar	nisation:		
Further Information ava	ailable in	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	onsider th		·		is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	<u> </u>	Not Justified	Not Co	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relat The Site Reference (if ap		olume 1 District Wide , P is: LGBND11	olicy LCR6	ōΑ		

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters

11 Mav 2016 Page 485 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

O	5	Change	Real	ested
u	J	CHAHE	: neut	iesten

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:	7199	Comment Number:	1				
Name: Sarah Lynott		C)rganisatior	n:			
Agent Name:		A	gent Orgar	nisation:			
Further Information ava	ilable in t	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the	comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsidar th	e document is legally of	omnliant? (Tick if indicated	1 'vec')		
·		σ,	, ,	rick ii iiiuicatet	a yes /		
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is sound?	No				
If the respondent consid	lers the D	Praft Placemaking Plan	s unsound,	is it because it	is (ticked where i	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified 🗸	Not Co	nsisten 🗸	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relate	s to: Vo	lume 1 District Wide,	Policy LCR6	δA			
The Site Reference (if app	olicable) i	s: LGBND11					

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of pp76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared

11 Mav 2016 Page 486 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested

11 Mav 2016 Page 487 of 956

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

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participat	te at the Exa	mination?		
Respondent Number: 7200 Comment Number:	1			
Name: Catherine Williams	Organisation	:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organi	sation:		
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally co	ompliant? (T	ick if indicate	d 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?				
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan i	is unsound, i	s it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Cor	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide ,	Policy LCR6	4		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11				

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;

11 May 2016 Page 488 of 956

- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the

lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7201 Comment Number: 1
Name: Sarah Lynott Organisation:
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 Sustified Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11 O4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a

11 May 2016 Page 489 of 956

proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

11 May 2016 Page 490 of 956

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

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?
Respondent Number: 7202 Comment Number: 1 Name: Margarida & John Dolan Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.
The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.
Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).
However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: - We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information.

11 May 2016 Page 491 of 956

noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish

Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

Schedule of Dary Made comments received (in Flati Order)
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.
We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.
I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7203 Comment Number: 1
Name: Kevin de Las Casa Organisation:
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):

11 May 2016 Page 492 of 956

Not Consisten

Not Effective

Not Justified

Not Positively Prepared

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents; We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem; We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar; We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight"

considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with

11 May 2016 Page 493 of 956

national policies. I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7204 Comment Number: 1
Name: Heather Rosswhite Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
Can't believe this beautiful space is being considered, when there are so many ugly unused options that would benefit from any change at all. !!! That also goes for the Bathampton meadows toowhat are you thinking about planners?.makes no sense at allexcept perhaps for a few greedy individual intereststhat's very lowand short termand exceedingly ignorant, not to mention corruptthis decade is about exposing corruption. Preserving the good that is left. Ignore this at your peril, it WILL COME BACK TO BITE YOU
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7205 Comment Number: 1 Name: Ann & Derek Prosser Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 494 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
We should like to ask you to add our names to the many hundreds of people and several relevant organisations who have asked that the Lower Playing Field at Beechen Cliff School is made a Local Green Space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7206 Comment Number: 1
Name: Robert Clacey Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
understand that the proposal to include the lower playing field of Beechen Cliff School was turned down on a technicality. As a resident of Bear Flat I ask that this is rectified and the playing field is made a Local Green Space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
with does the Respondent reel it is necessary to participate at the Examination:
Respondent Number: 7207 Comment Number: 1
Name: Clive & Nina Pugh Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 495 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
We write to confirm our support for the Beechen Cliff playing fields including the lower field to be designated a Local Green Space.
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?
Respondent Number: 7208 Comment Number: 1
Name: Gill & John Hawkins Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
I am emailing in response to a leaflet that has come through my door, the ideas of which my husband and I fully support. We request that the lower playing field at beechen Cliff school is made a 'local green space'.
This lower field is certainly well used for exercise and recreation and it would be a sad loss to local residents if this were ever taken.
I would be grateful if you would take our opinion into consideration .
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 496 of 956

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

Schedule of Duty Made comments received (in Flati Order)	
Respondent Number: 7209 Comment Number: 1 Name: Alan Gait Organisation:	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
I fully support the proposal that this Playing Field be designated as a Local Green Space.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 7210 Comment Number: 1	

Respondent Number: 7210 Comment Number: 1		
Name: Jonathan Barnes Org	ganisation:	
Agent Name: Age	ent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attac	chments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally composes the respondent consider the document is sound?	pliant? (Tick if indi	cated 'yes')
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is u	unsound, is it becau	use it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten	Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Po The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11	olicy LCR6A	
Q4 Soundness Comment		
Please find enclosed a request to review the recent unsucces Beechen Cliff School as a 'Local Green Space'	ssful request for de	signation of the lower playing field at

supporting and not opposing policies, including but not limited to - thinking wrongly that a school site cannot be designated

Review of the process indicates that the decision was based on incorrect information, and judicious selection of only

- that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which is

11 May 2016 Page 497 of 956

factually erroneous. I attach a more detailed letter raising the same and additional points in greater detail, with the expectation of a fair,
factually correct and tranparent review.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7211 Comment Number: 1
Name: M J Stephens Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
Just to say that I feel very strongly that the lower field should be designated an open green space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7212 Comment Number: 1
Name: Tim Williams Organisation:
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') $\ \square$
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 \square Not Justified \square Not Consisten \square Not Effective \square

11 May 2016 Page 498 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the

11 Mav 2016 Page 499 of 956

highway", which was fac	ctually erroneous.	

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

setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

Q5 Change Requested

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Respondent Number: 7218	Comment Number: 1	•		
Name: Peter Hayward	Org	ganisation:		
Agent Name:	Ago	ent Organi	sation:	
Further Information available in th	ne original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the	document is legally con	npliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the	document is sound?			
If the respondent considers the Dr	raft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, i	s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Con	sisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volu	ume 1 District Wide ,Po	olicy LCR6	A	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	LGBND11			
Q4 Soundness Comment				
draft Plan is unsound, on the ground	ds that it is not justified a	and not co	orth East Somerset: in summary, I consider the nsistent with national policy, in that it omits a signated as a Local Green Space in terms of §	a
The Greenway Lane Residents' Foru	• •		ation in the area, submitted to the Bath and	

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including

Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose

11 May 2016 Page 500 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.
- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.
- We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Set out in the proposal put to the council on 14 January 2013.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

Respondent Number:	7219	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Tony Farrelly		(Organisatio	ո։	
Agent Name:		,	Agent Orgai	nisation:	
Further Information ava	ailable in	the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 Mav 2016 Page 501 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed				
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 Consisten	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11				

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns:

- We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents;

- We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar;
- We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight" considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

11 May 2016 Page 502 of 956

- We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal. - We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 2015.

Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish	to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent	feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?
Respondent Number:	7223 Comment Number:	1
Name: Jamie & Julie Sout	:h	Organisation:

Agent Name:	Ag	ent Organis	ation:			
Further Information available in	n the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?		comment?	No		
Does the respondent consider th	e document is legally con	npliant? (Tid	ck if indicated 'y	/es') 🗌		
Does the respondent consider th	e document is sound?					
If the respondent considers the I	Draft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is	it because it is	(ticked where i	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Cons	isten 🗌	Not Effective		

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

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11

Q4 Soundness Comment

Agent Name

This is a representation on the draft Placemaking Plan for Bath and North East Somerset: in summary, I consider that the draft Plan is unsound, on the grounds that it is not justified and not consistent with national policy, in that it omits a proposal that open land behind Beechen Cliff in the city of Bath be designated as a Local Green Space in terms of §§76-77 of the NPPF.

The Greenway Lane Residents' Forum (Greenway!), a residents' association in the area, submitted to the Bath and North East Somerset Council on 14 January 2015 a proposal that land at Beechen Cliff used by Beechen Cliff School be declared in the Placemaking Plan as a Local Green Space. The proposal was supported by over 400 local residents. It was also supported by the Widcombe Association, the Bath Preservation Trust, the National Trust, the Bath branch of the Ramblers' Association, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Cotswolds Conservation Board (within whose setting the green space is situated) and the Somerset Playing Fields Association.

Extensive evidence was provided of the active community use of the green space, and also its amenity and heritage

11 May 2016 Page 503 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

importance (a summary of the key conservation issues highlighted is appended to this letter, and we understand that Greenway! will be submitting in evidence a copy of the full application as originally put in to the Council, including evidence relating to community importance, health and other matters).

However, the green space has not been included in the draft Placemaking Plan. We have the following concerns: We understand that the decision on which green spaces were to be included was made by a private committee of Councillors to which the public did not have access and without notice to Greenway!, even though the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) had undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and that Residents Associations would also be used as a way of disseminating information, noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, and that extra effort is needed to reach these residents; We understand that the decision was influenced by a private objection from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of audi alteram partem; We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that the site was "exempt" from designation since it was in educational use, although there is no such statement in the National Planning Policy Framework, nor any similar; We understand that the decision was influenced by advice from officers that there was "great weight in national policy to allow the future expansion and reconfiguration of schools" but that this advice omitted other relevant matters in a contrary sense to which the NPPF also gives "great weight" such as heritage assets (§132) and AONBs (§115): this means, we think, that the Council was obliged to show that it had considered carefully the balance between the "great weight"

considerations in this case, and the Council failed to meet this obligation. Indeed, the advice wholly ignored amenity and heritage considerations, and in particular the Council's own policies on the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP "attached particular... importance". It was therefore partial and biased.

We understand that the decision was made on the basis of advice from officers which did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to the Local Green Space proposal.

We understand that the decision was influenced by a statement "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway", which was factually erroneous.

We therefore believe the decision to exclude the Beechen Cliff site from the Local Green Spaces to have been based on incomplete information and erroneous information, and to have lacked the necessary openness of procedure. We believe that in respect of this proposal the Plan lacks soundness because it is insufficiently justified, and inconsistent with national policies.

I therefore urge the Inspector to find that the draft Placemaking Plan is unsound in this respect, and to find that the

lower part of the Beechen Cliff School playing fields should	d be classified in the new Local Plan as Local Green Space, as
set out in the proposal put to the Council on 14 January 201	015.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	
Respondent Number: 7225 Comment Number: 1	1
Name: Dr Ann Tonge Org	Organisation:
Agent Name: Ag	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 504 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide Delicy I CD6A
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
Can't believe this beautiful space is being considered, when there are so many ugly unused options that would benefit from any change at all. !!! That also goes for the Bathampton meadows toowhat are you thinking about planners?.makes no sense at allexcept perhaps for a few greedy individual intereststhat's very lowand short termand exceedingly ignorant, not to mention corruptthis decade is about exposing corruption. Preserving the good that is left. Ignore this at your peril, it WILL COME BACK TO BITE YOU
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?
Respondent Number: 225 Comment Number: 2 Name: Virginia Williamson Organisation: Bath & North East Somerset Allotments Associati 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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGBND40
Q4 Soundness Comment

Q5 Change Requested

If Lyncombe Vale South former allotments fall within, and are protected by, Green Belt designation, then this should be made clear in the Local Green Spaces report and it should be correctly listed. If the site does not have Green Belt protection, then it should be designated as a Local Green Space so that it is protected for its tranquillity, habitat and

application form, which is very descriptive and has numerous photographs.) The site just falls within the Green Belt - if that was the justification for objecting to the designation, then that would be understandable. But that is not the reason

given and, since it has been incorrectly listed as being in Weston ward, this cannot be assumed.

11 May 2016 Page 505 of 956

community resource.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Pachandant Number: 7001 Comment Number: 1
Respondent Number: 7081 Comment Number: 1 Name: David Vickery Organisation:
,
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Accommends sent with the comment:
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
The lovely green open space to the east of Teviot Park is a local amenity that cannot be built on, because it is used by my
family for walks and all the local community of East Keynsham, not just those few houses that front onto it. We were
never given the chance to nominate this land as 'Local Green Space' in BANES' local plan for its should be held as a "residential amenity" for the local community.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7082 Comment Number: 2
Name: Peggy Nethercott Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
The local people should have been given the right to nominate the land to the east of Teyiot Park, Keynsham as a

11 May 2016 Page 506 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order) ential amenity, a 'Local Green Space' in BANES local plan but we were not given the chance

residential amenity, a 'Local Green Space' in BANES local plan but we were not given the chance.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7084 Comment Number: 2
Name: Diane Tranter Organisation:
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
The green open space to the east of Teviot Park is an area used by all the local community for dog walking, picnics, nature walks and general enjoyment. It is a residential amenity and should therefore not be built on. My understanding in that was about the constitution of the constitu
is that we should have been given the chance to nominate this land as 'Local Green Space'
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7085 Comment Number: 2
Name: M Hanks Organisation:
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓

11 May 2016 Page 507 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
In order for BANES to allow this point to 'slip through the net' they did not allow the chance for the community to nominate this land as 'Local Green Space' in BANES. Shame on those representatives.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7087 Comment Number: 2
Name: David Briffett Organisation:
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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
1. The area concerned is a local amenity which should have been nominated as "Local Green Space" in BANES Local Plan.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Despendent with to participate at the Evernination (ticked if vec)?
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7088 Comment Number: 1
Name: Irene Pearce Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 508 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
There are serious breaches of planning control for the above proposed development. The open space east of Teviot Park cannot be built on as it is used by people who live beyond those residents local to the proposed development. It is a residential amenity and should not be built upon. We should be given the right to nominate this land as "local green space" in the BaNES local plan. We have not been given the chance to do this.
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?
Respondent Number: 7089 Comment Number: 1 Name: Nicola Rodway Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment I write to protest that I was not given the opportunity to nominate the green open space, east of Teviot Park as local
green space in the BANES local plan. Whilst my property may not front on to it, it is land used by the local community and as such I walk my dog daily in this area and accompany my son to school and back and have done for several years.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 509 of 956

Respondent Number: 7090 Comment Number: 2
Name: Nathan Moss Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
The green open space to the east of Teviot Park is a local amenity that cannot be built on, because it is used by all the local community of East Keynsham, not just those few houses that front onto it ("residential amenity" for the local community is the legal precedent here - and also we should have been given the right to nominate this land as 'Local Green Space' in BANES' local plan but we were never given that chance.
Q5 Change Requested
December December 1 with the provision to get the Franciscotion (tipled if we)?
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: 7091 Comment Number: 1
Name: John Leatherbarrow Organisation:
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11

My first point is the green open space to the east of Keynsham and adjacent to Teviot Road is a local amenity criss-crossed by age old footpaths that cannot and should not be built upon because it is used by the local community - children use it to play ball games, fly kites, etc and generally relax with their parents and family. Also, older children practice netball/basketball on the hard court. Dog walkers come from all over the area to walk through the beautiful fields and wild meadow and also by ramblers/walkers. The legal precedent here is "residential amenity for the local community" and the residents should have been given a chance to nominate this land as local GREEN SPACE in Banes local plan but were never given that opportunity.

11 May 2016 Page 510 of 956

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?
Respondent Number: 7092 Comment Number: 1 Name: William Kerr Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
The plan submitted by Mactaggart & Mickel takes no account of the fact that the fields east and north of Teviot Park have been used for decades by the residents of a large part of the Chandag estate and therefore should have been actively considered for Local Green Space status. The fact that this has not happened represents a breach of planning control.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7093 Comment Number: 1
Name: Anne and Steve Asprey Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
The current green open space has been a local amenity for many years to the public who live in East Keynsham.

11 May 2016 Page 511 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Apparently opportunity to nominate this land as Local Green Space was not given by BANES as part of their local plan. At present all other houses in the area have their fronts opening on to green space, with access roads at the rear of the properties. The proposed current plan takes no notice of this at all.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7096 Comment Number: 2
Name: Bob Elcome Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The manuscratetion maleton to Malama 4 District Mide Della 16064
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGKND11
The Site Reference (II applicable) is: LGKND11
Q4 Soundness Comment
This is something that is a key part of the character of this part of the Wellsway estate. Unlike most estates it was specifically designed so that houses open their front doors onto green space with the roads at the rear. This character was further supported by the local amenity greenspace known locally as Breaches Gate (the area of open space lying between Breaches Lane and Breaches Wood to the east of Keynsham park, featuring an open aspect through the Avon Valley and the Cotswold landmarks of Kelston Mount and Lansdown). This area has been used for generations (with the full permission of the landowners) as Local Green Space for the local community dog walking and recreation for local children. It is the right of the local community to keep this amenity and not have it removed by builders.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7066 Comment Number: 1 Name: Stephen and Sharon Tovey Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 512 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGRND28
Q4 Soundness Comment We are pleased to see that the large area put forward by Hinton Blewett Parish Council, which included land at Westend Farm House, has not been considered suitable to be designated as Green Space/Open Space. We agree fully with the BANES inspector's assessment to refuse this site as a Green Space/Open Space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$ Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7072 Comment Number: 1 Name: Christopher Whitmarsh Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGRND28
Q4 Soundness Comment am pleased to see the large area of land put forward by Hinton Blewett Parish Council, that includes land at Homefields, has not been considered suitable to be designated as green/open space (map attached as confirmation of area under discussion). agree fully with the BANES inspector's assessment to refuse this site as a green/open space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7076 Comment Number: 1 Name: Lilian Richards Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 513 of 956

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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGRND28
Q4 Soundness Comment
I am pleased to see that the large area of land put forward by Hinton Blewett Parish Council that includes land owned by me at Elm Close, has not been considered suitable to be designated as green/open space(map attached). I agree fully with the BANES inspectors assessment to refuse this site as green/open space.
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?
Respondent Number: 3094 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: Purnell Property Partnership Agent Name: Neil Rowley Agent Organisation: Savills 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy LCR6A The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGRND49
Q4 Soundness Comment
Proposals Map – Local Green Space We were notified by letter dated 26th September 2015 that part of the site could be allocated as a Local Green Space. We had no issue with this in principle other than that some of the area that had been nominated as a Local Green Space actually had permission for development under the outline consent. However, it appears that the proposed Local Green Space nomination has not been carried through to the Draft Plan as it is not shown on the 'on-line' proposals map. If this Local Green Space is nominated again we would ask the Council to compare the nomination with the outline planning consent in order that areas of land that were permitted for development are not included.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 514 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 435

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 11					
Name: John Webb Organisation:					
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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 435					
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
Despite all that has been said in the past under the heading of Sport and Recreational Facilities no mention is made of the river or indeed the canal. Recreational development proposals affecting waterways are dealt with at Paragraph 435.					
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box					
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?					

11 May 2016 Page 515 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR7B

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 18 Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey 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 1 District Wide, Policy LCR7B The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment The responsibilities of the various parties for providing broadband facilities in the manner set out in the policy is unclear. Consequently the policy expectations are unclear to the decision maker (and others) contrary to the NPPF paragraph154. This undermines the potential effectiveness of the policy. In particular, what exactly is expected from developers? And when the policy asserts that "Appropriate technology will be identified that will enable the delivery of superfast broadband infrastructure as part of infrastructure planning" who is responsible for doing so?
Q5 Change Requested Edit policy to make responsibilities clear. Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 27 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ☑
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy LCR7B The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 516 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy LCR7B - Broadband and Paragraphs 443-448

This section and in particular the policy is unnecessarily repetitive and lacks clarity and needs to be completely redrafted. Paragraph 3 of the policy merely repeats paragraph 2. Paragraphs 3 and 4 could be incorporated into a single paragraph either 1 or 2. The viability test needs to be reworded, it is entirely possible that the provision of the alternative suggested could also render the development unviable.

However paragraph 448 raises doubts about the appropriateness of the policy itself. This says 'it is recognised that the availability of such infrastructure may vary across the district'. In addition the last sentence of paragraph 448 is unclear and needs to be reworded.

We do not consider it is our place to provide alternative wording for a section of the plan which has been so badly drafted. The Council should redraft the section and re-consult prior to any examination. This policy is not positive or effective.

епестіче.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 Mav 2016 Page 517 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy LCR9

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number	: 19	
Name:	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd	
Agent Name: Martin Bailey	Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey	
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	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 Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective □	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Policy LCR9	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
•	ential development (including purpose built student corporate opportunities for informal food growing, wherever tion. There is no suggestion of such a requirement in adopted	
·		
Q5 Change Requested Delete paragraph 3 of the policy		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate.		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?	
	coate at the Examination?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participose. Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number	pate at the Examination?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participal Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name:	coate at the Examination? : 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation:	No
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name:	: 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: 1. No Attachments sent with the comment?	10
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	coate at the Examination? : 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	10
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	coate at the Examination? : 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	10
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	coate at the Examination? : 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	10
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	coate at the Examination? : 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? In is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective □	No
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	coate at the Examination? : 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? In is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective □	No
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number Name: Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	oate at the Examination? : 28 Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley Agent Organisation: t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ? In is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective . Policy LCR9	No

11 May 2016 Page 518 of 956

Paragraph 5 introduces standards set out in the Green Space Strategy and the Planning Obligations SPD within the statutory Local Plan Policy. This is inappropriate and SPDs should not be used to introduce additional costs and standards or incorporate additional policy requirements set out in the SPD. This policy is contrary to National Policy.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 519 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 466

Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number:	3
Name: Nicholas Stubbs	Organisation:
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	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	, Para 466
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
p177 466: sense "lower-value activities lost" surely "high	ner-value" in the context
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ition (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	ate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 520 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 485

Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 4
Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 485
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Existing Article 4 directions already severely limit the total number of HMOs in Bath which has significant consequences for students, young professionals, people on low incomes etc. Article 4 directions in parts of the city that don't have a large number of HMOs will limit the diversity of areas and therefore prevent integrated communities. An increasing proportion of the population aren't living in traditional family units and so this needs to be recognised. Additional Article 4 directions will also cause difficulties for strong transport links to be developed and therefore encouraging more car use which is against the Council's aims. Student developments across the city will support the diversity of its make up but also provide economic benefits such as infrastructure and both direct and indirect spending.
Q5 Change Requested
The Council should not consider additional Article 4 directions
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?
There is significant concern that student housing needs will not be met
Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 5
Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □

11 May 2016 Page 521 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 485

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Existing Article 4 directions already severely limit the total number of HMOs in Bath which has significant consequences for students, young professionals, people on low incomes etc. Article 4 directions in parts of the city that don't have a large number of HMOs will limit the diversity of areas and therefore prevent integrated communities. An increasing proportion of the population aren't living in traditional family units and so this needs to be recognised. Additional Article 4 directions will also cause difficulties for strong transport links to be developed and therefore encouraging more car use which is against the Council's aims. Student developments across the city will support the diversity of its make up but also provide economic benefits such as infrastructure and both direct and indirect spending.

Q5 Change Requested

The Council should not consider additional Article 4 directions

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?

There is significant concern that student housing needs will not be met

11 May 2016 Page 522 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ED1B

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Numb	er: 14				
Name:	Orga	anisation:	Deeley Freed	Estates Ltd and DFE Pro	jects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey					
Further Information available in the original comm	ent?	No	Attachmer	nts sent with the comme	nt? No
Does the respondent consider the document is leg	ally comi	nliant? (Tic	k if indicated	'ves')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sou			II III aleatea	yes	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking		nsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where indicated	d):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)		Not Cons	isten 🗸	Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District W	ide , Pol	licy ED1B			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
This draft policy is long, rather convoluted and esote reservations are twofold:	ric with I	both descr	iptive materi	al and draft policy. The p	orincipal
1) Clause 3b uses many terms and data items known can be no clear indication to the public, developers of development proposal.	-				
2) No reference is made to national policy that: "Plan allocated for employment use where there is no rease paragraph 22).				•	
Q5 Change Requested					
1) Edit the policy to take out non-policy material and	to conta	ain only cri	teria which c	an be assessed by all par	ties.
2) Add reference in the policy to NPPF paragraph 22 policy.	and ensu	ure that dr	aft policy ED1	LB is consistent with that	national
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Exan	nination	(ticked if y	es)?		

11 May 2016 Page 523 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ED1C

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 21 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd 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 1 District Wide , Policy ED1C
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The intent of the policy is understood, but the policy is too broad in its application and as a consequence would prevent a potential change of use of office space that would have an equivalent economic benefit for the city. The University is actively pursuing off campus opportunities to meet its operational accommodation requirements, and therefore, a change of use to D1 use could be justified given the wider economic benefits that directly derive from the University's activities. The policy should, therefore, be revised to facilitate those opportunities.
Q5 Change Requested
The policy should be revised to facilitate opportunities for the change of use of B1(A) premises that would have an equivalent economic benefit for the city, including D1 use .
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 15
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey
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 1 District Wide , Policy ED1C The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 524 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

By cross-referring to Clause 3b of draft Policy ED1B, the policy becomes subject to the same criticisms as set out in the separate representation made in respect of that policy. (Please see separate representation on ED1B).

Q5 Change Requested

Edit para 1 of the policy to refer only to criteria which can be assessed by all parties in an amended Policy ED1B. In addition, make reference to NPPG paragraph 22 and ensure that policyED1C is consistent with it to avoid sterilizing land.

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?

11 May 2016 Page 525 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ED2A

Although not an employment land user or developer, given the restrictions placed on future university development by

11 May 2016

Page 526 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

other draft policies within this plan, BSU considers it necessary to comment on how these policies may enable its future growth to be met sustainably.

Core Employment Areas as designated by the Local Plan have been reviewed and updated for draft Policy ED.2A of the Placemaking Plan, and amended into two categories: Strategic Industrial Estates or Other Primary Industrial Estates. SIEs have a greater deal of protection, with Newbridge Riverside protected under this designation. There is a presumption in favour of their protection, and alternative proposals will require evidence of:

- a. Viability of reuse or redevelopment;
- b. The results of a marketing period of 24 months, on reasonable terms, during a sustained period of UK economic growth;
- c. Market signals of demand in the district and locality;
- d. The availability and quality of alternative premises.
- E. Other evidence casting doubt on related industrial supply policies.

Applicants will also need to demonstrate that non-industrial uses would not have an adverse impact on the sustainability of the provision of services from industrial premises that remained in the locality, or would not act against the development of undeveloped areas for industrial uses.

BSU do not wish to object to this policy, and agree with the ethos and role of the policy, however, consider that amendments could be made to bring the policy into full NPPF compliance, and make the policy more robust and effective, given NPPF paragraph 22 which states that:

'alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities'

Therefore, we consider that a 24 month marketing period during a sustained period of UK economic growth is deliberately seeking to override the significance of market signals, as market signals will indicate likely demand which will be intrinsically tied to wider economic conditions.

Furthermore, we consider additional criteria should be added, to consider site-specific conditions which may affect the feasibility of re-use or redevelopment for economic uses, and therefore render change of use the only feasible option for the building/site. This should be done in light of the nature of the industrial land supply in Bath, and the changing industrial market in the city and region. For example, the Lambert Smith Hampton Industrial Land Review Report, which forms part of the evidence base for the Placemaking Plan, acknowledges the lack of demand for larger industrial units of lower quality. It also states that:

'Some industrial uses and premises do not sit comfortably alongside residential areas, principally heavier industrial processes under Class B2 and warehousing and distribution uses under Class B8 which in many cases have their own specific requirements in terms of building size and scale, accessibility, operational requirements including working hours.'

This demonstrates some of the site-specific factors which may be relevant when assessing redevelopment or reuse. Lambert Smith Hampton Industrial Land Review Report (December 2015)

We note a factual inaccuracy in relation to the evidence base underpinning the policy approach. The Lambert Smith Hampton Industrial Land Review assessment is based on 'estate dashboards'. The 'estate dashboard' for Brassmill Lane/Locksbrook Road at Appendix 3, states that Herman Miller is an occupier, and that there is 100% occupancy (and nil availability). Clearly that is no longer the case as Herman Miller vacated the significant unit at the end of summer 2015. We have also been made aware that Roper Rhodes, who occupy space in Brassmill Lane, are also departing the site in favour of taking further space in Melksham. Therefore it is our view that the 'performance' section, and potentially policy approach, require updating in light of these changes.

Summary

We would therefore propose that the plan introduce flexibility/mechanism to enable University development to be incorporated as part of mixed-use sites, or to replace elements of allocation requirements, where the designated land use is no longer required. The 15-year requirement, by virtue of its length, is incapable of predicting the market trends

11 May 2016 Page 527 of 956

across this period, and therefore allocating to meet this need does not sufficiently allow this to be reduced should demand require it. We would therefore request a presumption that University development is considered acceptable in principle on sites allocated for employment-generating uses, as it is clear that University development makes a significant contribution to both economic and job generation.

Q5 Change Requested

We would therefore propose that the plan introduce flexibility/mechanism to enable University development to be incorporated as part of mixed-use sites, or to replace elements of allocation requirements, where the designated land use is no longer required. The 15-year requirement, by virtue of its length, is incapable of predicting the market trends across this period, and therefore allocating to meet this need does not sufficiently allow this to be reduced should demand require it. We would therefore request a presumption that University development is considered acceptable in principle on sites allocated for employment-generating uses, as it is clear that University development makes a significant contribution to both economic and job generation.

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?

Reserve position should we be required to support BSU's position in the city.

Respondent Number: 6350 Comment Number	r: 1					
Name:	Organisation: Hallatrow Business Park Ltd					
Agent Name: Robert Selwood	nt Name: Robert Selwood Agent Organisation: Sellwood Planning					
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No	Attachmei	nts sent with the comment?	Yes		
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	, , ,	ick if indicated	'yes') 🔽			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound,	is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):			
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Cor	nsisten 🗸	Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	e , Policy ED2A					

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

This representation is submitted on behalf of Hallatrow Business Parks Ltd which is the freeholder of both the Business Park at Hallatrow and adjoining land. The site extends to an area of 3.85 hectares. It was previously a MAFF storage depot. It is now occupied by the Bookbarn, Concept Finishing Ltd and Andy Loos Ltd. In addition, planning permission was granted in 2006 (05/00316/FUL) for a Garden Centre. A start was made on this in 2009.

The NPPF (paras. 18 to 22) expects the planning system to do all it can to support sustainable economic growth and act proactively to meet economic development needs. At paragraph 28 this is echoed in terms of achieving a prosperous rural economy and supporting the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses. The role of Local Plans is critical to the achievement of these NPPF objectives and paragraphs 160 and 161 of the NPPF require Local Planning Authorities to have a robust economic evidence base to inform employment land allocations in Local Plans.

The pre submission version of the Plan (para. 490) notes the NPPF guidance outlined above, but it fails to actually deliver what the NPPF seeks. Paragraph 492 states that the Core Business Areas defined in Policy ET.3 of the 2007 Local Plan "have been reclassified into four Strategic Industrial Estates and four Other Primary Industrial Estates". There is no supporting evidence or policy rationale to this reclassification. As a consequence, the policy has not been justified as the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.

11 Mav 2016 Page 528 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The particular concern of Hallatrow Business Parks, is the manner in which the emerging Local Plan deals with its site at Hallatrow. The Hallatrow Business Park was identified as one of the 'Core Business Areas' in Policy ET.3(a) of the 2007 Local Plan. Paragraph B.2.35 states that

"There are also significant employment in the industrial sector in the rural areas varying from large sites within or adjoining villages such as the printing works at Paulton, to freestanding industrial estates in the countryside such as Hallatrow and Burnett Business Parks and Clutton Hill Farm. Some result from conversions of buildings formerly in other uses while others are long established industrial sites. They often provide relatively low cost premises and make an important contribution to providing employment in rural areas".

Given that the Hallatrow Business Park was identified as a Core Business Area in the 2007 Local Plan and these areas were regarded as making 'an important contribution to providing employment in rural areas', it is surprising that the proposed submission Placemaking Plan does not include this site in Policy ED.2A as either a 'Strategic' or as an 'Other Primary Industrial Estate'. As a consequence, the Hallatrow Business Park is proposed to be relegated to the status of 'non strategic industrial premises', which are not identified on the Policy Map.

This shift of policy emphasis is not explained or justified. Whilst it is conceivable that the Council could cite changed circumstances since 2007 (although this is not accepted), it should be noted that the 'Options' version of the Placemaking Plan (November 2014) proposed to include the Hallatrow Business Park as a 'Strategic Economic Development Site' in Policy ED.2A (p191).

The proposed submission Policy ED.2A, therefore, fails the tests of soundness for the following reasons -it is not positively prepared, since it is not a strategy which will retain a portfolio of strategic employment sites in the rural area. This will not 'proactively meet economic development needs'

-it is not justified by the evidence, and no reasoning is given why it was decided to delete the Hallatrow Business Park from Policy ED.2A between the Options and pre-submission version of the plan. The pre-submission strategy is not the most appropriate strategy compared to the 'Options' plan approach

-it is not effective, since relegating the Hallatrow Business Park to the Policy ED.2B category risks its loss as a key rural employment site which conflicts with the objectives of the plan to promote the rural economy

-it is not consistent with national policy, since it will not ensure a consistent supply of suitable employment land in the rural areas of the district.

The sound approach would be to revert to the 'Options' version of Policy ED.2A, so that the Hallatrow Business Park retains its status as a Strategic or Primary industrial estate.

As noted at the start of this representation, the Hallatrow Business Park comprises several large industrial and storage buildings plus the site of a Garden Centre which was commenced in 2009. As such, this remains an extant commitment. It is considered that in order to allow the Hallatrow Business Park to consolidate its role as a strategic rural employment site that the Policy Map shows both the built and committed parts of the site as forming the land which will be subject to Policy ED.2A. A copy of the proposed Policy ED.2A boundary is attached.

Q5 Change Requested

In order to make Policy ED.2A sound, the Hallatrow Business Park site should be added to the list of sites as follows "i. Hallatrow Business 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?

The objector owns and runs the Hallatrow Business Park which is a major employer in the rural area. Participation at the public examination is necessary to test the deficiencies in the Council's approach to both economic development and the potential strategic employment role that could be played by the Hallatrow Business Park.

11 May 2016 Page 529 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ED2B

Respondent Number: 7110	Comment Number: 1					
Name:	Orga	anisation: Stu	udioUS Invest	ment Managei	ment	
Agent Name: Helen Tilton Agent Organisation: Turley						
Further Information available in the	e original comment?	No /	Attachments	sent with the o	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the of Does the respondent consider the of the respondent considers the Dra	document is sound? N	lo	•	·	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓	Not Justified 🗹	Not Consiste	en 🗸	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to: Volui The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	me 1 District Wide,Po	licy ED2B				

Q4 Soundness Comment

We welcome the Council's review of the Core Business Areas, the result of which is a proposal to reclassify these areas as either 'Strategic Industrial Estates' or 'Other Primary Industrial Estates'. We support the decision to remove lesser value (in terms of economic importance) sites from any defined employment 'allocation', as this better reflects the different role that these employment areas have to play in the future economic growth of the city.

We directly support the re-classification of the Wansdyke Centre (as shown by Diagram 8), which is not proposed to be carried forward as either a Strategic or Other Primary Industrial Estate. We note that this decision has been underpinned by the Lambert Smith Hampton 'Report on the BaNES Industrial Market, November 2015'. In light of the Report's indications that the Wansdyke Centre is of poor quality and suitable for redevelopment for alternative uses, it is entirely appropriate that this site should not be afforded specific protection through an employment allocation. Given the potential for positive redevelopment at this site it might be that the Council could consider making a specific allocation for redevelopment for a mix of uses.

Paragraph 494 would benefit from being re-worded to make it clear that reference to '...these locations [are] considered to be the most important concentrations of industrial land in the District' refers specifically to the Strategic Industrial Estates, and that it is only this classification of land that is to be afforded the 'highest level of protection' by the Plan. This would reflect commitments set out elsewhere within the employment chapter.

We note that the Plan (Paragraph 500) refers to paragraph 51 of the NPPF and to references therein relating to supporting planning applications for changes/redevelopment from commercial buildings currently in the B-use classes, where there is an identified need for additional housing. We would suggest that, at the local level, Sui Generis student accommodation would need to be factored in to how the Council looks to positively support wider residential accommodation needs.

Policy ED2.B states as follows:

- "1: Proposals for the uses listed in ED.2A will be acceptable in principle at sites already occupied by smaller clusters and stand-alone industrial premises provided that this would not cause unacceptable environmental, residential amenity or highways problems.
- 2: Non-strategic sites are not afforded the same level of protection as those listed in ED.2A. Applications for residential development or others uses will normally be approved unless there is a strong economic reason why this would be inappropriate. Evidence of unsuccessful marketing on reasonable terms for 12 months prior to an application and during a sustained period of UK economic growth will be taken as evidence that there is not a strong economic reason for refusal".

11 Mav 2016 Page 530 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

With reference to part 1 of ED2.B:

For the avoidance of doubt, we would suggest that the policy should not cross-refer to Policy ED2.A, as that policy refers not just to B-class uses, but also to other uses such as builders' merchants and car showrooms that ED2.A considers to be appropriate only with reference to maps and locations that are associated specifically with the ED2.A allocations. Policy ED2.B therefore needs to state within its own policy text the types of uses that will be supported in principle. We would suggest that any such text should explicitly refer to B-class uses as well as a broad range of other appropriate Sui Generis uses, and that the policy should allow flexibility for any other compatible employment generating uses (to be assessed on their merits).

With reference to part 2 of ED2.B:

Part 2 of ED2.B is essentially split into two contradictory parts. On the one hand, the policy clearly states that applications for residential development and other uses will normally be approved (unless there is a strong economic reason why this would be inappropriate). In light of the supporting explanatory text to the chapter and policy, we would suggest that this is a logical and appropriate positively-worded policy statement. With this wording, there is no onus on the developer to prove the case that there is a strong economic reason that development cannot proceed – and nor should there be - as the types of land to which ED2.B relates have already been reviewed and assessed to be of lesser importance. The second part of the policy, however, seems to infer that 12-months of marketing is required to be undertaken. We would suggest that this is unnecessary evidence in light of the above (and in any event, other timescales, and other forms of evidence, should also be deemed acceptable). Any text relating to marketing evidence would be better located within the supporting text, and should make it clear that this is just one example of 'suitable' evidence, and that this should only be required to be provided in the event that there is any dispute over whether a strong economic reason against a change of use exists.

Q5 Change Requested

As set out in response to Question 4 above, the suggested changes are:

- Consideration of the Wansdyke Centre for a mix of uses;
- Paragraph 494 would benefit from being re-worded to make it clear that reference to '...these locations [are] considered to be the most important concentrations of industrial land in the District' refers specifically to the Strategic Industrial Estates, and that it is only this classification of land that is to be afforded the 'highest level of protection' by the Plan:
- At the local level, Sui Generis student accommodation would need to be factored in to how the Council looks to positively support wider residential accommodation needs;
- With reference to part 1 of Policy ED2.B:

For the avoidance of doubt, we would suggest that the policy should not cross-refer to Policy ED2.A, as that policy refers not just to B-class uses, but also to other uses such as builders' merchants and car showrooms that ED2.A considers to be appropriate only with reference to maps and locations that are associated specifically with the ED2.A allocations. Policy ED2.B therefore needs to state within its own policy text the types of uses that will be supported in principle. We would suggest that any such text should explicitly refer to B-class uses as well as a broad range of other appropriate Sui Generis uses, and that the policy should allow flexibility for any other compatible employment generating uses (to be assessed on their merits).;

- With reference to part 2 of ED2.B:

The second part of the policy seems to infer that 12-months of marketing is required to be undertaken. We would suggest that this is unnecessary evidence(and in any event, other timescales, and other forms of evidence, should also be deemed acceptable). Any text relating to marketing evidence would be better located within the supporting text, and should make it clear that this is just one example of 'suitable' evidence, and that this should only be required to be provided in the event that there is any dispute over whether a strong economic reason against a change of use exists .

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?

StudioUS Investment Management has current land interests with the potential to support mixed-use and student accommodation needs close to Bath City Centre.

11 May 2016 Page 531 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy RE1

Respondent Number: 117 Comment Number: 14
Name: Christine Hunt Organisation: Priston Parish Council
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') \Box
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RE1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
RE1: Employment Uses in the Countryside
Priston Parish Council believes the wording "replacement of existing buildings" in clause i should include "to be of a design well-related to its context",
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 532 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy RE5

Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 29
Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RE5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy RE5 - Agricultural Land
The policy contains a negative obligation and general comments on negative obligations apply. In addition using a negative obligation means the policy is contrary to the NPPF paragraph 112. The emphasis in this paragraph is in taking account of the economic (and other) benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. PHSV consider that this paragraph within the NPPF provides appropriate guidance and therefore Policy RE5 is unnecessary and should be deleted. This policy is contrary to National Policy.
Q5 Change Requested
Policy RE5 is unnecessary and should be deleted.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

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

11 May 2016 Page 533 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy RE6

Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number: 10	
Name: Rohan Torkildsen Organisation: Histor	ic England
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Atta	achments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if inc	dicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it beca	ause it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Consisten \([☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy RE6	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Whilst most of the District's traditional rural farm buildings and farmsteads m be of architectural and historic interest and of communal, aesthetic and evide can help secure their future it is vital related works are appropriate to ensure and the integrity and significance of the buildings and farmsteads are safegual	ential value. Whilst adaptation and re use the aforementioned values are recognised
Consequently it is important this policy reflects such concern and ensure such conserved.	non designated heritage assets are
Q5 Change Requested	
The Policy could either cross reference to Policy HE 1 or include additional crit	teria (preferred).
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?

11 May 2016 Page 534 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP12

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

Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number: 10				
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation:				
Agent Name: Agent Organisat	tion:			
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 min	nor changes			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it	t because it is (ticked where indicated):			
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Consis	sten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CP12				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
pp 31, 35ff, CP12 policy areas. 31, Table 1 Describes the maps on pages 35ff to be "REVISIONS to the boundaries of shopping centres." Please clarify that the maps show, in red, the buildings which ARE within a shopping centre.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes	s)? 🗆			

11 May 2016 Page 535 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CR1

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number:	7
Name:	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Bailey	Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey
Further Information available in the original comment	? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\mathbf{\sqrt{\sq}}}}}}}}}} \end{\sqrt{\sq}}}}}}}}}}}}} \end{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sqrt{\sq}}}}}}}}}}} \end{\sqiitith}}}}}} \end{\sqiititith}}}}}} \end{\sqiititith}}}}}} }} \sqrt{\sqrt	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy CR1
Q4 Soundness Comment	
sequential test and other national policy in NPPG paragr conflicts with NPPG guidance that "There should be no r	ntial test policy. This uses, in part, words from the national raphs 23-27. The result is two parallel sequential tests. This need to reiterate policies that are already set out in the National aragraph 151 in being inconsistent with the principles and
Q5 Change Requested	
<u> </u>	ential test policy and to set out other requirements particular to
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ition (ticked if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 536 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CR2

Respondent Number: 828 Name: Agent Name: Martin Bailey Further Information available in the	Age		Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Proje tion: Martin Bailey Attachments sent with the comment			
Does the respondent consider the		pliant? (Ticl	if indicated 'yes')			
Does the respondent consider the	e document is sound? N	No				
If the respondent considers the D	raft Placemaking Plan is ເ	ınsound, is i	t because it is (ticked where indicated)	:		
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified 🗹	Not Consi	sten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸			
The representation relates to: Vol	ume 1 District Wide,Po	licy CR2				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is	:					
Q4 Soundness Comment						
1) Draft policy CR2 seeks to apply the Council's own impact assessment policy. This uses, in part, words from national policy in the NPPF, paragraph 26, but the Council's own words are added, creating new meaning. The result is two parallel impact assessment requirements. This conflicts with NPPG guidance that "There should be no need to reiterate policies that are already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework." It also renders the policy inconsistent with national policies and principles (NPPF paragraph 151). 2) The proposed 500 sq m (gross) threshold for impact assessments for out-of-centre convenience retail floorspace lacks justification in the document and in the "evidence base' cited. There is substantial evidence (not referred to by the Council) of the increased use of neighbourhood convenience stores up to 1,000 sq m (net) in size for local needs/top-up shopping (e.g. 'Back to the Future' - Cooperative Group 2015) and it may be reasonable to accommodate this trend to meet community needs. Of note, accepted retail impact assessment methodology is designed to deal with large supermarkets/superstores and adapts poorly to smaller, community stores of 500 -1,000 sq m net for which there is not a widely accepted methodology.						
Q5 Change Requested						
particular to Bath – only if necessar	y and if fully justified.		policy and to set out other requireme			
			s in Policy CR2, adding that scheme-spe e town centres to demonstrate no risk			
Does the Respondent wish to partic	•	,				
Why does the Respondent feel it is	necessary to participate a	at the Exam	nation?			

11 May 2016 Page 537 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CR3

Respondent Number: 7105 Comment Number: 1
Name: Jonathan Overton Organisation: Bath Restaurants Association
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CR3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
We have no idea if the document is legally compliant - this process is not approachable to simple men like us. So we
ticked no as to tick nothing did not seem an option. Please forgive our lack of understanding if relevant. We feel Policy CR3 is unsound because it does not enable BaNES to 'curate' Bath for the good of all this in the 'mix'.
Q5 Change Requested
Policy CR3 must be tightened to allow BaNES to curate the city. Further it needs measures to ensure that this policy cannot be so easily abused and side stepped as in the past.
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 Bull Bull and Acceptable by the bull and the state of

The Bath Restaurant Association has been a positive supporter of development in central Bath for many years. Members have focussed on running their own businesses excellently rather than protectionist stances. However we now believe it is vital that B&NES be given real and effective power to curate the mix of use in central Bath. We will offer logical reasoned argument that describes the vast growth in numbers of seats in central Bath and changes in the hospitality market / business models which have completely changed the rules. We are a passionate group of individuals who believe in Bath and its uniqueness and align our businesses to this. We fear that as with the credit crunch, market development needs rules and curation for the greater good. It is time to speak up for Bath and we will!

11 May 2016 Page 538 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CR4

Respondent Number:	828	Comment Number:	9			
Name:		(Organisation: [Deeley Freed	Estates Ltd and DF	E Projects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Baile	e y		Agent Organisa	tion: Martin	Bailey	
Further Information avail	able in t	he original comment?	No	Attachmen	ts sent with the co	mment? No
Does the respondent con	sider the	e document is legally o	compliant? (Tick	k if indicated	'yes')	
Does the respondent con	sider the	e document is sound?	No			
If the respondent conside	ers the D	raft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is i	t because it is	s (ticked where ind	icated):
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified 🗹	Not Consis	sten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates	to: Vol	ume 1 District Wide ,	Policy CR4			
The Site Reference (if appl	cable) is	:				
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Small-scale local shops floo retailers in "local" formats increased use of neighbour e.g. 'Back to the Future' - C community needs and the resulting in lack of provisio	- are ofto hood co ooperati small size	en larger than the cor nvenience stores up to ive Group 2015). It ma	ner shop size re o 1,000 sq m (n ay be reasonab	eferred to in t let) in size for le to accomm	he draft policy. The local needs/top-upodate this trend to	is reflects the p shopping (see o meet
Q5 Change Requested						
Redraft the policy to refer t	o functi	on, not size				
Does the Respondent wish	to partic	cipate at the Examinat	ion (ticked if ye	es)? 🗆		

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

11 May 2016 Page 539 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 593

Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number: 2 Name: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 593 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Promoting sustainable transport - Highways England supports the promotion of sustainable travel, recognising the need for new development to be balanced, with minimising traffic congestion and making places more accessible by sustainable modes of transport. We welcome the policy aims in line with the NPPF, and the principle of managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, focusing development on sustainable locations or those which can be made sustainable. We note that this underpins the principles of the sustainable transport policy.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 7 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Para 593 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 540 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
The same is true of sustainable travel which is referred to at Page 212.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Evamination?

11 May 2016 Page 541 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 596

Respondent Number: 279 Comment	Number: 11			
Name: Rohan Torkildsen	Organisatio	n: Historic England		
Agent Name:	Agent Orga	nisation:		
Further Information available in the original c	omment? No	Attachments s	ent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document	is legally compliant?	(Tick if indicated 'yes	5')	
Does the respondent consider the document	is sound?			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placema	aking Plan is unsound	I, is it because it is (ti	cked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justifie	ed 🗌 Not C	onsisten 🗌 N	lot Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 Distr The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	ict Wide,Para 596			
Q4 Soundness Comment				
At paragraph 592 the Plan makes a welcome re strategy. It is therefore disappointing and surpr and objectives.			•	•
Q5 Change Requested				
At paragraph 596 refer to the aim and objective and townscapes and making improvements who			as, heritage assets, lands	capes
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?

11 May 2016 Page 542 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ST1

Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number: 10 Name: Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited Agent Name: James Millard Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy ST1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment Policy ST1 (Promoting Sustainable Travel) is drafted in order to provide a policy basis upon which the objective of delivering well-connected places that are accessible by sustainable means of transport is delivered. Such an objective is supported, however we have concerns regarding the specific policy requirements set out in ST1. As drafted the Policy ST1 refers to the 10 sub-paragraphs as "principles" yet the opening paragraph to the policy refers to the decision-making process and indicates that planning permission is dependent upon development proposals addressing the 10 principles. For example ST1 (1) requires development to "reduce the growth and the overall level of traffic congestion". This requirement is considered to be too broad in its scope as it is not site specific. It is not the role of new development to address existing problems, rather development proposals must be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the impact is acceptable and appropriate mitigation measures put in place where required. ST1 (2) suggests that planning permission will also be dependent upon "reducing dependency on the private car". Once again the scope of this principle, upon which planning permission is based, is too broad-brush and fails to consider site specific proposals and the extent to which the wider objectives of promoting sustainable travel can be achieved, in a manner that is consistent with the impact of individual development proposals. As currently worded this part of Policy ST1 sets in place a criteria which may place an unacceptable and unjustified policy
burden on individual development sites. If it is intended that Policy ST1 is to set out general principles for the Plan area then reference to "planning permission" within the policy should be deleted. Individual development proposals can contribute to meeting the objectives but cannot in themselves address these principles. Policy ST7 (Transport Requirements for Managing Development) provides the policy basis for considering the transport related impacts of development. This reinforces our position that reference to "planning permission" within ST1 should be deleted as individual proposals will in fact be considered against the policy provisions of ST7.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 543 of 956

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 25
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The correct emphasis on encouraging public transport and reducing dependence on the car is not fully matched by he policies in the Bath Transport strategy.
Q5 Change Requested
Emphasise that the evidence for new Park and Ride solutions needs to be well- demonstrated and in particular their capacity to fulfil the policy recommendation to reduce dependence on the car should be interrogated.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the
placemaking plan
Degrandent Numbers 270 Comment Numbers 12
Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number: 12 Name: Rohan Torkildsen Organisation: Historic England
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
To accord with national policy for the historic environment Policy ST1 should include reference to safeguarding affected heritage assets, historic areas, townscapes, landscapes, streets, places and spaces.
Q5 Change Requested

11 May 2016 Page 544 of 956

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to	participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 304 Comment N	lumber: 22
Name:	Organisation: University of Bath
Agent Name: Mark Rose	Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd
Further Information available in the original co	mment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is Does the respondent consider the document is If the respondent considers the Draft Placemak Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	sound? Yes, with minor changes king Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
The representation relates to: Volume 1 Distriction The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	ct Wide,Policy ST1
Q4 Soundness Comment	
	es of this policy, although criterion 6 is dealt with more appropriately d therefore be deleted. However, it must be recognised that it is not ia to all development.
OF Change Requested	

Q5 Change Requested

To ensure that the policy is not too prescriptive and is positively applied to all development, the policy should be reworded to state that these principles 'should be applied where appropriate to the particular type and location of development proposed'.

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

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

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

Respondent Number: 1366 Comment Number	. 2
Name: Guy Gibson	Organisation: Network Rail
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 legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	, ,
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	, ,

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST1

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 545 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure. It is considered that NR's involvement in the production of this document will be to ensure that rail infrastructure continues to meet the needs of the areas communities and that there is an acceptable delivery mechanism in place to meet this commitment. Councils must continue to engage with Network Rails Network Planning and Strategy teams in order to identify future requirements. In this context NR would hope that the DPD would address the following:

Level Crossing Safety

Development proposals' affecting the safety of level crossings is an extremely important consideration for emerging planning policy to address. The impact from future development can result in a significant increase in the vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic utilising a crossing which in turn impacts upon safety and service provision.

As a result of increased patronage, Network Rail could be forced to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using a crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. This would be in direct conflict with strategic and government aims of improving rail services. Therefore the location of proposed new development is an important consideration for Network Rail and should form part of any initial appraisal of future development sites.

Please note the Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway:

oSchedule 4 (j) of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 requires that... "Where any proposed development is likely to result in a material increase in volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (public footpath, public or private road) the Local Planning Authority prior to granting approval must consult: The operator of the network which includes or consists of the railway in question and the Secretary of State for Transport".

Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and the developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed.

Protection Assets

Network Rail (in line with normal practice) would expect to be consulted on any development that may impact on their assets in the area. In this regard the imposition of appropriate planning conditions are likely to be an important tool that will enable planning permissions to be granted whilst also safeguarding NR assets.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

Respondent Number:	6176	Comment Number:	4		
Name: John Eddison		(Organisation:		
Agent Name:		,	Agent Organisa	tion:	
Further Information ava	ilable in t	he original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No

11 Mav 2016 Page 546 of 956

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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Para 599. Improved public transport is a laudable aim but is not currently met by bus services in rural areas. How is this to be addressed?
Q5 Change Requested
Further work to address and resolve the above points
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number: 7
Name: Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn
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 □
Not residence in the consistent in the consisten
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy ST1 Promoting Sustainable Travel refers to a number of principles which are quired to be addressed by planning
applications. However, many of these relate to existing transport issues and it is not the role of new development to address existing problems. As an example, the first principle requires that development reduces the overall level of
traffic congestion and the second principle requires that development reduces dependency on the private car. New
developments should not be required to address these issues which already exist, but should only be required to address
issues which arise as a result of the developments themselves.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 547 of 956

Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 12
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy ST1 (Promoting Sustainable Travel) is drafted in order to provide a policy basis upon which the objective of delivering well-connected places that are accessible by sustainable means of transport is delivered. Such an objective is supported, however we have concerns regarding the specific policy requirements set out in ST1.
As drafted the Policy ST1 refers to the 10 sub-paragraphs as "principles" yet the opening paragraph to the policy refers to the decision-making process and indicates that planning permission is dependent upon development proposals addressing the 10 principles. For example ST1 (1) requires development to "reduce the growth and the overall level of traffic congestion". This requirement is considered to be too broad in its scope as it is not site specific. It is not the role of new development to address existing problems, rather development proposals must be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the impact is acceptable and appropriate mitigation measures put in place where required. ST1 (2) suggests that planning permission will also be dependent upon "reducing dependency on the private car". Once again the scope of this principle, upon which planning permission is based, is too broad-brush and fails to consider site specific proposals and the extent to which the wider objectives of promoting sustainable travel can be achieved, in a manner that is consistent with the impact of individual development proposals.
As currently worded this part of Policy ST1 sets in place a criteria which may place an unacceptable and unjustified policy burden on individual development sites. If it is intended that Policy ST1 is to set out general principles for the Plan area then reference to "planning permission" within the policy should be deleted. Individual development proposals can contribute to meeting the objectives but cannot in themselves address these principles.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 14
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 548 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Policy ST1 (Promoting Sustainable Travel) is drafted in order to provide a policy basis upon which the objective of delivering well-connected places that are accessible by sustainable means of transport is delivered. Such an objective is supported, however we have concerns regarding the specific policy requirements set out in ST1. As drafted the Policy ST1 refers to the 10 sub-paragraphs as "principles" yet the opening paragraph to the policy refers to the decision-making process and indicates that planning permission is dependent upon development proposals addressing the 10 principles. For example ST1 (1) requires development to "reduce the growth and the overall level of traffic congestion". This requirement is considered to be too broad in its scope as it is not site specific. It is not the role of new development to address existing problems, rather development proposals must be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the impact is acceptable and appropriate mitigation measures put in place where required. ST1 (2) suggests that planning permission will also be dependent upon "reducing dependency on the private car". Once again the scope of this principle, upon which planning permission is based, is too broad-brush and fails to consider site specific proposals and the extent to which the wider objectives of promoting sustainable travel can be achieved, in a manner that is consistent with the impact of individual development proposals.			
As currently worded this part of Policy ST1 sets in place a criteria which may place an unacceptable and unjustified policy burden on individual development sites. If it is intended that Policy ST1 is to set out general principles for the Plan area then reference to "planning permission" within the policy should be deleted. Individual development proposals can contribute to meeting the objectives but cannot in themselves address these principles. Policy ST7 (Transport Requirements for Managing Development) provides the policy basis for considering the transport related impacts of development.			
Q5 Change Requested			
This reinforces our position that reference to "planning permission" within ST1 should be deleted as individual proposals will in fact be considered against the policy provisions of ST7.			

Page 549 of 956

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

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

11 May 2016

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 612

Respondent Number: 152 Comment Number: 2	
Name: Organisation: Corston Parish Council	
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') $\ \ \Box$	
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Para 612	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
It is believed that there are proposed housing developments in the Saltford area which will, if approved, cause more additional infrastructure problems in the area and also add to the traffic problems along the A4 described at paragrap (a) above.	h
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 550 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ST3

Respondent Number: 279 Comment Numbe Name: Rohan Torkildsen Agent Name:	r: 13 Organisation: H Agent Organisat		
Further Information available in the original commer		Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legal Does the respondent consider the document is soun If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl	d?	, .	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consist	ten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wid The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	e,Policy ST3		
Q4 Soundness Comment			
The Policy fails to accord with national policy for the h the District's heritage assets, historic areas, townscape its setting.			
Q5 Change Requested			
There is no unacceptable impact on heritage and envir Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Natura 2000		cluding the World Heritage Site and its sett	ing,
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examir	nation (ticked if yes	s)?	

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

11 May 2016 Page 551 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ST4

Respondent Number: 1366 Comment Number: 1
Name: Guy Gibson Organisation: Network Rail
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
In relation to Policy ST4 relating to the safeguarding of land at Westmoreland Station Road as a rail freight facility and interchange, Network Rail inform the council that due to the limited length of the rail head, this land is not ideally suited to modern freight requirements and therefore the future use of this site is under review. Until this review is complete Network Rail are not in a position to confirm whether the continued safeguarding of this land for rail freight purposes up to 2029, as proposed under Policy ST4, is either necessary or appropriate.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$

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

11 May 2016 Page 552 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ST5

Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: 7 Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FOBR 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
In Bath, residential streets and shopping streets are interconnected. Through traffic and unnecessary motorised vehicles should be removed from all city centre streets, residential as well as shopping streets.
Q5 Change Requested
Delete from para 1 'from the main shopping streets'
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?
FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

11 May 2016 Page 553 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ST6

Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: 8 Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FOBR 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy ST6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The text uses the essentially meaningless 'unacceptable' formulation, and fails to recognise that a balance may have to be struck between the needs of the Green Belt, etc, and the need to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution in Bath, objectives which feature elsewhere in the Plan.
Q5 Change Requested
To rectify this: FoBRA proposes that paras 1a and 1b are amended to read: a. Development can be shown to be in the public interest, taking into account the need to protect the Bath World Heritage Site by reducing traffic intrusion, and the potential impact on environmental assets and amenity, including the setting of Bath, the Cotswolds AONB, Natura 2000 sites (SPAs/SACs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest.' b. Measures are taken to minimise and mitigate any impact on the surrounding road network and its capacity safely to accommodate potential traffic generation.
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? FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.
Respondent Number: 279 Comment Number: 14 Name: Rohan Torkildsen Organisation: Historic England Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 554 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box				
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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Cor	nsisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST6				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Historic England recognise the local authority's efforts to find suitable help reduce congestion and enhance the ambience of the Bath WHS. I September/October 2015) as to the effectiveness of a P&R to the east out a very clear and robust case for such a facility, within the context suggested.	Noting the recent debate (P&R Consultation to fixed the city it will be important for BANES to set			
If, following Examination, the principle for a facility is accepted eviden guidance (if within or affecting the WHS) and the B&NES WHS Setting and any potential mitigation. Http://www.icomos.org/world_heritage/HIA_20110201.pdf				
In so far as the Policy is expressed we would suggest the following adjustment to acknowledge the relevance of considering all heritage assets and not just the WHS				
(a) that there is no unacceptable impact on environmental and heritage Site and its setting, the Cotswolds AONB and Natura 2000 sites (SACs/	-			
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?

11 May 2016 Page 555 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Part: Policy ST7 Volume: 1, District Wide Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number: Name: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy ST7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Highways England supports the aims off all of the policies in this section; however, of particular interest in this task is Policy ST7 Transport Requirements for Managing Development. The crucial part of this policy for us is the requirement that that the provision made for any improvements to the transport system required to render the development proposal acceptable is met. As far as we are concerned therefore no development should come forward that requires upgrading to the SRN to make it acceptable before the works are in place. Q5 Change Requested Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: Comment Number: 11 170 Name: Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited Agent Name: James Millard Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning 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 Effective Not Consisten The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy ST7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment With regards to Policy ST7 the proposed policy is broadly supported and the associated criteria are acceptable in terms

11 May 2016 Page 556 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

of ensuring that the impact of development does not result in an unacceptable impact. Reference to "charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles" requires further justification in terms of how such requirements are considered appropriate and we would encourage the Council to be mindful of impact of viability in the context of paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Further detail is considered necessary on this particular policy requirement, specifically in terms of the extent of such provision, it is not clear whether this is intended to relate to each property or whether this relates to a communal provision. Greater clarity is considered necessary in order to understand the viability implications of such a policy requirement.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 23
Name: Organisation: University of Bath
Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd
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 1 District Wide Policy ST7
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy ST7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The University supports the overarching principles of this policy, but considers some of the criteria proposed to manage the impact of transport requirements to be unnecessary and more appropriately dealt with through other measures
within the PMP. In particular, criterion 1 e) proposes to permit development only if 'no traffic mitigation measures are
required that would harm the historic or natural environment'. This is overly prescriptive and not positively prepared as a means of enabling sustainable development. Moreover, the PMP includes other policies that are much better suited to
manage impacts on the historic or natural environment (notably, but not exclusively HE1, NE2 and NE3). This criterion
unnecessarily restricts development and proposes measures already in place through other policies and should be
deleted.
Similarly, criterion 4 b) proposes that there should be 'no increase in on-street parking in the vicinity of the site which
would affect highway safety and/or residential amenity'. Again this is overly prescriptive and not positively prepared as a means of enabling sustainable development. Moreover, the preparation of a transport assessment / statement is the
most appropriate measure for demonstrating the likely impact of development on on-street parking and ensuring that
development is acceptable, and this is already proposed under criterion 3 of the policy. On this basis, criterion 4 b)
unnecessarily restricts development and should be deleted.
Q5 Change Requested
Criteria 1 e) and 4 b) should be deleted.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 557 of 956

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 20
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey
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 1 District Wide , Policy ST7
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
1) Specific reference needs to be made in section 4 of policy ST7 to application - in all cases - of the Accessibility Assessment referred to in paragraphs 655-657 of the document. This is necessary to provide flexibility according to the particular circumstances of each proposal. The need for such flexibility is acknowledged by the Council (e.g. paragraph 642A in the context of residential development) and this needs to be reflected within the policy.
2) Neither the policy nor Schedule 2 to the policy make it clear that the floorspace figures referred to are GIA (gross internal area). This should be made explicit in order to make the policy effective.
3) The residential minimum standards appear to be unjustified and impractical in some circumstances. For example, in parts of the Enterprise Area they would render development non-viable by requiring expensive underground parking which could not be provided in the context of prevailing land values. The minimum levels proposed appear to be in conflict with national planning policy and the Council's transport strategy, both of which stress the need to promote sustainable transport outcomes.
4) The C3 residential cycle parking standard is unjustified and needs to bear a relationship to the size of dwelling. The cycle parking standards need to be justified. Flexibility needs to be introduced to the requirement.
5) There is a tension between item 4b of Policy ST7 and restrained parking in the Enterprise Area. Item 4b could helpfully provide for monitoring and potential financial contributions to resident parking schemes where justified and necessary.
Q5 Change Requested
1) Make express reference in section 4 of the policy to application – in all cases - of an Accessibility Assessment of the kind referred to at paragraphs 655-657 of the document.
2) Edit the policy to make it clear that the floorspace figures are GIA and add a clear note to Schedule 2 to this effect.
3) The proposed draft residential parking standards need to be reviewed carefully in the context of national and local sustainable transport policies, also taking into account the practical implications including potential effect on the viability of development proposals. The minimum residential standards will need to be reduced.
4) The cycle parking standards need to be justified. Flexibility needs to be introduced to the requirement relating this to size of property and reasonable forecasts of cycle use.

11 May 2016 Page 558 of 956

5) Qualify item 4b in the policy to provide for mitigation in in the form of monitoring and potential financial contributions

towards resident parking schemes in the vicinity of a proposed development site where justified.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number: 10
Name: Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn
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 1 District Wide , Policy ST7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
It also affects Policy ST7 Transport Requirements For Managing Development which requires facilities for charging plugin and other ultra-low emission vehicles. The impact of this has again not been tested in the Viability Assessment.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 13
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST7
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Policy ST7 (Transport Requirements for Managing Development) provides tit ,fcTTc:y basis for considering the transport

11 May 2016

Page 559 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

related impacts of development. This reinforces our position that reference to "planning permission" within STI should be deleted as individual proposals will in fact be considered against the policy provisions of ST7 th regards to Policy ST7 the proposed policy is broadly supported and the associated criteria are acceptable in terms of ensuring that the impact of development does not result in an unacceptable impact. Reference to "charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles" requires further justification in terms of how such requirements are considered appropriate and we would encourage the Council to be mindful of impact of viability in the context of paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Further detail is considered necessary on this particular policy requirement, specifically in terms of the extent of such provision, it is not clear whether this is intended to relate to each property or whether this relates to a communal provision. Greater clarity is considered necessary in order to understand the viability implications of such a policy requirement.

is considered necessary in order to understand the viability implications of such a policy requirement.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 15
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy ST7
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
With regards to Policy ST7 the proposed policy is broadly supported and the associated criteria are acceptable in terms of ensuring that the impact of development does not result in an unacceptable impact. Reference to "charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles" requires further justification in terms of how such requirements are considered appropriate and we would encourage the Council to be mindful of impact of viability in the context of paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Further detail is considered necessary on this particular policy requirement, specifically in terms of the extent of such provision, it is not clear whether this is intended to relate to each property or whether this relates to a communal provision. Greater clarity is considered necessary in order to understand the viability implications of such a policy requirement.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 560 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Para 638

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 5	
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd	
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	lo
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 1 District Wide , Para 638	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Paragraph 638 and Diagrams 9 and 10 provide for two parking zones for Bath: Bath City Centre Zone and Bath Outer Zone. This results in a sharp distinction in requirements between adjoining areas and in circumstances where this will not be desirable. Much of the Enterprise Area is in the "Central Area" as defined in Diagram 6 in the adopted Core Strategy with other sites in the Western Corridor and this needs to be recognized by providing a transition between the	
two parking zones defined in the draft Placemaking Plan.	
In all zones it will also be essential to apply the Accessibility Assessment referred to in paragraphs 655-657 of the draft plan in order to apply parking policy in a reasonable manner.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Amend the text in paragraph 638 and amend diagrams 9 and 10 to introduce a transitional parking zone corresponding to the defined Central Area and Western Corridor. Consequential amendments to paragraphs 639-648 (additional new text to be inserted) and to Parking Schedule 2 (providing for a Central Bath transitional zone).	
Additionally, cross-reference should be made to application in all cases of the Accessibility Assessment (paragraphs 655 657) in paragraph 638.	i –
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	

11 May 2016 Page 561 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Diagram 9 Bath City Centre Zone

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

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 5
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey
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 1 District Wide, Diagram 9 Bath City Centre Zone The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 638 and Diagrams 9 and 10 provide for two parking zones for Bath: Bath City Centre Zone and Bath Outer Zone. This results in a sharp distinction in requirements between adjoining areas and in circumstances where this will not be desirable. Much of the Enterprise Area is in the "Central Area" as defined in Diagram 6 in the adopted Core Strategy with other sites in the Western Corridor and this needs to be recognized by providing a transition between the two parking zones defined in the draft Placemaking Plan.
In all zones it will also be essential to apply the Accessibility Assessment referred to in paragraphs 655-657 of the draft plan in order to apply parking policy in a reasonable manner.
Q5 Change Requested
Amend the text in paragraph 638 and amend diagrams 9 and 10 to introduce a transitional parking zone corresponding to the defined Central Area and Western Corridor. Consequential amendments to paragraphs 639-648 (additional new text to be inserted) and to Parking Schedule 2 (providing for a Central Bath transitional zone).
Additionally, cross-reference should be made to application in all cases of the Accessibility Assessment (paragraphs 655-657) in paragraph 638.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$

11 May 2016 Page 562 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Diagram 10 Bath Outer Zone

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

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 5 Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Project Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the commen	
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 1 District Wide , Diagram 10 Bath Outer Zone The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Paragraph 638 and Diagrams 9 and 10 provide for two parking zones for Bath: Bath City Centre Zone and Bath Zone. This results in a sharp distinction in requirements between adjoining areas and in circumstances where not be desirable. Much of the Enterprise Area is in the "Central Area" as defined in Diagram 6 in the adopted Strategy with other sites in the Western Corridor and this needs to be recognized by providing a transition bet two parking zones defined in the draft Placemaking Plan.	this will Core ween the
In all zones it will also be essential to apply the Accessibility Assessment referred to in paragraphs 655-657 of belian in order to apply parking policy in a reasonable manner.	the draft
Q5 Change Requested	
Amend the text in paragraph 638 and amend diagrams 9 and 10 to introduce a transitional parking zone corre to the defined Central Area and Western Corridor. Consequential amendments to paragraphs 639-648 (additi text to be inserted) and to Parking Schedule 2 (providing for a Central Bath transitional zone).	
Additionally, cross-reference should be made to application in all cases of the Accessibility Assessment (paragi 657) in paragraph 638.	aphs 655-
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$	

11 May 2016 Page 563 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Schedule 2 Parking Standards

Respondent Number:	102 Comment Number	er: 9			
Name: Robin Kerr		Organisation	: Federation o	f Bath Residents' Associations	(FOBR
Agent Name:		Agent Organ	isation:		
Further Information availa	able in the original comme	nt? No	Attachmer	nts sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent cons	sider the document is legal	ly compliant? (1	ick if indicated	'yes') 🗹	
Does the respondent cons	sider the document is sour	d? No			
If the respondent consider	rs the Draft Placemaking P	lan is unsound,	is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified ✓	Not Cor	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates	to: Volume 1 District Wic	le, Schedule 2	Parking Standa	rds	
The Site Reference (if applied	cable) is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

This section proposes a major change from maximum parking standards for residential developments outside the city centre, to a regime of minimum standards. For non-residential developments, a set of maximum parking standards is proposed for the remainder of the city outside the centre. This is unsound, because, so far as FoBRA is aware, no assessment has been made of the overall impact of these proposed changes on parking provision and therefore on traffic volumes, or of the impact of such changes on the objectives of the Bath Transport Strategy (BTS). Specifically:

- a. The Bath Transport Strategy
- (http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/getting_around_bath_transport_strategy_-_final_issue_web_version.pdf), which was approved by B&NES Council in November 2014, calls for the use of parking control as one of a range of measures to reduce the intrusion of vehicles in the city, especially in the historic core. In particular, the BTS includes:
- •Policy GABP6: The Enterprise Area is developed as part of an integrated approach with strong sustainable transport links to the city centre and rail stations. The development will focus initially on office and related development at the eastern end of the site and have limited car parking (our italics). Subsequent housing development will also focus on accessibility by non-car modes.
- •Action GABP16: Traffic generated by developments in the Enterprise Area will be managed by effective parking standards to minimise the impact of traffic on the network.
- •Action GABA17: Undertake a further analysis of parking requirements to ensure that the proposal to retain 500 public parking spaces within the Enterprise Area is sufficient to maintain the vitality of the City Centre economy and to encourage modal shift.

The proposed Parking Standards section does not take proper account of the policy and actions set out in the BTS, and does not even define the Enterprise Area as requiring special consideration for parking standards; being treated the same as the rest of the city outside the city centre, as defined in the Core Strategy (map attached).

- b. The last document published by B&NES specifically on parking strategy was in 2011 in http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s7548/DraftBathParkingStrategy.pdf This has effectively been subsumed in the BTS. However, it includes the following:
- •9.2 Policy issues: A policy of low car parking provision in new sustainable developments close to the city centre is a key part of the overall traffic management strategy to reduce travel demand and car usage. This policy brings into

11 Mav 2016 Page 564 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

question two main issues: what level of car parking provision is appropriate and whether residents of these developments should be allowed on or off-street parking permits.

•Action A10: Review local residential parking standards appropriate to different types of location and levels of accessibility to sustainable transport.

These policy statements underline that control of parking provision is an important tool for traffic management, and that different parking standards are appropriate in different types of location. Developments close to the city centre are of special significance in this regard.

c. The Enterprise Area

http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/masterplan_vision_report_141030_low_res_0.pdf extends along the River Avon from the city centre out to the west of the city. It will be the site of most major development in Bath during the period covered by the Placemaking Plan.

Q5 Change Requested

a) To rectify this: Parking Standards should be redefined to comply with the BTS and its precursor documents (see b. below).

b & c)To rectify this:

- Parking Standards specific and appropriate to the Enterprise Area should be established, separately from the rest of the city outside the centre.
- •Consideration should be given to the need to retain maximum parking standards for residential development within the Enterprise Area.
- •Within the Enterprise Area, it may be appropriate to distinguish areas in the immediate vicinity of the city centre (eg the Bath Central Area as defined in the Core Strategy see map attached) from more peripheral parts of the Enterprise Area.
- •In setting Parking Standards, due regard should be paid to the aggregate parking provision in the area, its impact on traffic levels and the objectives of the Bath Transport Strategy.

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?

FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

Respondent Number:	170	Comment Number:	12			
Name:		C	Organisation:	Robert Hitch	ins Limited	
Agent Name: James Milla	rd	A	gent Organisa	ation: Pegası	us Planning	
Further Information avail	able in t	he original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent con Does the respondent con If the respondent consider	sider th	e document is sound?			I 'yes') is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Cons	sten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates The Site Reference (if appl			Schedule 2 Pa	irking Standa	ırds	

Q4 Soundness Comment

Schedule 2 (Parking Standards) is intended to guide development in terms of overall parking provision. Paragraph 652 states that for residential development the standard are a minimum in order to provide the Council with flexibility to negotiate higher levels if necessary. Paragraph 655 sets out the mechanism through which a departure from the

11 Mav 2016 Page 565 of 956

minimum standards, to provide a lower provision, may be appropriate, based on an assessment of accessibility. This provides some conformity with the NPPF (Paragraph 39) which requires local authorities to take into account the accessibility of development. There is a lack of detail at this time as to how the Accessibility Assessment will be undertaken. It should also be noted that when setting standards for parking the NPPF (Para 39) is clear that this should also take into account the type of development and local car ownership levels. It is not clear at this point the extent to which the considerations set out in Schedule 2 have taken into account the considerations listed at paragraph 39 of the NPPF. Overall, it is considered necessary that parking standards contain an appropriate degree of flexibility in order to allow specific development schemes to respond appropriately to local demand and site specific issues.

and specific development schemes to respond appropriately to local demand and site specific issues.				
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?				
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 56 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective □				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Schedule 2 Parking Standards The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
C3 Residential should state more clearly that there are no minimum standards for parking provision within Bath city centre zone.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Insert C3 'in central Bath residential developments may be developed car-free, but with provision for car clubs'.				
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan				
Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 6 Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union Agent Name: Agent Organisation:				
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No				

11 Mav 2016 Page 566 of 956

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 1 District Wide, Schedule 2 Parking Standards The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
The Placemaking Plan gives zero provision for vehicle parking for students living in student accommodation in Bath and expects educational establishments to discourage car use by students and staff. There are a number of reasons why students may require a vehicle including disabilities, needing to travel for work or a placement, needing to visit family that are unwell etc. Whilst it may be the case that students are less likely to bring their own vehicle, some provision still needs to be made for a small number of students who need a car. Whilst car use may be discouraged, it will not be the case that all students will follow this guidance.				
Q5 Change Requested				
The Council should plan for at least 1 car parking space per 20 bedrooms in student accommodation				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				
Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 14				
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP				
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Schedule 2 Parking Standards The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				

Schedule 2 (Parking Standards) is intended to guide development in terms of overall parking provision. Paragraph 652 states that for residential development the standard are a minimum in order to provide the Council with flexibility to negotiate higher levels if necessary. Paragraph 655 sets out the mechanism through which a departure from the minimum standards, to provide a lower provision, may be appropriate, based on an assessment of accessibility. This provides some conformity with the NPPF (Paragraph 39) which requires local authorities to take into account the accessibility of development. There is a lack of detail at this time as to how the Accessibility Assessment will be undertaken. It should also be noted that when setting standards for parking the NPPF (Para 39) is clear that this should also take into account the type of development and local car ownership levels. It is not clear at this point the extent to which the considerations set out in Schedule 2 have taken into account the considerations listed at paragraph 39 of the NPPF. Overall, it is considered necessary that parking standards contain an appropriate degree of flexibility in order to

11 May 2016 Page 567 of 956

allow specific development schemes to respond appropriately to local demand and site specific issues.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
,
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 16
Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes
Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Schedule 2 Parking Standards
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Schedule 2 (Parking Standards) is intended to guide development in terms of overall parking provision. Paragraph 652 states that for residential development the standard are a minimum in order to provide the Council with flexibility to negotiate higher levels if necessary. Paragraph 655 sets out the mechanism through which a departure from the minimum standards, to provide a lower provision, may be appropriate, based on an assessment of accessibility. This provides some conformity with the NPPF (Paragraph 39) which requires local authorities to take into account the accessibility of development. There is a lack of detail at this time as to how the Accessibility Assessment will be undertaken. It should also be noted that when setting standards for parking the NPPF (Para 39) is clear that this should also take into account the type of development and local car ownership levels. It is not clear at this point the extent to which the considerations set out in Schedule 2 have taken into account the considerations listed at paragraph 39 of the NPPF. Overall, it is considered necessary that parking standards contain an appropriate degree of flexibility in order to allow specific development schemes to respond appropriately to local demand and site specific issues.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Perpendent feel it is percessed to participate at the Evamination?

11 May 2016 Page 568 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy ST8

Respondent Number: 4422 Comment Number: 1 Name: Elizabeth Higgins Organisation: Bristol Airport 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy ST8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment Bristol Airport supports the supporting text to this policy contained within paragraphs 668 – 671. However, there appears to be a typo in the drafting of the actual policy wording. The words (or similar to) "will not be permitted" should be added to the existing policy. Furthermore, please make all references to Bristol Airport as 'Bristol Airport' as oppose to 'Bristol International Airport'. Bristol Airport welcomes the inclusion of the safeguarding map on the interactive map. It is important that applicants are aware of the safeguarding map at the pre-application stage. Providing the above comments are adressed, Bristol Airport will have no further comments
Q5 Change Requested
The words (or similar to) "will not be permitted" should be added to the existing policy.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number: 30 Name: Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy ST8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 569 of 956

This policy is clearly incomplete and does not provide clear guidance. It als	o ably demonstrates why this draft plan is not		
fit for purpose, should be withdrawn, redrafted and a new consultation undertaken. As drafted this policy is not justified			
or effective.			
Q5 Change Requested			
aco 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?

Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy ST8 - Airport and Aerodrome Safeguarding Areas

11 May 2016 Page 570 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy M1

Respondent Number: 95 Comment Number: 4	
Name: Organisa	ition: The Coal Authority
Agent Name: Agent O	rganisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No	Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally complian	t? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsou	nd, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not	t Consisten
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy N	M1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Support – The Coal Authority supports the clear intention of these	·
NPPF in paragraphs 143 and 144 imposes the obligation to avoid	. ,
approach establishes a suitable mechanism through which Bath a	nd North East Somerset will be able to implement this
requirement of National Planning Policy.	
Reason – In accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (tick	ed if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 571 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 5

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy M5

95

Respondent Number:

Agant Nama	Ü	The Coal Authority	
gent Name: Agent Organisation:		sation:	
Further Information available in the original commer	nt? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	ly compliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl	lan is unsound,	s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Cor	sisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wid	e,Policy M5		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Comment - The Coal Authority supports the inclusion of guidance uses the terminology 'Conventional and Uncoterminology within the Local Plan. Reason – To ensure consistency with the NPPF.	•	• •	
Q5 Change Requested			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partic	ipate at the Exa	mination?	
Respondent Number: 3026 Comment Numbe	r: 1		
Name: Tim Richards	Organisation		
Agent Name:	Agent Organ	sation:	
Further Information available in the original commer	nt? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	Yes
Further Information available in the original commer Does the respondent consider the document is legall			Yes
	ly compliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes') ✓	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	ly compliant? (T d? Yes, with r	ick if indicated 'yes') ✓ ninor changes	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legall Does the respondent consider the document is sound	ly compliant? (T d? Yes, with r lan is unsound,	ick if indicated 'yes') ✓ ninor changes	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legall Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl	ly compliant? (T d? Yes, with r lan is unsound, Not Cor	ick if indicated 'yes') ninor changes s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legall Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide	ly compliant? (T d? Yes, with r lan is unsound, Not Cor	ick if indicated 'yes') ninor changes s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	Yes

11 May 2016 Page 572 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Infrastructure Act apply to all types of unconventional gas and extraction methods.

It is my understanding that:

i.The previous licence holder, UK Methane, were prospecting for a) CBM, b) shale gas, c) coal mining and d) locations where Underground Coal Gasification (UCG) could be undertaken. UGC produces Syn-Gas which is not a hydrocarbon covered by the Petroleum Act and is not produced using hydraulic fracturing. UCG would not be covered by the safeguards and prohibitions relating to hydraulic fracturing in the Infrastructure Act.

ii. Whilst Coal Bed Methane is a hydrocarbon covered by the Petroleum Act the safeguards, prohibitions and definition of hydraulic fracturing in the Infrastructure Act and its Regulations do not apply to CBM because coal is not shale, nor is it encased in shale.

iii. The previous licence holder, UK Methane, may have been interested in using High Pressure Gas Fracturing rather than hydraulic fracturing – which would also not be covered by the Infrastructure Act and its Regulations.

In UK Methane's document "Appendix B Supporting information for PEDL application of Bristol Application, Blocks ST55, ST64, ST65, ST66, ST67" they clearly state that:

"Applications are being made in the 13th Landward Licensing Round primarily for the exploration and development of coal derived gases, secondly to explore the deeper Devonian measures but also to identify as part of that programme areas of coal that may lend themselves to the development of Underground Coal Gasification. "Adding"Parts of the South Wales Coalfield, Bristol and Somerset Coalfield and Kent Coalfield may be suitable for such a combined project albeit small scale in the first instance" UK Methane mention their preference for High Pressure Gas Fracturing in their Wales PEDL application.

Given that other sources of unconventional gas other than shale gas and CBM have been targeted in the area, that CBM is not covered by the Infrastructure Act's safeguards and prohibitions and that hydraulic fracturing may not be the fracturing technology used, then the Energy Minerals section may not be sufficiently comprehensive.

Further, the section does not mention climate change impacts of unconventional gas. While UK Methane did mention the possibility of using Carbon Capture and Storage, this technology is not proven at scale and its development has been all but shut down by the current government. The previous Chief Scentific Advisor to DECC has said that any new fossil fuel is likely to add to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions and lead to further global warming. This would be counter to BANES climate change mitigation policies.

Q5 Change Requested

Other gases such as SynGas should be mentioned in relation to Underground Coal Gasification. Potential impacts of UCG should be mentioned. Fracturing techniques other than hydraulic fracturing should be mentioned. A distinction should be made between shale gas which is covered by safeguards and prohibitions in the Infrastructure Act and Coal Bed Methane and Underground Coal Gasification that are not. Including these changes in the plan would mean that it better represented the unconventional gas exploration objectives that the area as already been subject to and which it could be subject to again in the future.

Does the Respond	ent wish to	participate at t	he Examination (ticked if y	yes)?	
------------------	-------------	------------------	------------------	-------------	-------	--

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

Respondent Number: 6580 Comment Number: 7

Name: Andrew Lord Organisation: Cotswolds Conservation Board

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 573 of 956

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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy M5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Government's consultation on fracking has only just been completed. Government policy confirms no surface fracking within an AONB will be permitted (although fracking below 1200m under an AONB from outside an AONB may be permissible).
Q5 Change Requested
The Cotswolds Conservation Board recommends that the most up to date Government policy for not permitting surface fracking within AONBs is referred to in Policy M5 (following the completion of the current Government consultation).
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 574 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 1, District Wide Part: Policy CP13

Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number: 3	1
Name: Sean Walsh Or	ganisation: Highways Agency
Agent Name: Ag	gent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally cor	mpliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \square
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, P	Policy CP13
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
We welcome the Placemaking Plan delivering better places well located development, importantly as far as Highways Enecessary infrastructure.	
Highways England supports the general spatial vision and st direction and specific ways in which this can be met. Particu accessible by sustainable means of transport.	
Spatial Strategy for BANES - We note that the spatial stratege evidence, formulation of options to meet the objectives, ergustainability appraisal and assessing deliverability. Highwar approach to the positioning of new development.	ngaging with local communities, testing options through the
In table 2 Locational Policy Framework we note the inclusion Development Boundary. Due to the scale of development lienvisage any major issues in terms of impacts on the SRN.	

Housing Development on non-allocated sites at Bath, Keynsham and Somer Valley - Any sites that are not allocated in Bath, Keynsham and the Somer Valley, and elsewhere in BANES for that matter, should, as stated in the text comply with policy including transport requirements. We would take that to mean that they should be supported by the necessary supporting documentation and as necessary make any infrastructure improvements to make the development 'acceptable' either as a standalone scheme or as a requirement as a contribution to make development in an area as a whole acceptable.

Infrastructure - Highways England is keen to ensure, as is set out in Plan that delivery of the District wide spatial strategy is supported by the necessary infrastructure. In previous responses to the Placemaking Plan consultation we have raised concerns about the ability of the SRN to cope with trips generated from development levels proposed in Bath, stating "Taken together the proposed sites in Bath have the potential to add significant pressure to the SRN, A46 and A36, and their interconnecting links through the City, and lead to the requirement for some significant works to mitigate their impact." The IDP sets out a lot of the infrastructure that CIL will fund so we are keen for works on the SRN to accommodate growth to be reflected in it. We have no specific comments on any of the additions to the infrastructure

11 May 2016 Page 575 of 956

section of the Placemaking Plan.
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?
Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number: 4 Name: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP13 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment Infrastructure - Following on from ST7 policy CP13 Infrastructure Provision supports this, requiring new developments to be supported by the timely delivery of the required infrastructure to provide balanced and more self-contained communities. The Core Strategy is supported by the IDP, which as mentioned earlier should contain any improvements required to the SRN to accommodate development, particularly around Bath.
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?
Respondent Number: 170 Comment Number: 13 Name: Organisation: Robert Hitchins Limited Agent Name: James Millard Agent Organisation: Pegasus Planning 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP13 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 576 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Q5 Change Requested

Q5 Change Requested

base supports that need / future need.

Policy CP13 (Infrastructure Provision). It is recognised that new development must be supported by appropriate infrastructure. In this context any infrastructure provision associated with development must be consistent with tests set out in paragraph 203 and 204 of the NPPF, test which have statutory status as a result of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (As Amended). Furthermore, Policy CP13 and its implementation, needs to be considered in the context of Paragraph 173 of the NPPF and ensure that developments are not subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viable is threatened.

Policy CP13 refers to the Infrastructure Delivery Programme as a key determinant in setting out infrastructure requirements. Whilst this may be correct on a plan-wide basis and in response to those sites allocated within the Plan, we would be concerned if the provisions of the Infrastructure Delivery Programme are used as a basis for seeking contributions from individual development sites. Such an approach is unlikely to be consistent with the NPPF. It is also not clear how the Infrastructure Delivery Programme relates to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the latter of which is a live document.

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: 274 Comment Number: 2
Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CP13
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Planning Obligations/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to Sport from new housing i.e. Western Riverside
Sport England supports use of planning obligations (s106)/community infrastructure levy (CIL) as a way of securing the provision of new or enhanced places for sport and a contribution towards their future maintenance, to meet the needs arising from new development. This does need to be based on a robust NPPF evidence base. This includes indoor sports facilities (swimming pools, sports halls, etc) as well as playing fields and multi use games courts.
All new dwellings in Bath and NE Somerset in the plan period should provide for new or enhance existing sport and recreation facilities to help create opportunities for physical activity whilst having a major positive impact on health and mental wellbeing.

11 May 2016 Page 577 of 956

Would wish to see a reference that new major housing sites will be contributing to sport and recreation if the evidence

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: 1366 Comment Number: 3 Name: Guy Gibson Organisation: Network Rail 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide, Policy CP13 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Future Funding
Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit. It is not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development. It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such improvements. The likely impact and level of improvements required will be specific to each station and each development meaning standard charges and formulae may not be appropriate. Therefore in order to fully assess the potential impacts, and the level of developer contribution required, it is essential that where a Transport Assessment is submitted in support of a planning application that this quantifies in detail the likely impact on the rail network. To ensure that developer contributions can deliver appropriate improvements to the rail network we would recommend that Developer Contributions should include provisions for rail.
Q5 Change Requested
-A requirement for development contributions to deliver improvements to the rail network where appropriateA requirement for Transport Assessments to take cognisance of impacts to existing rail infrastructure to allow any necessary developer contributions towards rail to be calculatedA commitment to consult Network Rail where development may impact on the rail network and may require rail infrastructure improvements. In order to be reasonable these improvements would be restricted to a local level and would be necessary to make the development acceptable. We would not seek contributions towards major enhancement projects which are already programmed as part of Network Rail's remit.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 578 of 956

Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 15
Name: Organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Daniel Weaver
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CP13 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Policy CP13 (Infrastructure Provision). It is recognised that new development must be supported by appropriate
infrastructure. In this context any infrastructure provision associated with development must be consistent with tests set out in paragraph 203 and 204 of the NPPF, test which have statutory status as a result of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (As Amended). Furthermore, Policy CP13 and its implementation, needs to be considered in the context of Paragraph 173 of the NPPF and ensure that developments are not subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viable is threatened. Policy CP13 refers to the Infrastructure Delivery Programme as a key determinant in setting out infrastructure requirements. Whilst this may be correct on a plan-wide basis and in response to those sites allocated within the Plan, we would be concerned if the provisions of the Infrastructure Delivery Programme are used as a basis for seeking contributions from individual development sites. Such an approach is unlikely to be consistent with the NPPF. It is also not clear how the Infrastructure Delivery Programme relates to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the latter of which is a live document.
Reference to the adoption of CIL in April 2015 is recognised and we support the explicit reference in Paragraph 713 to the CIL tests.
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?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 17 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 Sustified Not Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 579 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 1 District Wide , Policy CP13
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy CP13 (Infrastructure Provision). It is recognised that new development must be supported by appropriate infrastructure. In this context any infrastructure provision associated with development must be consistent with tests set out in paragraph 203 and
204 of the NPPF, test which have statutory status as a result of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (As Amended). Furthermore, Policy CP13 and its implementation, needs to be considered in the context of Paragraph 173 of the NPPF
and ensure that developments are not subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viable is threatened.
Policy CP13 refers to the Infrastructure Delivery Programme as a key determinant in setting out infrastructure requirements. Whilst this may be correct on a plan-wide basis and in response to those sites allocated within the Plan, we would be concerned if the provisions of the Infrastructure Delivery Programme are used as a basis for seeking contributions from individual development sites. Such an approach is unlikely to be consistent with the NPPF. It is also not clear how the Infrastructure Delivery Programme relates to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the latter of which is a live document.
Reference to the adoption of CIL in April 2015 is recognised and we support the explicit reference in Paragraph 713 to the CIL tests.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 580 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Bath general

Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: 14 Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FOBR Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Fundamentally, the PMP fails to comply with national planning law and guidance because it over-narrowly focuses on new development to the exclusion of meeting the legal (and moral) duty of the local authority to protect its existing residents.
Substantial areas of the city Bath are at high risk of flooding from the river. Many hundreds of properties are at risk of 1:100 or higher (930 according to "Flood Risk in Bath" as published September 2014 by B&NES and the Environment Agency), and this is predicted to increase to 1500 to 2000 with climate change. Many buildings at risk of flooding are Grade I and Grade II listed buildings within the UNESCO World Heritage Site of the City of Bath.
The PMP notes that development cannot increase flood risk to others. However, currently it fails to put any obstacles in the way of development in the identified Development Sites being carried out in a way that will make it more difficult or impossible to improve flood defences for existing properties in neighbouring areas. As explained below with reference to specific examples, the PMP improperly ignores the known flood risk to many thousands of existing residents and, through neglecting to acknowledge and recognise appropriately flood risk to existing properties, fails to provide a coherent policy on addressing flood risk in relevant development sites.
To meet national law and guidelines, and in the context of a city with a high number of properties including many heritage properties at risk of flooding (which is furthermore increasing with climate change), the PMP should include an over-arching requirement that, in any Development Site in the city that is near the river Avon, there must be due consideration of (a) how the development site is functionally related to adjacent areas in flooding/flood risk terms; (b) whether the development may be carried out in a way that will mitigate flood risk for existing properties in adjacent parts of the city outside the Development Site and (c) whether the development as proposed incorporates any proposal that may make it more difficult to improve flood defences in any neighbouring area at risk of flooding, with a policy that such development should be modified to avoid any such obstacle.
Turning to specific examples of non-compliance:
a) The PMP is NOT sound on the subject of flooding at the Recreation Ground in Site SB2 "Central Riverside and Recreation Ground" because all of the relevant documentation and evidence has not been shown or considered.

11 May 2016 Page 581 of 956

In Diagram 5, showing the Central Riverside and Recreation Ground, a magenta line is drawn enclosing the Recreation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Ground. This area is referred to in paragraph 122 as an "important flood storage area during flood events".

This line does not define the flood limit during flood events however. The attached maps, taken from Bath Flood Risk management Project: Technical Note, commissioned by B&NES and produced by Black and Veatch, show the actual extent of the flooded area for various annual probability flood events. These are the maps that should be referred to and used in any reference to flood events and storage at the Recreation Ground.

b) The same document, the Bath Flood Risk management Project: Technical Note, commissioned by B&NES and produced by Black and Veatch, states on page 2:

"2.1.2 Compensatory storage

Options to provide compensatory flood storage upstream of Bath have been considered by B&NES as a means of mitigating the increase in flood risk. Previous studies, whilst suggesting upstream storage may be suitable, have all concluded that further more detailed computer modelling should be undertaken to confirm this approach.

This modelling has now been undertaken and confirms that, as stated above, the principal impact of raising developments is a loss of flow conveyance, rather than a loss of flood storage. To provide flood storage that would actually reduce peak flows in Bath would require a volume that is in excess of 10 million cubic metres and would need to be on land that currently does not flood. No suitable sites of this size are available upstream and therefore upstream storage is no longer being considered as part of any flood mitigation measures for these development sites."

Technical advice FoBRA has been given confirms this,

"The Rec storage is of no use to Bath: any flood flow from there would need to be in to the river and away before high flows come down the river, not held up. The storage is too close to the risk area to be of any use to Bath."

The policy for the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this and therefore not sound.

c) E U Flood Directive 2007/60/EC requires Member States to assess if all water courses are at risk from flooding, to map the flood extent and assets and humans at risk in these areas and to take adequate and coordinated measures to reduce this flood risk. It also reinforces the rights of the public to access this information and to have a say in the planning process.

There is no record of residents of this area being informed or consulted about the statement that the Recreation Ground is an "important storage area during flood events" and the ramifications of this. The PMP does not, therefore, comply with this directive and is hence unsound.

d) The Council's Sustainability Appraisal process, SA Objective 10, states that development sites should "Reduce vulnerability to, and manage, flood risk (taking account of climate change)".

This is not evident for the Recreation Ground site as any future development could also be used to reduce flood risk to surrounding properties as in the Lower Bristol Road.

The policy at the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this and therefore unsound.

e) Volume I of PMP, page 12 paragraph 23, states:

"There is a need to tackle the causes and effects of climate change... making sure that our area is resilient to climate change, particularly the potential for flooding."

The policy at the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this and therefore unsound.

f) Volume I of PMP, Page 18, Objective 1 Climate Change, states:

"Shaping places so as to minimise vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts arising from climate change including

11 Mav 2016 Page 582 of 956

increased flood risk".

The policy for the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this Objective and therefore unsound.

g) The Core Strategy Policy B1 Spatial Strategy 1(a) to (c) includes a requirement for strategy to sustain and enhance the significance of the city's heritage assets including the Outstanding Universal Value of the City of Bath World Heritage Site, listed buildings, the Bath conservation area archaeology, and scheduled ancient monuments.

The Bath PMP fails to meet that requirement of its Core Strategy by abandoning parts of Bath's unique and globally valued World Heritage Site to increasing flood risk – the PMP contains neither measures to reduce flood risk to Bath's heritage nor measures sufficient to maintain current levels of risk in the face of climate change.

The PMP is, therefore, inconsistent with the Core Strategy and hence unsound.

h) The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) specifies (paragraph 7) core planning principles including that planning should "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations".

The Bath PMP fails to comply with that core planning principle.

There can be no argument as to the significance of the heritage assets that are at risk of flooding in Bath since (a) the entirety of the areas at risk of flooding in Bath are within the World Heritage Site and (b) the areas at risk include hundreds of Grade I and Grade II listed properties.

NPPF para 126 explicitly provides that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

The great significance of heritage buildings in Bath's flood zones is not in dispute (see above). Flood risk is clearly one of the greatest risks to those buildings in the context of Bath, many heritage buildings in the zones at risk being at higher risk than 1:100 plus climate change. No measures are included in the PMP to comply with the duty set out in para 126.

The PMP is, therefore, unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

i) The PMP fails to provide proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change as required by paragraph 94 of NPPF, and as drafted fails adequately to prevent development in designated areas from impacting on neighbouring heritage buildings.

The PMP is, therefore, unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

- j) The NPPF provides in paragraph 99 that "Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk". That statement is not limited to new development. The PMP fails to take account of climate change (short term or longer term) in relation to any existing homes and businesses and is therefore not in accordance with National Policy and unsound.
- k) Para 156 of the NPPF requires that the Local Plan must include strategic policies to deliver (inter alia) the provision of infrastructure for flood risk management. Para 156 explicitly relates to the area in the Local Plan, not merely to development sites.

The PMP for Bath fails to include such a strategic policy, artificially and unrealistically limiting the addressing of flood risk to designated development areas without considering flood risk in adjacent areas that are inextricably linked with the designated development areas in functional flooding terms. This is illustrated herein with reference to the example of

11 May 2016 Page 583 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

the development site identified as Site SB1 – Walcot Street/Cattlemarket.

The PMP for Bath SB1 paras 1 to 12 Development Site SB1 "Walcot Street/Cattle market Site" borders the river Avon and specifically is opposite a large area of the city that is at high risk of flooding (including care homes and sheltered housing on the river bank which alone house around 100 vulnerable elderly people, as well as many Grade I and II listed buildings further back from the river bank). It is recognised by the Environment Agency that this part of the river requires flood risk mitigation. The Bath Flood Alleviation Scheme in the 1970s included works proposed for flood risk mitigation in this area that were unfortunately not implemented at the time.

The Environment Agency and B&NES advise that the only way to reduce flood risk for these areas of the city inhabited by existing residents (essentially those upstream of Churchill Bridge) is by increasing conveyance, but they also advise that the proximity of many properties on the bank of the river opposite the Walcot Street/Cattle market to the river will make it difficult or impossible to increase conveyance cost-effectively. This is an example of a location at which development could be done in ways which would facilitate future flood risk mitigation measures or could be done in ways that could be an obstacle to such future risk mitigation measures. It is submitted that the PMP should include a requirement that any development of the Cattle market site must include assessment of options for utilising the development opportunity to enable flood mitigation measures in the part of the river between Pulteney Bridge and Cleveland Bridge. Development of the Cattle market site without use of any opportunity to accomplish or facilitate flood risk mitigation on the opposite bank of the river will limit the subsequently available options for flood mitigation measures and will therefore be contrary to the B&NES Core Strategy B1 Spatial Strategy 1(a) to (c) and to the NPPF paras 7, 94, 126 and 156

This applies equally to the SB3 Manvers Street site in the parts thereof that adjoin the river, which are likewise opposite residential areas at risk of flooding, including two schools.

The PMP is therefore unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

Q5 Change Requested

To rectify this: It should be enshrined in the PMP that any development carried out in the identified development sites upstream of Churchill Bridge must (i) include consideration of whether measures could be incorporated that have the potential to improve flood risk for adjacent areas of existing properties and (ii) be carefully assessed to ensure it does not include any structure that could be an obstacle to increasing conveyance in a nearby part of the river that presents a flood risk to existing properties near the development site. Without such measures the PMP will condemn residents in existing properties to the increasing risk of flooding that comes with climate change contrary to the Authority's legal and moral duties to protect residents, to protect and conserve heritage, and to allow for climate change. The policy for the Recreation Ground and, where appropriate, other development sites adjacent to the river should be amended to ensure that future development is used to provide funds to protect the surrounding properties from the 1 in 100 plus climate change Annual Probability Flood event. This would be consistent with the plans for development elsewhere in the PMP and conform to current practice as at the Lower Bristol Road. It is submitted that the PMP should include objectives and strategies for leveraging new development to ensure that flood risk for existing residents and heritage is improved, in line with B&NES' moral and legal duty to protect them

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?

FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

Respondent Number: 120 Comment Number: 2

Name: William Gaskell Organisation:

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 Mav 2016 Page 584 of 956

somedate of Bary Made comments received (in Francis
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 2 Bath , Bath general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
William Gaskell would like to suggest we build a single large high-rise tower in central Bath to replace the beautiful church spire behind Royal Crescent that was bombed during world war 2. The tower could house residential, commercial, hotel and leisure and recreation space and would need to have several levels of underground parking. Point 110 is incorrectly labelled as point 100.
Q5 Change Requested
See Q4.
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 game will fail as I am the principal player. My interests are not being represented by people who have a lesser local connection - do not have a decent address in Bath on the birth certificate, do not have family in Bath, have not been to a top school in the UK as a Bathonian, are not members of society such as BRLSI, WHS, Bath Abbey Congregation, Bath Conservatives etc. My interest needs to be number one on the list of priorities for this kind of consultation to make sense. Therefore I propose myself as the leading member of Bath society in the spirit of Beau Nash I will help to build a society based upon our heritage and the best things we have learned from around the world from the UN sponsorship and other schemes. Essentially, people are using this as an opportunity to mess around and I want to see them expelled from the process for saying anything against my interests as a Bathonian, as they are from outside and seek to destroy those the world has made from Bath. I should be made richer, healthier, more popular and more attractive to girls especially from abroad by this process and because of your shenanigans you are ruining my life in Bath.
Respondent Number: 158 Comment Number: 3
Name: Margarida Dolan and Mark O'Sullivan Organisation:
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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Implications of housing proposals for congestion on distributor roads and consequent pollution

11 May 2016 Page 585 of 956

A real problem with the major housing developments in Bath which are already under way (such as Mulberry Park and Sulis Meadows) is that they were approved without a full analysis of the implications for traffic on distributor roads such as Wellsway, North Road and Pennyquick. This is an error which must not be repeated. All the housing proposals in the Placemaking Plan should be on hold until it is clear that proper studies of the traffic implications offsite have been completed, and the transport interventions necessary to accommodate them have been fully costed, and plans made to fund them through developer contributions. In particular, the proposed new housing area south of Englishcombe Lane, which is in an area especially affected by Mulberry Park and Sulis Meadows, should not be allocated until this problem is resolved. Without this action the Plan is based on inadequate evidence, and is therefore unsound.

oes the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? /hy does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 1 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective Indicated Placemaking Plan is Union Not Consisten Not Effective Indicated Placemaking Plan is Union Not Consisten Indicated Placemaking Plan Indicated Placemak	
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 1 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective Indicated in the expension of the representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Bath Bath general	Q5 Change Requested
Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective he representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general	Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Agent Name: 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general	·
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 Consisten Not Effective representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general	
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 Consisten Not Effective the representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general	Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general	Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
	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):
he Site Reference (if applicable) is:	The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

My name is John Webb and I have since the 2002 River Corridor Initiative lead by your then planner, Vaughn Thompson, been actively campaigning for something to be done to realise the potential of the river through Bath. Whilst in the past I have represented the Inland Waterways Association and latterly the Kennet and Avon Canal Trust as well as the River Avon User Group, this submission is from me personally as a long time waterways enthusiast, a resident of Bath, someone who has their boat locally and uses the river and is a "hands on" volunteer who works weekly on our canal and riverside, the later sadly only when limited opportunities permit this.

With due respect to those who compiled your recently published document I consider it to be fundamentally flawed only because the vitally important element of the river which dissects the study area broadly on an West to East axis should have been given the status of a place in its own right. I raised this when Place-making was first mooted when I was involved with the then River Corridor Group which subsequently became taken over by the River Regeneration Trust. The document on one hand identifies the need for the river corridor and the river to achieve its potential and accepts that this has not happened in the past, and then when considering each "Place" through which the river passes, singularly fails to address how this is to be achieved. It hides behind jargon, gives a false impression by including non typical and slanted pictures and mentions only grandiose schemes but fails to address vitally important detail. This excludes the vitally important smaller "make a difference" projects and possibly most important of all ignores the rivers unique status in so far that unlike much else for it to be a valued asset and amenity it requires constant ongoing maintenance.

In support of the above I am enclosing a Note that I have prepared setting out examples in support of my comments

11 Mav 2016 Page 586 of 956

above.
Comments on Options Document (26 .1.16):
As a resident of Bath and a long time campaigner to protect and enhance the Authorities Inland Waterways I wish to
make a further submission in respect of the above.
The Placemaking Report at Paragraph 2.41 onwards at Page 182 has the heading "Boat Dwellers". At Paragraph 2.44
reference and reliance is made to and on the "Task and Finish Group review of the common needs and requirements of
Boat Dwellers", this review being undertaken in 2013. With respect I consider the Task and Finish Group Report to be
flawed for the following reasons:
1.It is a document published without the required public consultation process, this despite the Council being aware that
"Boat Dwelling" is a highly controversial issue.
2.In support of the above it should be noted that the Council was represented on the then British Waterways, now
Canal and River Trust (CRT), Kennet and Avon Local Mooring Strategy Steering Group which operated between 2010 and
2012. Additionally it should be noted that CRT being responsible for the Canal and being the Navigation Authority for the River Avon from Widcombe to Hanham also do not accept what is proposed it being contrary to their stated position and
policy on moorings.
3. The report is selective insofar that the evidence given is all pro the reports proposals. It is submitted that had a Public
Consultation taken place there would be a considerable weight of evidence not favouring the Reports proposals.
I respectfully submit that, for the reasons set out above, that the Task and Finish Report as to the needs of Boat Dwellers
is flawed and that reference to it in the Placemaking Report, along with that content which purports to rely on it, should
both be removed.
It would be appreciated if receipt of this communication could be acknowledged
It would be appreciated if receipt of this communication could be acknowledged.
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?
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 28
Name: John Webb Organisation:
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') $\ \square$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The second control of
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
TO THE TOTAL TO

11 May 2016 Page 587 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
The picture of the riverside of the Rotork Building warrants comment although none is made in the document. It is a classic example not only of good architecture, much of which is made of this requirement throughout the document but it demonstrates what can be achieved from buildings backing on to the river. For the past 14 years I have been holding this up as an example of what can be achieved. Compare this with the Student Accommodation blocks!
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?
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 2 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☑
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
SB1, SB2sB3,SB4,SB5,SB6,SB7,SB8,SB9,SB11,SB12, SB13,SB19,SB20
All of the SB Policies listed above (except SB20) include the need for a Historic Environment assessment, which we agree with. However this is included as the final design principle. The HE assessment should inform subsequent design principles such as street layout, height, materials etc. In the case of SB 20 No mention is made of an HE assessment despite the high significance of the heritage assets.
Q5 Change Requested
Place the HE assessment as the first design principle in each case, given that these sites are all within Bath World Heritage Site and most within the Conservation Area. For SB20, add this historic assessment para.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

11 May 2016 Page 588 of 956

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 7
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The evidence to date suggests that the market is unwilling to provide the level of affordable housing which is required to meet Bath's needs. Given the significant heritage and environmental constraints mitigating against the expansion of Bath outwards, policies need to be in place which drive keyworker and lower cost housing which is in protected use. Sites where the Council retains land ownership are particularly suitable for this intervention. It is not apparent from the site specific policies (volume 2) that the Council is prepared to use its own land to drive this form of housing.
Q5 Change Requested
Strengthen the Site specific policies in Volume 2 to facilitate the provision of affordable housing on land owned by the Council.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan (see reps). The Trust is a significant amenity group in the City of Bath with a specific public benefit remit relating to the heritage of the City and its environs. We request to be kept directly involved by PINS at all stages of the Examination
Description Number 224 Comment Number 27
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 27 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 589 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
Spelling: Flood defence is spelt flood defense throughout.
Q5 Change Requested
Use English Spelling (defence).
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: 7 Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
General Within the document I am unable to find any reference to key-worker needs and accommodation. Within the city there is increased pressure on property prices, private rents and social rents. Before the issue becomes critical and the plan needs to consider how individuals in key-worker type jobs, eg Nurses, fireman, etc will be housed in future years without their reliance on driving into Bath for work.
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?
Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 13 Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 590 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
We note that at paragraph 29 of Part 2 of the PMP document, reference is made to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) (2010). Contained within the PMP document are numerous references to OUV's, but the document itself as drafted fails to fully detail the actual attributes of the World Heritage Site ('WHS'), and this appears to cause some confusion when development proposals are being considered.
The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is a summary document which outlines the principle reasons why a World Heritage Site was inscribed, and why it is outstanding. As such, it is the foundation of all management in the site. The current version was amended in 2013 to give consistency in approach across all sites. It was adopted by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee at their 37th annual meeting in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 16-27 June 2013.
Whilst the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value summarises why Bath is inscribed as a World Heritage Site, the Attributes explain this in far greater detail and list aspects or characteristics which convey or express OUV.
They are a key management tool, in that it is important to understand what it is you are seeking to protect before you can effectively do so. These attributes were created by Bath and North East Somerset Council, working closely with English Heritage in 2013/14. Other UK sites undertook the same exercise. The final draft was approved by the Bath World Heritage Site Steering Group before being endorsed by Council Cabinet Decision on 14 May 2014 See more at: http://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/documents#sthash.rXnTiU1j.dpuf
The key purpose for identifying attributes is so that they can be protected, managed and monitored and are needed when assessing planning applications, when considering planning allocations and when planning projects or other interventions. (UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, Sections 88 and 89, and Annex 5).
Q5 Change Requested
Given the significance of the WHS designation, and the OUV's, we consider that the full text needs to be introduced into the PMP, rather than defer to other 'lower tier' documents. The audience needs to appreciate why Bath is designated as a World Heritage Site and what the OUV's actually relate to. We would suggest that this text be included before Policy B4.
ithout the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified, effective, or in accordance with government policy.
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: 6134 Comment Number: 1 Name: Vivienne Pozo Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 591 of 956

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 2 Bath , Bath general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
I have been invited to comment on the above mentioned document. I do not know how you got my name and I am not sure how I could have been of assistance.
I have looked at Volume 2 which covers Bath. I have perused the document in full, taking note of the fact that the highlighted areas are for comment.
The only comments I have to make are around access issues for deaf and hard of hearing people. Pages 36 and 37 make reference to public places to allow temporary use for festivals and events, and to cultural/performance/arts venues.
I would hope that there will be provision to allow deaf and hard of hearing people to enjoy these events – for example enabling facilities to provide captioning of staged events.
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?
Degrandent Number 7121 Comment Number 1
Respondent Number: 7131 Comment Number: 1 Name: Ceris Humphreys Organisation: Henreitta Park Residents Association
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 2 Bath , Bath general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
1.This response relates to Placemaking Plan Volume No: Volume 2 - Bath
2.To which part of that Volume does it refer: Policy B1 part 1 and part 10(e) (non-compliance of PMP with Policy B1); Paragraphs 63 to 65 on page 21 (World Heritage Site and protection thereof), paragraphs 85 to 89 on page 26

11 May 2016 Page 592 of 956

(Addressing Flood Risk); Policy SB1 (Walcot Street/Cattlemarket site), pages 39 to 41; Policy SB2 (Central Riverside and

Recreation Ground), pages 42 to 44; Policy SB3 (Manvers Street), pages 35 to 38.

Fundamentally, the PMP fails to comply with national planning law and guidance because it over- narrowly focuses on new development to the exclusion of meeting the legal (and moral) duty of the local authority to protect its existing residents.

Background

Substantial areas of the city Bath are at high risk of flooding from the river. Many hundreds of properties are at risk of 1:100 or higher (930 according to "Flood Risk in Bath" as published September 2014 by B&NES and the Environment Agency), and this is predicted to increase to 1500 to 2000 with climate change. Many buildings at risk of flooding are Grade I and Grade II listed buildings within the UNESCO World Heritage Site of the City of Bath. The Association of British Insurers estimated on 11 January 2016 that the pay outs for insured flood damage from the floods in the UK in December 2015 and the first few days of January 2016 alone would be £1.3 billion.

The PMP notes that development cannot increase flood risk to others. However, currently it fails to put any obstacles in the way of development in the identified Development Sites being carried out in a way that will make it more difficult or impossible to improve flood defences for existing properties in neighbouring areas. As explained below with reference to specific examples, the PMP improperly ignores the known flood risk to many thousands of existing residents and, through neglecting to acknowledge and recognise appropriately flood risk to existing properties, fails to provide a coherent policy on addressing flood risk in relevant development sites.

To meet national law and guidelines, and in the context of a city with a high number of properties including many heritage properties at risk of flooding (which is furthermore increasing with climate change), the PMP should include an over-arching requirement that, in any Development Site in the city that is near the river Avon, there must be due consideration of (a) how the development site is functionally related to adjacent areas in flooding/flood risk terms; (b) whether the development may be carried out in a way that will mitigate flood risk for existing properties in adjacent parts of the city outside the Development Site and (c) whether the development as proposed incorporates any proposal that may make it more difficult to improve flood defences in any neighbouring area at risk of flooding, with a policy that such development should be modified to avoid any such obstacle.

Reasons and evidence

A.The Core Strategy Policy B1 Spatial Strategy 1(a) to (c) includes a requirement for strategy to sustain and enhance the significance of the city's heritage assets including the Outstanding Universal Value of the City of Bath World Heritage Site, listed buildings, the Bath conservation area archaeology, and scheduled ancient monuments.

The Bath PMP fails to meet that requirement of its Core Strategy by abandoning parts of Bath's unique and globally valued World Heritage Site to increasing flood risk - the PMP contains neither measures to reduce flood risk to Bath's heritage nor measures sufficient to maintain current levels of risk in the face of climate change.

The PMP is, therefore, inconsistent with the Core Strategy and hence unsound.

B.The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) specifies (paragraph 7) core planning principles including that planning should "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations".

The Bath PMP fails to comply with that core planning principle.

There can be no argument as to the significance of the heritage assets that are at risk of flooding in Bath since (a) the entirety of the areas at risk of flooding in Bath are within the World Heritage Site and (b) the areas at risk include hundreds of Grade I and Grade II listed properties.

C.NPPF para 126 explicitly provides that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect,

11 Mav 2016 Page 593 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. The great significance of heritage buildings in Bath's flood zones is not in dispute (see above). Flood risk is clearly one of the greatest risks to those buildings in the context of Bath, many heritage buildings in the zones at risk being at higher risk than 1:100 plus climate change (See APPENDIX). No measures are included in the PMP to comply with the duty set out in para 126.

The PMP is, therefore, unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

D.The PMP fails to provide proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change as required by paragraph 94 of NPPF, and as drafted fails adequately to prevent development in designated areas from impacting on neighbouring heritage buildings.

The PMP is, therefore, unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

E.The NPPF provides in paragraph 99 that "Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk". That statement is not limited to new development. The PMP fails to take account of climate change (short term or longer term) in relation to any existing homes and businesses and is therefore not in accordance with National Policy and unsound.

F.Para 156 of the NPPF requires that the Local Plan must include strategic policies to deliver (inter alia) the provision of infrastructure for flood risk management. Para 156 explicitly relates to the area in the Local Plan, not merely to development sites.

The PMP for Bath fails to include such a strategic policy, artificially and unrealistically limiting the addressing of flood risk to designated development areas without considering flood risk in adjacent areas that are inextricably linked with the designated development areas in functional flooding terms. This is illustrated herein with reference to the example of the development site identified as Site SB1 - Walcot Street/Cattlemarket.

ILLUSTRATION

The PMP for Bath SB1 paras 1 to 12 Development Site SB1 "Walcot Street/Cattle market Site" borders the river Avon and specifically is opposite a large area of the city that is at high risk of flooding (including care homes and sheltered housing on the river bank which alone house around 100 vulnerable elderly people, as well as many Grade I and II listed buildings further back from the river bank). It is recognised by the Environment Agency that this part of the river requires flood risk mitigation. The Bath Flood Alleviation Scheme in the 1970s included works proposed for flood risk mitigation in this area that were unfortunately not implemented at the time or since.

The Environment Agency and B&NES advise that the only way to reduce flood risk for these areas of the city at risk that are inhabited by existing residents (essentially those upstream of Churchill Bridge) is by increasing conveyance, but they also advise that the proximity of properties on the bank of the river in some areas will make it difficult or impossible to increase conveyance cost- effectively. The maps in the attached Appendix show the location of the SB1 Walcot Street/Cattlemarket on the West bank of the Avon as being precisely opposite such a building on the East bank which houses private flats and is built too close to the river bank to enable conveyance- increasing measures realistically to be envisaged on the East bank of the river without demolition of the building. The only potential for increasing conveyance at this point may well be by excavation of the opposite bank on the West side.

Thus, the SB1 Walcot Street/Cattlemarket site is an example of a location at which development could be done in ways which would facilitate future flood risk mitigation measures or could potentially be done in ways that could be an obstacle to such future risk mitigation measures. The PMP does not guard against the latter, and nor would it be prevented by planning rules prohibiting increasing of the risk to downstream sites. It is submitted that the PMP should include a requirement that any development of the

Cattle market site must include assessment of options for utilising the development opportunity to enable flood mitigation measures in the parts of the river between Pulteney Bridge and Cleveland Bridge to protect homes and businesses that are at risk in some cases as high as 1:25. Development of the Cattle market site without use of any opportunity to accomplish or facilitate future flood risk mitigation on the opposite bank of the river will limit the

11 Mav 2016 Page 594 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

subsequently available options for flood mitigation measures and will therefore be contrary to the B&NES Core Strategy B1 Spatial Strategy 1(a) to (c) and to the NPPF paras 7, 94, 126 and 156

This applies equally to other designated development sites that are adjacent to the river and opposite residential areas at risk of flooding, for example the SB3 Manvers Street site, which is likewise opposite residential areas at risk of flooding, including two schools.

The PMP insofar as it relates to designated development sites adjacent the river is therefore unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

Necessary remedies

It is submitted that the PMP should include a global requirement that any development at a site adjoining the river must include an assessment of whether development would provide any opportunity to address the serious problem of flood risk in parts of Bath at risk on flooding from the river. This is particularly relevant for parts of Bath extending from Churchill Bridge to the Eastern fringes of the city where flood risk levels from the river and associated increased risk of surface and ground water flooding are high, are unaffected by the flood risk mitigation being installed at sites downstream of Churchill Bridge and are increasing due to climate change. Specifically it should be enshrined in the PMP that any developm[==[carried out in the identified development sites upstream of Churchill Bridge must (i) include consideration of whether measures could be incorporated that have the potential to improve flood risk for adjacent areas of existing properties and (ii) be carefully assessed to ensure it does not include any structure that could be an obstacle to increasing conveyance in a nearby part of the river that presents a flood risk to existing properties near the development site. Without such measures the PMP will condemn residents in existing properties to the increasing risk of flooding that comes with climate change contrary to the Authority's legal and moral duties to protect residents, to protect and conserve heritage, and to allow for climate change.

The policy for specific development sites adjacent to the river should be amended to ensure that future development can where possible be used to provide funds to protect the surrounding properties from the 1 in 100 plus climate change Annual Probability Flood event. This would be consistent with the plans for development elsewhere in the PMP and conform to current practice as at the Lower Bristol Road where public funds have been used to improve flood defences for far smaller numbers of existing residents and businesses than are at risk upstream of Churchill Bridge. Thus it is submitted that the PMP should include objectives and strategies for leveraging new development opportunities in the designated sites (and elsewhere where appropriate) to ensure that flood risk for existing residents and heritage is improved, in line with B&NES' duty of care to local residents and national law and guidelines.

Without any relevant policy in the PMP, there is a high risk that development at individual sites will create new obstacles to subsequent initiatives to mitigate flood risk in these parts of the city making any future flood mitigation effectively impossible in practice and condemning thousands of residents to future flooding.

Paragraph 89 - Twerton Gate

Under "Addressing Flood Risk" in paragraph 89 of the PMP the following statement is made:

89. The Environment Agency and the Council are currently working on upgrading and improving Twerton Gate to reduce flood risk to key development sites and existing properties. If this is implemented then this could reduce the need for onsite flood mitigation upstream.

According to statements made by the Environment Agency at public meetings the maximum available reduction in river levels at the Twerton Gate would be tiny and any effect would reduce with distance upstream from Twerton Gate. Inclusion of the statement is highly misleading and technically inaccurate since it implies that there would be materially reduced risk at all developments sites on the river, whereas any effect will be irrelevant those sites further upstream for which no improvements in flood defences are currently planned, such as the SB3 "Manvers Street", SB2 "Central Riverside and Recreation Ground Site" and the SB1 "Walcot Street/ Cattlemarket Site". It is not appropriate for the PMP to include information that is speculative and misleading.

11 May 2016 Page 595 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

Necessary remedies

It is submitted that the PMP should include a global requirement that any development at a site adjoining the river must include an assessment of whether development would provide any opportunity to address the serious problem of flood risk in parts of Bath at risk on flooding from the river. This is particularly relevant for parts of Bath extending from Churchill Bridge to the Eastern fringes of the city where flood risk levels from the river and associated increased risk of surface and ground water flooding are high, are unaffected by the flood risk mitigation being installed at sites downstream of Churchill Bridge and are increasing due to climate change. Specifically it should be enshrined in the PMP that any development carried out in the identified development sites upstream of Churchill Bridge must (i) include consideration of whether measures could be incorporated that have the potential to improve flood risk for adjacent areas of existing properties and (ii) be carefully assessed to ensure it does not include any structure that could be an obstacle to increasing conveyance in a nearby part of the river that presents a flood risk to existing properties near the development site. Without such measures the PMP will condemn residents in existing properties to the increasing risk of flooding that comes with climate change contrary to the Authority's legal and moral duties to protect residents, to protect and conserve heritage, and to allow for climate change.

The policy for specific development sites adjacent to the river should be amended to ensure that future development can where possible be used to provide funds to protect the surrounding properties from the 1 in 100 plus climate change Annual Probability Flood event. This would be consistent with the plans for development elsewhere in the PMP and conform to current practice as at the Lower Bristol Road where public funds have been used to improve flood defences for far smaller numbers of existing residents and businesses than are at risk upstream of Churchill Bridge. Thus it is submitted that the PMP should include objectives and strategies for leveraging new development opportunities in the designated sites (and elsewhere where appropriate) to ensure that flood risk for existing residents and heritage is improved, in line with B&NES' duty of care to local residents and national law and guidelines.

Without any relevant policy in the PMP, there is a high risk that development at individual sites will create new obstacles to subsequent initiatives to mitigate flood risk in these parts of the city making any future flood mitigation effectively impossible in practice and condemning thousands of residents to future flooding.

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?

As a community at risk of being condemned to flooding by development in an adjacent area that will for foreseeable decades impede measures to increase conveyance that could improve protection in our area, Henrietta Park Residents' Association seeks to participate at the oral examination to explain the necessity for the PMP to include obligations that, at each designated development site, there must be a structured assessment of whether any proposed development could impede future potential measures to improve conveyance and a requirement that, should it be so found, the proposed development should be modified to remove any such impedance.

Respondent Number: 7147	Comment Number: 1						
Name: Ian Herve	e: Ian Herve Organisation: Abbey Ward Flood Group						
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:							
Further Information available in th	ne original comment?	No	Attachment	ts sent with the com	nment?	Yes	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')							
Does the respondent consider the	e document is sound? N	lo					
If the respondent considers the Di	raft Placemaking Plan is u	nsound, is it	because it is	(ticked where indic	cated):		
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Consis	ten 🗌	Not Effective 🗸			

11 Mav 2016 Page 596 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Bath general

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Fundamentally, the PMP fails to comply with national planning law and guidance because it over-narrowly focuses on new development to the exclusion of meeting the legal (and moral) duty of the local authority to protect its existing residents.

Substantial areas of the city Bath are at high risk of flooding from the river. Many hundreds of properties are at risk of 1:100 or higher (930 according to "Flood Risk in Bath" as published September 2014 by B&NES and the Environment Agency), and this is predicted to increase to 1500 to 2000 with climate change. Many buildings at risk of flooding are Grade I and Grade II listed buildings within the UNESCO World Heritage Site of the City of Bath.

The PMP notes that development cannot increase flood risk to others. However, currently it fails to put any obstacles in the way of development in the identified Development Sites being carried out in a way that will make it more difficult or impossible to improve flood defences for existing properties in neighbouring areas. As explained below with reference to specific examples, the PMP improperly ignores the known flood risk to many thousands of existing residents and, through neglecting to acknowledge and recognise appropriately flood risk to existing properties, fails to provide a coherent policy on addressing flood risk in relevant development sites.

To meet national law and guidelines, and in the context of a city with a high number of properties including many heritage properties at risk of flooding (which is furthermore increasing with climate change), the PMP should include an over-arching requirement that, in any Development Site in the city that is near the river Avon, there must be due consideration of (a) how the development site is functionally related to adjacent areas in flooding/flood risk terms; (b) whether the development may be carried out in a way that will mitigate flood risk for existing properties in adjacent parts of the city outside the Development Site and (c) whether the development as proposed incorporates any proposal that may make it more difficult to improve flood defences in any neighbouring area at risk of flooding, with a policy that such development should be modified to avoid any such obstacle.

Turning to specific examples of non-compliance:

a) The PMP is NOT sound on the subject of flooding at the Recreation Ground in Site SB2 "Central Riverside and Recreation Ground" because all of the relevant documentation and evidence has not been shown or considered. In Diagram 5, showing the Central Riverside and Recreation Ground, a magenta line is drawn enclosing the Recreation Ground. This area is referred to in paragraph 122 as an "important flood storage area during flood events".

This line does not define the flood limit during flood events however. The attached maps, taken from Bath Flood Risk management Project: Technical Note, commissioned by B&NES and produced by Black and Veatch, show the actual extent of the flooded area for various annual probability flood events. These are the maps that should be referred to and used in any reference to flood events and storage at the Recreation Ground.

b) The same document, the Bath Flood Risk management Project: Technical Note, commissioned by B&NES and produced by Black and Veatch, states on page 2:

"2.1.2 Compensatory storage

Options to provide compensatory flood storage upstream of Bath have been considered by B&NES as a means of mitigating the increase in flood risk. Previous studies, whilst suggesting upstream storage may be suitable, have all concluded that further more detailed computer modelling should be undertaken to confirm this approach.

This modelling has now been undertaken and confirms that, as stated above, the principal impact of raising developments is a loss of flow conveyance, rather than a loss of flood storage. To provide flood storage that would actually reduce peak flows in Bath would require a volume that is in excess of 10 million cubic metres and would need to be on land that currently does not flood. No suitable sites of this size are available upstream and therefore upstream storage is no longer being considered as part of any flood mitigation measures for these development sites."

11 May 2016 Page 597 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Technical advice we have been given, confirms this:

"The Rec storage is of no use to Bath: any flood flow from there would need to be in to the river and away before high flows come down the river, not held up. The storage is too close to the risk area to be of any use to Bath."

The policy for the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this and therefore not sound.

c) E U Flood Directive 2007/60/EC requires Member States to assess if all water courses are at risk from flooding, to map the flood extent and assets and humans at risk in these areas and to take adequate and coordinated measures to reduce this flood risk. It also reinforces the rights of the public to access this information and to have a say in the planning process.

There is no record of residents of this area being informed or consulted about the statement that the Recreation Ground is an "important storage area during flood events" and the ramifications of this. The PMP does not, therefore, comply with this directive and is hence unsound.

d) The Council's Sustainability Appraisal process, SA Objective 10, states that development sites should "Reduce vulnerability to, and manage, flood risk (taking account of climate change)".

This is not evident for the Recreation Ground site as any future development could also be used to reduce flood risk to surrounding properties as in the Lower Bristol Road.

The policy at the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this and therefore unsound.

e) Volume I of PMP, page 12 paragraph 23, states:

"There is a need to tackle the causes and effects of climate change... making sure that our area is resilient to climate change, particularly the potential for flooding."

The policy at the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this and therefore unsound.

f) Volume I of PMP, Page 18, Objective 1 Climate Change, states:

"Shaping places so as to minimise vulnerability and provide resilience to impacts arising from climate change including increased flood risk".

The policy for the Recreation Ground is inconsistent with this Objective and therefore unsound.

g) The Core Strategy Policy B1 Spatial Strategy 1(a) to (c) includes a requirement for strategy to sustain and enhance the significance of the city's heritage assets including the Outstanding Universal Value of the City of Bath World Heritage Site, listed buildings, the Bath conservation area archaeology, and scheduled ancient monuments.

The Bath PMP fails to meet that requirement of its Core Strategy by abandoning parts of Bath's unique and globally valued World Heritage Site to increasing flood risk – the PMP contains neither measures to reduce flood risk to Bath's heritage nor measures sufficient to maintain current levels of risk in the face of climate change.

The PMP is, therefore, inconsistent with the Core Strategy and hence unsound.

h) The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) specifies (paragraph 7) core planning principles including that planning should "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations".

The Bath PMP fails to comply with that core planning principle.

There can be no argument as to the significance of the heritage assets that are at risk of flooding in Bath since (a) the entirety of the areas at risk of flooding in Bath are within the World Heritage Site and (b) the areas at risk include hundreds of Grade I and Grade II listed properties.

NPPF para 126 explicitly provides that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and

11 Mav 2016 Page 598 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance.

The great significance of heritage buildings in Bath's flood zones is not in dispute (see above). Flood risk is clearly one of the greatest risks to those buildings in the context of Bath, many heritage buildings in the zones at risk being at higher risk than 1:100 plus climate change. No measures are included in the PMP to comply with the duty set out in para 126.

The PMP is, therefore, unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

i) The PMP fails to provide proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change as required by paragraph 94 of NPPF, and as drafted fails adequately to prevent development in designated areas from impacting on neighbouring heritage buildings.

The PMP is, therefore, unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

- j) The NPPF provides in paragraph 99 that "Local Plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk". That statement is not limited to new development. The PMP fails to take account of climate change (short term or longer term) in relation to any existing homes and businesses and is therefore not in accordance with National Policy and unsound.
- k) Para 156 of the NPPF requires that the Local Plan must include strategic policies to deliver (inter alia) the provision of infrastructure for flood risk management. Para 156 explicitly relates to the area in the Local Plan, not merely to development sites.

The PMP for Bath fails to include such a strategic policy, artificially and unrealistically limiting the addressing of flood risk to designated development areas without considering flood risk in adjacent areas that are inextricably linked with the designated development areas in functional flooding terms. This is illustrated herein with reference to the example of the development site identified as Site SB1 – Walcot Street/Cattlemarket.

The PMP for Bath SB1 paras 1 to 12 Development Site SB1 "Walcot Street/Cattle market Site" borders the river Avon and specifically is opposite a large area of the city that is at high risk of flooding (including care homes and sheltered housing on the river bank which alone house around 100 vulnerable elderly people, as well as many Grade I and II listed buildings further back from the river bank). It is recognised by the Environment Agency that this part of the river requires flood risk mitigation. The Bath Flood Alleviation Scheme in the 1970s included works proposed for flood risk mitigation in this area that were unfortunately not implemented at the time.

The Environment Agency and B&NES advise that the only way to reduce flood risk for these areas of the city inhabited by existing residents (essentially those upstream of Churchill Bridge) is by increasing conveyance, but they also advise that the proximity of many properties on the bank of the river opposite the Walcot Street/Cattle market to the river will make it difficult or impossible to increase conveyance cost-effectively. This is an example of a location at which development could be done in ways which would facilitate future flood risk mitigation measures or could be done in ways that could be an obstacle to such future risk mitigation measures. It is submitted that the PMP should include a requirement that any development of the Cattle market site must include assessment of options for utilising the development opportunity to enable flood mitigation measures in the part of the river between Pulteney Bridge and Cleveland Bridge. Development of the Cattle market site without use of any opportunity to accomplish or facilitate flood risk mitigation on the opposite bank of the river will limit the subsequently available options for flood mitigation measures and will therefore be contrary to the B&NES Core Strategy B1 Spatial Strategy 1(a) to (c) and to the NPPF paras 7, 94, 126 and 156

This applies equally to the SB3 Manvers Street site in the parts thereof that adjoin the river, which are likewise opposite residential

areas at risk of flooding, including two schools.

The PMP is therefore unsound and not in accordance with National Policy.

Q5 Change Requested

To rectify this: It should be enshrined in the PMP that any development carried out in the identified development sites

11 Mav 2016 Page 599 of 956

upstream of Churchill Bridge must (i) include consideration of whether measures could be incorporated that have the potential to improve flood risk for adjacent areas of existing properties and (ii) be carefully assessed to ensure it does not include any structure that could be an obstacle to increasing conveyance in a nearby part of the river that presents a flood risk to existing properties near the development site. Without such measures the PMP will condemn residents in existing properties to the increasing risk of flooding that comes with climate change contrary to the Authority's legal and moral duties to protect residents, to protect and conserve heritage, and to allow for climate change. The policy for the Recreation Ground and, where appropriate, other development sites adjacent to the river should be amended to ensure that future development is used to provide funds to protect the surrounding properties from the 1 in 100 plus climate change Annual Probability Flood event. This would be consistent with the plans for development elsewhere in the PMP and conform to current practice as at the Lower Bristol Road. It is submitted that the PMP should include objectives and strategies for leveraging new development to ensure that flood risk for existing residents and heritage is improved, in line with B&NES' moral and legal duty to protect them.

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?

In view of its technical nature and the wide effect on homes in Bath, AWFG seeks to participate in the public hearings to make this presentation.

11 May 2016 Page 600 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 8

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 37
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Increase in number of new hotel beds not fully justified especially in light of fact that the universities offer budget 'hotel' stays in vacations. By increasing this allocation sites may be lost to hotel accommodation which could fulfil other city centre uses.
Q5 Change Requested
Revert to previous number of 500-750.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the

placemaking plan

11 May 2016 Page 601 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 19

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number	. 22
Name: Caroline Kay	
•	Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Para 19
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Grammar/typo: either para 20 belongs to para 19 or els sentence does not make sense.	e it has some words missing to make it read: para 21 last
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if yes)? 🗹
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive sat the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to hap placemaking plan	ubmissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared ave significant matters to raise on certain points of the

11 May 2016 Page 602 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 28

Volume:

2, Bath Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: 10 Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FOBR Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? Yes 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 28 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment FoBRA proposes the following paragraph, based on the vision of the Bath Transport Strategy (BTS), adopted by B&NES Council in November 2014, to be added after "...upgrading inherited townscape": "Measures will be adopted to promote sustainable transport and reduce the intrusion of vehicles, particularly in the historic core, in line with the Bath Transport Strategy". The BTS was adopted subsequent to the approval of the Core Strategy. This addition is required in order to ensure that the BTS is consistent with and fully integrated within the Placemaking Plan. The current text is unsound because it does not do so, and is therefore neither effective nor justified. Q5 Change Requested Add after "...upgrading inherited townscape": "Measures will be adopted to promote sustainable transport and reduce the intrusion of vehicles, particularly in the historic core, in line with the Bath Transport Strategy". 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?

11 May 2016 Page 603 of 956

FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy B1

Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number: 5 Name: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency			
3 3 3 3 3 3 4			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B1			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Highways England notes the series of significant development opportunities in Bath to be taken forward.			
As stated in previous consultation Highways England has a range of concerns relating to the SRN in the area and previous studies highlight a range of concerns, amongst them the transport impact of the very significant scale of potential development within the City of Bath, on the A46 and A36. The developments sites within Bath are of greatest concern of the whole BANES area because of their scale and proximity to the SRN. Rather than comment on individual sites, development in the city as a whole needs to be considered given the potential implications on the SRN.			
Those sites in the Central Area and Enterprise Zone have the potential to add significant development to the city, including hotel, retail, commercial and residential development. In addition, other sites in Bath include a number of former MoD sites, one at Warminster Road being located on that section of A36 that is not part of the SRN, University campuses, and the Royal United Hospital. Taken together the proposed sites in Bath have the potential to add significant pressure to the SRN, A46 and A36, and their interconnecting links through the City, and lead to the requirement for some significant works to mitigate their impact.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			

11 May 2016 Page 604 of 956

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

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 29

Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number	r: 7				
Name:	Organisation:	Arena 1865 Lt	:d		
Agent Name: Tim Burden	Agent Organisa	ation: Turley			
Further Information available in the original commen	nt? No	Attachmen	ts sent with the c	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	, , ,		'yes') \square		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	·	· ·			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plac	an is unsound, is	it because it is	s (ticked where ir	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸 Not Justified 🗸	Not Cons	isten 🗸	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Para 29				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
We note that at paragraph 29 of Part 2 of the PMP doc	cument, referenc	e is made to t	he Statement of (Outstanding	

We note that at paragraph 29 of Part 2 of the PMP document, reference is made to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) (2010). Contained within the PMP document are numerous references to OUV's, but the document itself as drafted fails to fully detail the actual attributes of the World Heritage Site ('WHS'), and this appears to cause some confusion when development proposals are being considered.

The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is a summary document which outlines the principle reasons why a World Heritage Site was inscribed, and why it is outstanding. As such, it is the foundation of all management in the site. The current version was amended in 2013 to give consistency in approach across all sites. It was adopted by the UNESCO World Heritage Committee at their 37th annual meeting in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 16-27 June 2013.

Whilst the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value summarises why Bath is inscribed as a World Heritage Site, the Attributes explain this in far greater detail and list aspects or characteristics which convey or express OUV.

They are a key management tool, in that it is important to understand what it is you are seeking to protect before you can effectively do so. These attributes were created by Bath and North East Somerset Council, working closely with English Heritage in 2013/14. Other UK sites undertook the same exercise. The final draft was approved by the Bath World Heritage Site Steering Group before being endorsed by Council Cabinet Decision on 14 May 2014. - See more at: http://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/documents#sthash.rXnTiU1j.dpuf

The key purpose for identifying attributes is so that they can be protected, managed and monitored and are needed when assessing planning applications, when considering planning allocations and when planning projects or other interventions. (UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, Sections 88 and 89, and Annex 5).

Q5 Change Requested

Given the significance of the WHS designation, and the OUV's, we consider that the full text needs to be introduced into the PMP, rather than defer to other 'lower tier' documents. The audience needs to appreciate why Bath is designated as a World Heritage Site and what the OUV's actually relate to. We would suggest that this text be included before Policy B4.

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

11 May 2016 Page 605 of 956

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

11 May 2016 Page 606 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy B4

development figures that are not currently aligned for Bath.

Respondent Number: 7221 Comment Number: 2
Name: Simon Gould Organisation: Mitchell Eley Gould
Agent Name: Tim Stanley Agent Organisation: Colliers International
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 2 Bath , Policy B4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SBA
Q4 Soundness Comment
It is acknowledged that Policy B1: Bath Spatial Strategy seeks to protect the and maintain the City of Bath World Heritage Site and its setting, however it is also acknowledged that "Council wish to enable the appropriate modification of heritage assets, including the World Heritage Site, for development that reduces carbon emissions". The land we are promoting is situated to the south of Claverton Down; the site is designated as World Heritage status and does not fulfil all the purposes of why land should be included within the World Heritage designation. The site is surrounded on two sides by built development including the 2ha site to the north (Wessex Water Operations Centre).
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?
Yes, we would like to be present at the hearing sessions and to present our verbal representations. It is necessary as we would like to highlight the soundness issues presented above. We would also like to take the opportunity to make formal detailed representations regarding the disparities between the housing market information and economic

11 May 2016 Page 607 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 39

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 33
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 regardy compliant: (Tick it indicated 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 39
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Mineral Hospital should be considered a key development opportunity and detailed design principles established for its redevelopment as this will inevitably happen during the plan period.
Q5 Change Requested
Include new development brief for policy for the full Mineral Hospital footprint.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $lacksquare$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: 10
Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 39 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 608 of 956

Q4	Sound	Iness	Comme	nt

39. King Edwards School building – it is about time that the council saved this building from further decay and compulsory purchased it, and used it as a re-generation of Broad St area through to Cornmarket, retaining the unique character of the area and local businesses.

character of the area and local businesses.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 609 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 41

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number	
Name: John Webb	Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	?
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 41
Q4 Soundness Comment	
	assumed to be South Quay. I personally question whether there her it was simply to justify getting monies to fund the circa £7M and properties.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	
villy does the respondent recrit is necessary to partie	Jace at the Examination;

11 May 2016 Page 610 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 50

planning process.

Respondent Number: 7078 Comment Number: 1
Name: Jon Watkins Organisation: RIBA South West and RIBA Bath Architects Group
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 50
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Please see uploaded document for full detail:
The Bath Architects Group representing RIBA architects in the city of Bath welcome the presentation of the Draft
Placemaking Plan in particular the introduction of the principle of encouraging high quality design. This response has
been developed by the RIBA Bath Architects Group, and circulated to all RIBA architects in the city of Bath.
The Placemaking Plan offers an opportunity for design to find a place in the overall planning process which is currently
absent. As architects living and working in the city of Bath, the focus of our comments will be on Para 45-53: Design
Values for New Development in Bath, and the table describing Design Values for New Development.
The introductory paragraphs summarise well the tensions that are all too evident. Design quality is a highly subjective
matter, and it is about much more than architectural style and aesthetics. The question "what should new buildings
in Bath look like is not necessarily the right question to pose at the outset.
The Draft Placemaking Plan references the NPPF which succinctly and clearly sets out policy guidance to encourage and
enable good design generally, and we suggest that the whole of NPPF Section 7 should be referenced in the Placemaking
Plan, rather than just one paragraph. The reference to the NPPF para 60 is supported. It underlines a key principle about
not seeking to impose any particular architectural style " because good design is not about architectural style.
However, we view the disregard by BANES Council in the past of NPPF Para 62 (which requires all Local Planning
Authorities to have Design Review processes in place) as a dereliction of duty by BANES Council, which needs to be
addressed without any further delay. The Design Council/Landscape Institute/RTPI/RIBA document Design Review "
Principles and Practice (2013) sets out the argument for the adoption of Design Review, and the benefits to the city, to developers and to the Local Authority are clear.
The introduction of Design Review " for developments of all scales, not just the major developments " would be the
single most effective way of supporting the aim of the Draft Placemaking Plan to promote high quality design in Bath. It
would provide an opportunity for a highly informed discussion to take place between developers and the Local Authority

11 May 2016 Page 611 of 956

on a case by case basis. The opportunity for an informed discussion on design currently does not exist anywhere in the

A Design SPD is due to be prepared in 2016, and we would welcome the opportunity to assist in the drafting of this
document.
We make the following recommendations: 1. Put in place Design Review panel(s) to support the objectives of the Placemaking Plan - In accordance with NPPF; 2. Include the whole of NPPF Section 7 in the Placemaking plan; 3. Omit the specific bullet points listed in the Strategic Design Values table.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 612 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Design Values (table)

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 28 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 reguliy compliant: (No. 11 maleated 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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Design Values (table)
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
First strategic design value - Should be explicit about Bath Stone as a material in the conservation area.
Craftsmanship - The phrase 'Simplicity, only using embellishment with a purpose' is difficult to interpret. Is decoration 'embellishment with a purpose'?
Q5 Change Requested
Add the words 'with an emphasis that natural Bath Stone is the primary building material of the City and that other materials must clearly complement and enhance this material'.
Alter to 'decorative embellishment to be used purposefully, for decoration or practical use (such as drip courses and plat bands.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $lacksquare$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 7078 Comment Number: 3
Name: Jon Watkins Organisation: RIBA South West and RIBA Bath Architects Group
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 613 of 956

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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Design Values (table)
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Strategic Design Values:
The Design Values summarise well the main themes that need to be considered and supported in new development. However, the more detailed bullet points which expand on the headings are at times over prescriptive, and often contradictory. Some of the points would be relevant in some places but completely inappropriate in others, so they cannot be applied as a general principle.
We strongly recommend that these detailed bullet points should be omitted entirely. They are poorly drafted, ill-considered and at times make no sense at all. They will not enhance design quality but rather will create confusion and provide opportunities to clog up the planning process with non-constructive arguments between planning consultants and lawyers.
The Placemaking Plan is not the right place for trying to be prescriptive about design, but we do encourage the general objective of creating a collaborative process where design quality is central. One example, (para 52) appears to limit the aspiration of design quality to œvisual appearance of new development. We would like to stress that visual appearance is only one part of any discussion about design quality. So the drafting of a Design SPD needs to avoid specifics and allow high quality design to flourish in a constructive way allowing the designer to respond creatively to each specific context.
Do not attempt to be prescriptive and pre-empt possible outcomes as this only stifles innovation (contrary to NPPF); 4. Actively involve the architectural profession in ongoing policy guidance on Architectural and Urban Design matters; 5. Invest in training for officers and decision making Members of the Council.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 614 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 56

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 34
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 56 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Should include reference to the World Heritage Site Setting SPD.
Q5 Change Requested
Include WHS setting SPD.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

11 May 2016 Page 615 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 60

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number:	35
Name: Caroline Kay	Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 c	ompliant? (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 2 Bath ,	Para 60
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Agree with the reference to views of the valley from Little the meadows.	e Solsbury Hill but this is not compatible with a Park and Ride in
Q5 Change Requested	
No change needed here but should be borne in mind in tr	ansport section.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinati	ion (ticked if yes)? 🗹
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa	te at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive substantive substantive substantive substantive substantive to have placemaking plan	omissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared e significant matters to raise on certain points of the

11 May 2016 Page 616 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 69

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 36 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 69 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The appraisals should be used to inform management objectives.
Q5 Change Requested
Insert 'and will inform management objectives' after 2016.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

11 May 2016 Page 617 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 72 Volume: 2, Bath Respondent Number: 2673 Comment Number: Name: John Moran Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Attachments sent with the comment? Further Information available in the original comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 72 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment In recent years the term 'Bathness' has become common currency in local planning debates. I believe it was coined by the conservation lobby and it is often used to oppose anything that is remotely contemporary. I note that it is also endorsed on page 22 of the draft Placemaking Plan. Although I have never seen it properly defined, the term infers that Bath possesses a distinct visual character that, by implication, is defined by the Georgian architecture that gives the city its fame and World Heritage status. However, such a simplistic notion ignores the fact that Bath, far from having a unified character, is full of architectural variety. Each historical period has made its mark leaving a mix of Gothic, Georgian, Victorian, Edwardian and 20th Century architecture. Indeed, were it not for this variety I believe that a solely Georgian Bath would be rather over bearing. This is not to deny the importance of the classical set pieces but is simply to recognise that the city is much more than just Georgian architecture. To my mind there are only two things that can be said to be common unifying features and they are material - Bath stone (or its substitutes) - and scale. Beyond that 'Bathness' is meaningless and to endorse it is to give further leverage to a conservation lobby that already has no shortage of planning policies that support its position. I believe that the term is specious and simplistic, and that it should not be given official recognition in the Placemaking Plan or any other planning policy document. Q5 Change Requested The term 'Bathness' should be omitted from paragraph 72 and anywhere else that it appears.

11 May 2016 Page 618 of 956

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?

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 77

Respondent Number: Name: John Webb	194	Comment Number: 13	ganisation:			
Agent Name:		Δσ	ent Organisa	ation:		
-		_	_			
Further Information avail	lable in t	he original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No No
Does the respondent cor	isider th	e document is legally cor	npliant? (Tic	k if indicated	l 'yes') □	
Does the respondent cor	sider th	e document is sound?				
If the respondent conside	ers the D	raft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is	it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Cons	isten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates	to: Vo	lume 2 Bath , P.	ara 77			
The Site Reference (if appl	icable) i	5:				
Q4 Soundness Comment						
The Public Realm is mentic	ned at F	aragraph 77. This we hav	e already co	ommented o	n. It is a good platform as I s	suspect it
is driven by Tony Crouch w			-		0 1	'
, ,		, , p				
Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish	to parti	cipate at the Examination	n (ticked if y	es)?		

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

11 May 2016 Page 619 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy BD1

Respondent Number:	224	Comment Number:	4			
Name: Caroline Kay		0	rganisation	Bath Preserv	ation Trust	
Agent Name:		A	gent Organi	sation:		
Further Information availa	able in t	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider	sider th	e document is sound?	No		is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified		sisten 🗸	Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates The Site Reference (if appli			Policy BD1			
04 Coundness Comment						

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Bath Building Heights Strategy is referred to in the text and as such is given planning weight. It is certainly better than no policy on building heights. However, the Bath Building Heights Strategy does not supply adequately robust planning guidance because there are some ambiguities in its interpretation for commercial development which means as has been shown through recent experience of the planning system that the intentions of that strategy are breached by actual planning decisions. Building heights are a key determinant of viability and it is therefore imperative, if the addendum on Para 34 pf the plan is to be borne out, that there is no ambiguity about what heights are acceptable in the World Heitage City and its setting.

Q5 Change Requested

Amend the building heights strategy as currently drafted to remove ambiguity and adopt, amended, as SPD. Set this as a monitoring target early in the plan period.

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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue

to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 58

Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 620 of 956

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 2 Bath , Policy BD1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Should include specific reference to massing.
Q5 Change Requested
Include 'massing' after height and scale.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Despendent Numbers 7070 Comment Numbers 4
Respondent Number: 7078 Comment Number: 4 Name: Jon Watkins Organisation: RIBA South West and RIBA Bath Architects Group
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Turtier information available in the original comment. To Accaemients sent with the comments.
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy BD1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy BD1
Design and Access Statements: We support the policy wording, which will help to put design quality on the agenda, and encourage a greater understanding of the issues by all parties.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 621 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 85

Respondent Number: 194 Name: John Webb	Comment Number: 14	anisation:		
Agent Name:	Age	ent Organisation:		
Further Information available in			ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider th	ne document is legally com	pliant? (Tick if indicate	ed 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider th	ne document is sound?			
If the respondent considers the	Draft Placemaking Plan is ι	ınsound, is it because i	t is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Consisten	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Vo	olume 2 Bath , Pa	ra 85		
The Site Reference (if applicable)	is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Addressing Flood Risk is dealt with no longer to turn their back on the	• .	nteresting to note that	under Paragraph 86 the comm	itment
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to part	icipate at the Examination	(ticked if yes)?		

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

11 May 2016 Page 622 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 87

	2 Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	Agent Organisation: No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally of Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Para 87
Q4 Soundness Comment	
edge". The statement should be more definitive – ie ther	self, other than some landscape improvements at the river's e are no plans to alter Green Park itself. land Bridge ie the areas adjacent to Norfolk Crescent Green.
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinat	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa	ite at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 623 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 89

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 15
Name: John Webb Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 89
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The content of Paragraph 89 could be construed as the new weir at Twerton possibly negating upstream flood alleviation measures. The support arguments for what happens to the Puteney Weir FDS could be relevant.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 624 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 90

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: Name: John Webb	16 Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally c	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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath ,	Para 90
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
At Paragraph 90 the river is described as a dark tranquil coindeed the steel sheet piled trough.	corridor. No mention of vegetation or other management, or
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinati	ion (ticked if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 625 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 92

Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 5
Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson
Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 92
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 92 is responding to the 'importance of the River Avon' and in response to development bringing significant pressures on the potential loss of darkness, tranquillity and vegetation, it states 'These impacts are managed through the Placemaking Plan policy approach'. However, no further clarification is provided to define what is the Placemaking Plan policy approach.
Q5 Change Requested
We object to Paragraph 92 and we would seek the following inclusion:
1)Clarification should be provided by the Council to define what is the 'Placemaking Plan policy approach' and where this is referenced within the Placemaking 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?
There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness

11 May 2016 Page 626 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 93

Parameter Name	44			
Respondent Number: 256 Comment Numb	per: 11			
Name: Cllr Andrew Furse	Organisation:			
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:			
Further Information available in the original comme	ent? 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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 93 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
93. Some parts of the River corridor provide a unique setting within the city. For example, the path adjacent to Norfolk Crescent Green. These rural-like settings within the heart of the city need to be protected. This is referred to in policy B2-2h but no specific references.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 627 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 94

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 17 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 94 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
The Transport Strategy is dealt with at Paragraph 94 but no mention is made of using the river.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number: 7			
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation:			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 94 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
p28 94: Clarification "Good transport is fundamental to the economic success and wellbeing of the city, and to the ability of residents, visitors AND GOODS to move around."			

11 May 2016 Page 628 of 956

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 629 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 98

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 10

Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

Not Consisten **✓**

Not Effective ✓

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')

Not Justified **✓**

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):

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 98

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Not Positively Prepared

Q4 Soundness Comment

Eastern Park and Ride - We are in full agreement with the submission by the National Trust on this issue. Transport strategy general - we do not believe that the Bath Transport Strategy as worded is effective or justified The transport strategy makes extensive reference to more use of public transport without offering methods for this to be achieved. There are unconvincing references to the number of parking spaces to be removed from the City Centre (some 3000 to be removed over the plan period) without any clear indication as to how the transfer from car use to other forms of transport will be achieved. There is no explicit reference as an active thrust of B&NES policy to see the Bristol Metrowest extended through the East/West axis.

Q5 Change Requested

Reference to an East of bath park and ride should be replaced by references to an East of Bath commuter solution which may include park and ride, park and link or other innovative transport solutions, preferably in partnership with neighbouring authorities.

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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 38

Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 630 of 956

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 2 Bath , Para 98				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Bath Transport Strategy esp para 98 - We are not convinced by the evidence base that sufficient benefit would balance the harm done to the setting of the world heritage site by an eastern park and ride. The transport strategy makes extensive reference to more use of public transport without offering methods for this to be achieved.				
Q5 Change Requested				
SH suggestion: we would encourage a wider less specific statement that gives the option for a modern, forward thinking solution that could be located further outside the city and its setting, e.g. park and link, rather than focussing merely on an outmoded park and ride model. This could read; 'a new parking facility to the east/north east of Bath with transport links to the city centre, to help reduce demand for parking spaces within the city;'				
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan				
Respondent Number: 2919 Comment Number: 5				
Name: Dr David Martin Organisation:				
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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 98 The Site Peferance (if applicable) is:				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Part of the Plan incorporates a Transport Strategy. This Strategy includes the aim of improving the quality of life and reducing the environmental impacts of traffic in the city of Bath. However, it omits to mention any specific measures to improve air quality and reduce air pollution from road vehicles. Hence the Plan is unsound because it is not effective and does not provide a deliverable policy to achieve the desired improvements.				

11 May 2016 Page 631 of 956

The Plan (and the Transport Strategy) should set out the details of the traffic management plan for the city and should

clarify how the proposed measures in the plan will achieve air quality benefits. For example, the Plan should include provision for a Low Emission Zone, and should assess the options for delivering such a Zone.

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

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 4139 Comment Number: 3			
Name: Susan Lockert Organisation:			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 98			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
It would be an excellent idea to create a Park & Ride to the east of the city on the assumption a suitable site can be found. Congestion along he A4 London Road could be eased considerably if the Batheaston bypass could be extended to			
link with the A36 allowing vehicles to access the route south of the city without having to travel through Bath.			
Some of the parking issues in residential areas could be avoided if university students were not allowed to have cars them in Bath. Perhaps the universities could provide parking facilities on campus which would alleviate the problem			
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 4767 Comment Number: 2			
Name: Mark Funnell Organisation: National Trust			
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 98			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			

11 May 2016 Page 632 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Core Strategy appears to refer to only the extension of existing P&R sites, without mentioning new sites. The Bath Transport Strategy – 'Getting Around Bath' refers to the desirability of a PR to the east of the city to contribute to a better city environment. However, there is no detailed justification for this, other than the existing PR sites are popular and that a fourth site would "complete the picture". There is an objective to "undertake detailed assessments of sites to the East of the City", and a specific action saying this should take place "through the Placemaking Plan as part of a wider parking strategy".

The current draft Placemaking Plan states that the "reduction of the impact of vehicles is vital in this unique UNESCO World Heritage city and will require a combination of measures". These include: [sixth bullet point] "A new Park-and-Ride to the east of Bath". However, there is no reference to the detailed assessment of sites objective in the Transport Strategy, and the text does not acknowledge the possible impacts of a new P&R on the green setting of the World Heritage city. The Plan also does not consider the efficacy of a new PR in reducing traffic congestion in the city and promoting sustainable transport in the district.

It is suggested that the reference to a possible east of Bath PR should have its own bullet point and be re-worded as per the text below.

Q5 Change Requested

De-cant reference to a new Park-and-Ride site into its own bullet point, worded as follows:

-A potential new Park-and-Ride to the east of Bath, subject to detailed assessments that demonstrate (a) the efficacy in reducing city-centre congestion and promoting sustainable travel within the district, (b) that it would respect the natural and historic environments, and (c) that it would be deliverable within the Plan period

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 wish to see the reference to a potential east of Bath P&R within the Plan altered to reflect the importance of the green setting of the city and national and local planning policies.

11 May 2016 Page 633 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 102

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 31 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 102 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
There is evidence that more than 500 places will be retained (current number 3500) especially as the Council depends on parking for much of its income.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Replace 500 with more accurate assessment of the likely retained parking spaces.				
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan				

11 May 2016 Page 634 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 105

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 18				
Name: John Webb Organisation	on:			
Agent Name: Agent Orga	anisation:			
Further Information available in the original comment? No	Attachments sent with the comment? No			
Dth	(Tiel.: findicated basel)			
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant?	Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box			
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?				
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound	d, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):			
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not C	Consisten \(\square\) Not Effective \(\square\)			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 105				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Under Paragraph 105 when discussing the Central Area & Enterprise Zone it is conceded that Flood Risk is a key constraint which is likely to increase as a result of Climate Change.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$				

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

11 May 2016 Page 635 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Diagram 2 Bath City Centre & EA

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

Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	Organisation: Agent Organisation:			
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared Not Justified				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Diagram 2 Bath City Centre & EA The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment Diagram 2i. It is noted that the Herman Miller factory site is within the Enterprise Area boundary. It is likely that the building now empty will remain so for some time. There is currently a planning application being for student art space. Many residents believe this would be a good use for this site and bring with it the employment. The enterprise area therefore needs to be more specific as to the types of use that area acceptable.				
Diagram 2ii. Green Park station west needs to be sympathetic to Norfolk Buildings and the adjacent residential areas.				
Q5 Change Requested Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	tion (ticked if yes)? \Box			

11 May 2016 Page 636 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 109

Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Agent Name:	13 Organisation: Agent Organisati	ion:
Further Information available in the original comment	0	Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Place	?	, ,
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consist	ten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 109	
Q4 Soundness Comment		
109. B2-2r – "Whilst the incidence of independent and lobeen a slow decline in their presence." A proactive appr Returning streets such as Green Street and Westgate Street	oach is required to reet to local shopp	to maintain and encourage local retailers. ping/local retailers would encourage this.
B2-4d – Within Kingsmead ward there has recently beer hotel rooms are on stream with the Casino. It is question extensive B&B market, and many apartments for short I	nable whether mo	·
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	tion (ticked if yes	s)?

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

11 May 2016 Page 637 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

١	/olume:	2, Bath		Part: Policy B2	
	Responde	ent Number:	167	Comment Number:	2

Name: Organisation: Homebase Ltd Agent Name: Gareth Roberts Agent Organisation: GR Planing Consultancy Attachments sent with the comment? Further Information available in the original comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **Q4 Soundness Comment** Policy B2 – Central Area Strategic Policy Our clients do not object to the overall aims of this Policy or the inclusion of the Homebase store within the 'Key

Development Opportunities' under part '3 h'. They also welcome and support the confirmation in part '4 h' of the Policy of the commitment to existing businesses that remain compatible with the future role of this area being reincorporated in any redevelopment schemes or where not possible or feasible that reasonable efforts are made to relocate these businesses elsewhere – consistent with similar policies in the Saved Local Plan and adopted Core Strategy. However, part '4 a' to the Policy, in confirming that "small to medium sized comparison retail development" will be permitted in any redevelopment schemes, either needs to be more precise as to the scale of retail development that the Council is suggesting, which can then be tested and scrutinised further or otherwise this wording should be deleted.

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?

To ensure that the Plan's policies in relation to Sydenham Park (Homebase) are justified and effective, which they are presently not and to ensure that Homebase's future interests within this site and the direct and indirect local employment it supports are given due weight and attention in the Plan's detail.

Respondent Number: 194	Comment Number: 19			
Name: John Webb	Org	ganisation:		
Agent Name:	Age	ent Organisation:		
Further Information available	in the original comment?	No Attach	ments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent conside Does the respondent conside If the respondent considers th Not Positively Prepared	the document is sound?		ated 'yes') se it is (ticked where indicated): Not Effective	

11 May 2016 Page 638 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
After Paragraph 109 Asset "h" lists the River Avon and its banks are a nature conservation value and provide an important Bat Foraging Corridor. That may be true but surely it has other and dare I say it more important attributes.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 39
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy B2 paras n-w - One of the major risks to the Central area is future inappropriate development by virtue of height, massing, scale, materials or design. This is recognised in the emerging new WHS management plan. The new permitted development rights for office to residential risks the asset (as described in para 1m) of the mixed economy of the city centre being diminished without equivalent office space being introduced to replace it.
Q5 Change Requested
Include inappropriate development as a risk.
Include risk of PDs altering mix and consider Article 4 for the whole city centre area due to its high status as conservation area with a very high concentration of listed buildings.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the

11 May 2016 Page 639 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 113

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 2	20 Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally co	compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan i	is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath ,	Para 113
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Paragraph 113 does confirm the River Corridor as being a canal also fulfils this function.	a key element in providing continuous pedestrian routes. The
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination	ion (ticked if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 640 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume:	2, Bath	Part: Policy SB1

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 41 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust			
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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB1			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Diagram 4 does not include the Hilton Hotel (identified in the CACA as poorly designed building that could benefit from redevelopment) which is specifically detailed within the text as an aspirational redevelopment opportunity.			
The redevelopment of the YMCA site (also considered in the CACA as a poorly designed modern building impacting negatively on the conservation area) should also be considered within the context of this policy and included within the boundary as a possible improvement opportunity as part of a wider masterplan.			
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 12 should be the first requirement stated as the context needs to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Include the Hilton Hotel (and Podium car park) in the placemaking boundary in Diagram 4.			
Consider including YMCA in the placemaking boundary in Diagram 4.			
Move para 12 upwards and insert 'design constraints or' before 'appropriate mitigation'.			
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan			
Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: 14			
Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Organisation:			

11 May 2016 Page 641 of 956

Agent Organisation:

Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Agent Name:

Further Information available in the original comment?

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
SB1e - Cattlemarket site — Walcot Street. Any re-development of this site needs to retain the artisan markets on a Saturday. It should not be "if viable" since all modern development is driven by expensive land value — and such a market would not stand up to this financially. The city is in danger of being over sanitised with modern development, and such a market needs to survive to retain the diverse character of the city.				
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?				
Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 4 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Supportive representation but if the Hilton is redeveloped, please could a thrid view line be added: 'From Saracens street in the same direction, to the river and hill beyond.'				
Q5 Change Requested				
See Q4.				
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?				

11 May 2016 Page 642 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

seriedate of Bury Widde committer to receive a (mir fair order)
Respondent Number: 5162 Comment Number: 1
Name: Varian Tye Organisation:
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Site SB-1 Walcott Street /Cattle Market Site
I wish to question the boundary for this Placemaking site Why has The Hilton and the YMCA building been left out from inclusion within the boundary when both are examples of poorly designed modern buildings which would benefit from redevelopment together with present proposals for the Walcott Street/Cattle Market Site. The recently undertaken Conservation Character Appraisal for the City Centre also notes that these buildings as negative features in the Conservation Area. Negative features/buildings identified in the recent Conservation Area Appraisal are included in other Placemaking sites, such as the former Bath Police Station in Manvers street, and so why are the above buildings excluded from this
Placemaking site, in particular The Hilton.
I am uncertain as to what efforts have been made by the Council to encourage the owners of the Hilton to develop their
site as part of a wider Placemaking boundary for this important area of Bath.
The Placemaking text notes that the economic value as a successful Hotel has worked against the viability of any proposed schemes for the redevelopment of the Hilton Hotel. However, bearing in mind the sites favourable location and the benefits that may be achieved with a new sensitive scheme on the site, which may also include additional hotel accommodation, a redevelopment scheme may be possible.
What discussions have the Council undertaken with the owners of the site or developers/architects acting on their behalf regarding inclusion of the site in the Placemaking boundary? Are there circumstances where the owner of the Hotel would agree to its redevelopment and its inclusion in the present Placemaking boundary? The text refers to the possibility of including all or part of the existing library in possible future proposals, if so why
The text refers to the possibility of including all or part of the existing library in possible future proposals, if so why cannot the library also be included in the Placemaking boundary as well as The Hilton. If the library was developed a new site would need to be found for it, perhaps it could also include additional accommodation for the important Archive Section of the Council which is at present housed in restricted accommodation in the basement of the Guildhall.
If the present Hilton Hotel site is not favoured for redevelopment by the owners is it feasible to explore the potential of encouraging the owner to redevelop it by looking at a new site for the Hotel on one of the other Placemaking sites in Bath which would then free up the existing site for alternative redevelopment? I am concerned that the opportunity is not lost to develop the site of The Hilton and YMCA as part of a wider
Placemaking site boundary which would recognise the need to look comprehensively and in a coordinated manner at redevelopment of this important area of Bath.
Q5 Change Requested

11 May 2016 Page 643 of 956

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

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

Respondent Number: 7123 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: CMBI Ltd
Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Walcot Street / Cattlemarket Site
CMBI support the general thrust of Policy SB1 to deliver retail-led, mixed use redevelopment of the site. The support for the principle of redevelopment or remodelling, including possible extension, of the Hilton Hotel is welcomed. Whilst the historical and ecological interests are important, the driver should, and must, be the viability of redeveloping a site that is subject to significant abnormal development costs. The repair and re-use of the Cornmarket is properly identified as an aspiration, but should not be a 'requirement' absent a beneficial and viable use that works in commercial terms, and which could result in both the site remaining undeveloped and the building remaining disused. The policy must also allow for the possibility of accommodating a department store on the site, which would strengthen the primary shopping area as a whole through re-balancing the retail focus following the opening of the Southgate redevelopment, and providing a retail circuit. This will inevitably require a building of a particular form and mass, and it is essential that the policy is sufficiently flexible to accommodate it. It is essential that Policy SB1 is constructed in the most flexible of terms if a viable and deliverable scheme of development is to be achieved. It is currently far too detailed and prescriptive, and is not supported by an evidence base to demonstrate that it will facilitate, rather than frustrate, the redevelopment of the site. The national policy
requirement in the NPPF is clear that Local Plans should be 'aspirational but realistic' (para. 154). Many of the criteria included in Policy SB1 should be removed from the policy itself and included, in a less prescriptive form, in the reasoned justification.
The control of student accommodation within the central area/enterprise zone is the subject of another policy (B5). It has no place in a site allocation policy, which should be expressed in positive terms. It should therefore be deleted. Diagram 4 is similarly too prescriptive. In particular, the areas of public realm improvement and view corridors have not been informed by a commercially deliverable scheme, and may not be consistent with achieving such.
The difficulties, challenges and economics of bringing forward a successful and deliverable scheme of redevelopment on a complicated site will require flexibility and compromises to be made. The starting point is one of a site that, in the Council's own assessment, is an eyesore in this part of the city centre, and therefore one that offers considerable potential for enhancement through redevelopment. However, it is essential that the policy framework provides sufficient flexibility if prospective developers are to have the confidence to make the substantial commitment of resources that will be necessary to bring forward a viable scheme of redevelopment that can respond to commercial imperatives. An overly prescriptive and inflexible policy framework, the consequence of which could put any commercially viable scheme in prima facie conflict with the Development Plan, risks deterring the necessary investment

11 May 2016 Page 644 of 956

a +	+6	. ~	\sim	1+0	et.
aι	u	ıe	O	นเร	eι.

In its present form the Plan is therefore potentially unsound since it risks being neither 'effective' nor 'consistent with national policy' in terms of the deliverability of redevelopment of a key city centre site.

Q5 Change Requested

Policy SB1 should be amended to be expressed in much more generic terms. The detailed requirements specified in the policy should be removed, and if considered essential, expressed as aspirations in the reasoned justification. Diagram 4 should be amended accordingly, and it be made clear that it is for illustrative purposes only and does not form part of Policy SB1. The control of student accommodation is dealt with by another policy (B5) and therefore has no place in a site allocation policy that should be positively expressed. Reference to its exclusion from the site should therefore be removed from Policy SB1.

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: 7143 Comment Number: 1
Name: David McKinstry Organisation: Georgian Group
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') $\ \Box$
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Having looked at the document the Group is supportive of the general proposals, but we would urge the inclusion of the site occupied by the Hilton Hotel and the YMCA within the area suggested for review, given the prominence of the site within the World Heritage site and its scope for considerable improvement. This would seem an opportune moment to allow the improvement of these areas to be considered so that the Conservation Area might be further enhanced.
At present the Hilton Hotel and Cattle Market car park make a negative contribution to the historic environment and should be given priority for consideration in any place making proposal involving a World Heritage Site.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 645 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 123

Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number: 9)
Name: Nicholas Stubbs Or	ganisation:
Agent Name: Ag	ent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally cor	npliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \square
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , P	ara 123
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
p42, 123: Are not the legal issues now resolved?	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination	n (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 646 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Vision (SB2)

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

Respondent Number: 19	94 Comment Number:	22 Organisation:		
Agent Name:		Agent Organisation	on:	
Further Information availabl	e in the original comment	? No	Attachments sent with the	comment? No
Does the respondent conside	er the document is legally	compliant? (Tick i	f indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent conside	er the document is sound	?		
If the respondent considers	the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is it t	oecause it is (ticked where	indicated):
Not Positively Prepared	Not Justified	Not Consiste	en Not Effective	
The representation relates to:	: Volume 2 Bath	, Vision (SB2)		
The Site Reference (if applicat	ole) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment				
After Paragraph 123 there is a comment on the content of Pa		e possible removal	of the radial gate. This cou	ld be relevant to my
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to	participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if yes)	ı? 🗆	

11 May 2016 Page 647 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Diagram 5 Central Riverside & Recreation Ground

Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 9
Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd
Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☑
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Diagram 5 Central Riverside & Recreation Ground
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Diagram 5, page 43. As currently annotated, we object to two specific aspects of this Diagram.
Firstly, we note that there is an annotation of a "pedestrian link" running east / west in front of the Clubhouse to the north of the Rec. This route is not a current public right of way, and users only enjoy permissive access rights by the Recreation Ground Trust. The gates to the Rec are regularly closed at night, and therefore the ability to deliver a permanent footpath link here is unlikely to be achievable, nor likely to be popular with nearby residents. We therefore object to the current annotation and request that it is amended to a "potential pedestrian link" in order that such a requirement can be appropriately considered within a future planning application. Secondly, a number of "View Points" are annotated on the diagram. It is unclear as to how these have been derived, and
a number of views have been considered through Landscape and Visual Impact work undertaken on behalf of our clients, in consultation with Council Officer's. We consider that only showing a select number of these in this Diagram would add to confusion, and as such we suggest that these are deleted from this Diagram.
Q5 Change Requested
As described in Q4. Without the proposed drafting change, the policy is not justified, effective, or in accordance with government policy.

11 May 2016 Page 648 of 956

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?

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB2

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 21	
Name: John Webb Organisation:	
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	Na
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') $\ \ \Box$	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB2	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Picture SB2 shows a photograph of moored boats. A commitment to encourage controlled mooring so as to both encourage visiting boats and bring the river to life would not go amiss.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 48	
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust	
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB2	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
St Mary's Bathwick is an important landmark in cross views as is the view of Prior Park from Laura Place.	

11 May 2016 Page 649 of 956

No reference is made the Charitable ownership and management of the Rec and the need for the retention of considerable open space.
More detail about parking requirement needed (ie is it retention of existing capacity or more or less). It should be noted that by no means all of this area can be considered as available for car parking.
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 10 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation
Q5 Change Requested
Include these two markers by name in para 119.
Refer to the Rec Trust and its charitable objects.
Make clear that additional car parking should not be part of any development on this site.
Move para 10 upwards and insert 'design constraints or' before 'appropriate mitigation'.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 274 Comment Number: 7 Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB2 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Bath Rec
Sport England supports the long term aim of Bath Rugby to stay at the Rec and would strongly encourage emerging local plan policy to address this aim of stadium redevelopment with positive planning policies that allows the detail to be worked up through the planning process (development brief for example). We appreciate that the design of the redeveloped stadium would need to be sensitive and strongly encourage early dialogue with the parties involved including Historic England.
Q5 Change Requested

11 May 2016 Page 650 of 956

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

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

Respondent Number: 297 Comment Number: 8
Name: Organisation: Arena 1865 Ltd
Agent Name: Tim Burden Agent Organisation: Turley
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
NOTE Sections 1. Introduction and 2. Current position on non-planning matters are not reproduced below but can be referred to in the original representation.
SB2 – Central Riverside & Recreation Ground Policy B1(8)b from the Core Strategy has established the policy context for the Recreation Ground, and subject to the resolution of any unique legal issues and constraints, it will enable the development of a sporting, cultural and leisure stadium.
Draft Policy SB2 facilitates that policy aspiration, and suggests the potential to deliver 'A place that will have the river at its centre, and will act as a forum for leisure, sport, recreation, wildlife, entertainment and culture', which provides an inspirational setting for the development of a new sporting, cultural and leisure stadium that safeguards the valued assets and attributes of the World Heritage Site, including key views".
In this context, the proposed alterations to the Rec could facilitate the 'green heart' approach and will be able to provide a forum and focus for leisure, recreation, entertainment and culture for the 21st century. The Council's intention and approach is
considered helpful to reaffirm the Club's own emerging proposals for the Rec.
The philosophy behind the future proposal for the Rec takes account of Bath's cultural status as a 'World Heritage' site, and a redevelopment of this area would certainly allow for greater interpretation of the historic walks and architectural styles within the centre.
In principle, we agree with the general approach for policy SB2 and support the thinking that a remodelling of this area is required to make the best use of the existing attributes, like the river frontage, to facilitate its identity as a central feature for Bath.
Ultimately a more effective and suitable solution should be brought forward for managing foot traffic, cycle and vehicular movement in and around the identified SB2 development site, and proposals will need to consider pedestrian and cycle movement through this area, noting level changes.
Turning to the specific points raised on page 42, we respond as follows:
-The provision of a series of integrated spaces and development opportunities is supported, although we do note that

11 May 2016 Page 651 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

the area covered by policy SB2 is diverse and a 'one size fits all' approach is unlikely to be appropriate;

- -We support The Rec being a central feature and attraction, that rather than turning its back to the City, is a positive and attractive asset at its heart, linking with the town centre and surrounding land uses;
- -Subject to the separate representations and comments made to the recent Core Strategy policy, we continue to support a policy context which facilitates an enhanced arena facility at the Rec; and
- -There is a need for the long term future of the leisure centre to be firmed up to inform the development potential of that site.

POLICY SB2: Development Requirements and Design Principles Principles Riverside East (The Rec, including Bath Rugby Club, Bath Sports and Leisure Centre, the Pavilion, and other associated areas)

Our clients are broadly supportive of the proposed policy, as drafted. As detailed previously, much progress has been made since the adoption of the Core Strategy and our clients look forward to engaging with local stakeholders in order to progress a permanent scheme at the Rec.

The Core Strategy (and the NPPF) seeks to ensure that adequate and accessible provision is made for the recreation, leisure and cultural needs of Bath. Recreational and cultural facilities and services are necessary to sustain community needs and

support healthy lifestyles.

The Core Strategy policy identifies overarching principles which include the following:

- Promote healthy lifestyles
- Safeguard against the loss of community and sports facilities
- Encourage participation in community and cultural facilities
- Encourage flexible use of community and cultural facilities and venues

We support the principles for meeting local community and recreational needs, and it is evident that the redevelopment of the Rec and the financial investment to preserve and enhance the culture and recreational facilities available to the Bath ommunity will assist in this regard.

As suggested by representations to the Core Strategy EiP, the multi-purpose arena will have numerous benefits to the people of Bath, in terms of providing enhanced sporting, cultural and leisure facility provision, as well as providing a facility of a design quality befitting of Bath itself.

The arena will also doubtless have a beneficial effect on tourism in Bath, and the economic value that Bath Rugby represents for the City has been documented. It is notable that the existing built form at the Rec is of poor quality, and that there is an

opportunity to significantly enhance the facility. We consider there is a need to ensure that the policy does have scope for ancillary and/or associated uses which will ensure that the facility is not solely in active use on match days, but is potentially a 365 day a year facility in the heart of the City.

The Club is also incredibly active in the community, and it is envisaged that a rejuvenated Recreation Ground will provide facilities for a wide range of cultural, sporting and leisure activities.

Q5 Change Requested

Notwithstanding the above, there are a number of discrete matters which we object to the policy SB2, as currently drafted, as follows:

With respect of part 2 of the policy, it is considered unjustified to refer to a number of limited, specific views, in the policy at this time. The proposed abstract list of views tends to lose sight of the reasons why views are important, and an array of over 30 views have been agreed between our client and the Council as requiring assessment. specifying a limited number does not reflect the complexity of the assessment that would be required. It is envisaged that the Development Brief will consider this matter further, and we therefore suggest that the wording "for example from Grand Parade, Orange Grove and Terrace Walk to the hillsides beyond, and the iconic view from North Parade Bridge to Pulteney Bridge

11 Mav 2016 Page 652 of 956

Schedule of Dary Made comments received (in Flati Order)
and Weir" should be deleted from the policy wording.
With respect of part 4 of the proposed policy, the wording should be amended as follows to reflect that there are limited vehicular access points into the Rec: • "The safety and convenience of vehicular access to and from the Rec will be improved, where possible."
Part 5 requires the addition of an erroneous "to" on the 4th line.
With respect of part 10, this appears to duplicate parts of "Policy B4: The World Heritage Site and its setting" and appears unnecessary to be restated here.
Without the proposed drafting changes above, the policy is not justified, effective, or in accordance with government policy.
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: 4767 Comment Number: 1
Name: Mark Funnell Organisation: National Trust
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The National Trust owns and looks after land at Bath Skyline, and we therefore support the text in para. 2 that states that the design (of any permanent stadium at the Rec) would "respond appropriately and creatively to its sensitive context within the World Heritage Site, including the importance of open views for example from Grand Parade, Orange Grove and Terrace Walk to the hillsides beyond".
Q5 Change Requested
No change required.
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?
Although 'yes' has been ticked, we are unlikely to need to participate unless the policy is changed and we have concerns

11 May 2016 Page 653 of 956

over the changes.

Respondent Number: 6354 Comment Number: 1
Name: John Flinn Organisation: Bath Recreation Ground Trust
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Whilst we are very content in the manner in which the draft plan has been prepared and applaud the work by officers in creating such a positive plan for the Recreation Ground we have a minor concern with the noted Diagram (5). It appears to signify a pedestrian route across the North end of the Rec - this is not, nor will it become, a public right of way. As landowner we will protect our land from any such claim and will maintain the self determined status quo of controlled pedestrian access dependent on activity and Trust policy.
Q5 Change Requested
Please indicate that the signified pedestrian route is not necessarily a public right of way. (Blue arrow)
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6406 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Student Castle
Agent Name: James Taylor Agent Organisation: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Consisten \(\square\) Not Effective \(\square\)
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The redrawing of this area's boundary to exclude the former St John's School site is welcomed and is considered to represent a logical site allocation area in line with our earlier comments. The policy text associated with this allocation

11 May 2016 Page 654 of 956

potential use should not be required through planning policy.

refers to the potential for parking to be provided in areas within or adjacent to the site. NLP's representations in January 2015 addressed this issue and clarified that, whilst opportunities for parking on adjacent sites may be a possibility, this

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?

To ensure that our comments have been interpreted correctly and that any outstanding concerns can be explained.

11 May 2016 Page 655 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Diagram 6 Manvers Street

Respondent Number:	224	Comment Number	: 30			
Name: Caroline Kay			Organisatio	n: Bath Preser	vation Trust	
Agent Name:			Agent Orga	nisation:		
Further Information avail	able in t	he original comment	t? No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent con	sider the	e document is legally	compliant? (Tick if indicate	d 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent con	sider the	e document is sound	? No			
If the respondent conside	rs the D	raft Placemaking Pla	ın is unsound,	is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	/	Not Justified	Not Co	nsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates	to: Vo	lume 2 Bath	, Diagram 6	Manvers Stree	t	
The Site Reference (if appli	cable) is	: :				
Q4 Soundness Comment						
The redevelopment vision f Church. Both buildings have development that impacts	e been id	dentified in the recer	nt CACA as ina	•	ouse Centre (adjacent to the displayment designed modern	Baptist
Q5 Change Requested						
<u> </u>		•	•	•	ary map as possible redevelor for the area.	ment or
Does the Respondent wish	to partio	cipate at the Examina	ation (ticked i	f yes)? ✓		
Why does the Respondent	feel it is	necessary to particip	pate at the Ex	amination?		
The Bath Preservation Trus at the hearings for the Core placemaking plan					e original core strategy and ap se on certain points of the	peared

11 May 2016 Page 656 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB3

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 50
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
The Site Neterence (if applicable) is.
Q4 Soundness Comment
para 7 and 15 building heights - The reference to building heights and the Building heights strategy does not take into
account para 15 that the FZ status might require floor levels to be raised.
Q5 Change Requested
It should be made explicit that any requirement imposed by the FZ status para 15 does not authorise an increase in
heights beyond the predominant height of South Parade as described in para 7.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the
placemaking plan
Fracee.m. 6 Press.
December Number 244 2
Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 1
Name: Helen Woodley Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the decument is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 657 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
Excellent prospect for a new public space. Badly needed here and will help in reducing parking spaces, please could a set of showcase allotments be inclluded - small plots for local residents but publicly on show? Abbey wood is, I think the ward without any allotments, there would still be room for a good public open space.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 7
Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB3
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
A significant reduction in car parking space off Manvers Street could have a detrimental impact on Manvers Street Police Station which will soon be under operation as a University of Bath learning space. Despite good transport links, there will still be a number of students and staff who would need access to parking near to the building.
Q5 Change Requested
The Council should ensure that car parking is not significantly reduced at Manvers Street
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 5162 Comment Number: 2
Name: Varian Tye Organisation:
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 Consisten 🗹 Not Effective 🗹

11 May 2016 Page 658 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB3 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
SB -3 Manvers Street. Proposals for creating a new public space directly to the south of John Woods South Parade and west of St Johns Church are welcomed as are proposals to include within the site the former Bath Police Station which will hopefully be demolished as part of comprehensive proposals for redevelopment in this area. However, I also wish to question also the Placemaking boundary for the Manvers Street Site.
Why does the Placemaking boundary not include Lewis House and the four storey block on Manvers street directly to the South of Manvers Baptist Church. Both these buildings are examples of inappropriate poorly designed modern development which have also been identified as negative features in the recent Conservation Character appraisal.
Manvers Street is an important approach road into the Conservation Area from a major gateway into the Bath, Bath Spa Station. Lewis House forms a major frontage in the street and also part of the western built boundary to the proposed new public space based on Manvers Street car park. It also lies directly opposite the former Bath Police Station which has been included as it is negative building and will hopefully be redeveloped.
Lewis House detracts from the character of the World Heritage Site, the setting of existing listed buildings and the Conservation Area. It will also provide a very poor townscape feature and entrance point into the new public space/square off Manvers Street. The four storey block south of the Baptist Church likewise is a negative feature, in particular when read in the context of the setting of the two listed buildings on either side of it. The present Placemaking boundary lies directly to the east of it and would benefit from extending to include this building.
The inclusion of the above two negative building's for redevelopment in an extended Manvers Street Placemaking boundary would enhance and strengthen this key arrival route into the World Heritage Site from one of the most impressive routes and major gateways into the City, the former GWR line and Bath Spa Station which is a Grade II* listed building.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7135 Comment Number: 1 Name: John Shepherd Organisation: St John's Church South Parade 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB3 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 659 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

1. The Upper Car Park (an area immediately in front of the church) would appear to be included in the proposal for the creation of a public space. This area is owns currently by The Diocese of Clifton and is important the the church as affording access to the church itself (the great west door) presbytery, hall and other (old school) buildings) on site. It is also important as providing much needed disabled parking spaces for members of the congregation who would not be able to manage the stairs or the car-ramp from the lower car park.

2. In view of the wish of the authority to maintain/improve the aspect of the site from the river side I am puzzled as to the exclusion of the rest of the church site which comprises the old parish primary school and a significant length of river bank. It is more than likely that the Diocese will need to develop much of the site which was formerly the parish school and playground, now used as offices and office car parking.

Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			

11 May 2016 Page 660 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 131

Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 3					
Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson					
Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills					
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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 131 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
Paragraph 131 incorrectly states that there is additional capacity in the existing energy centre at Bath Riverside. In fact, based on the existing technology, there will be no spare capacity beyond the boundaries of Bath Riverside once the development is fully built out.					
Q5 Change Requested					
This error needs to be corrected					
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?					
There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.					

11 May 2016 Page 661 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB4

Respondent Number: 148 Comment Number: 2
Name: Ian Bell Organisation: The Initiative in Bath and North East Somerset
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The development of Bath Quays North represents an outstanding opportunity to create a new neighbourhood within the City. It will be an attractive riverside site for offices but we would like to see other elements included in order that it does not become a desert after the close of business. Cafes, restaurants, residential and small independent retail units could be combined to create a marvellous new area. Whilst plans are being devised we would also like to see a replacement for the surface car parking which will be lost. It would be possible to create multiple floors of underground car parking which would be attractive to workers, residents and visitors which, though costly in the first instance, would provide long term income which would increase the viability of the site for office use.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 148 Comment Number: 4 Name: Ian Bell Organisation: The Initiative in Bath and North East Somerset 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 662 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment			
We would be delighted to see a conclusion to Bath Rugby's efforts to re-develop their stadium on the Recreation Ground. There is no question the club brings great benefits to the City but they need the development in order to ensure it remains a long term sustainable business.			
We believe Bath suffers from the lack of a significant cultural venue which could be used for performance or exhibitions. A building of iconic design would be a tremendous attraction for the City.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 51			
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust			
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB4			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Para 16 - The failure to identify an alternative site for the Coach Park is a weakness.			
SB4 4 paras 4 and 18 - The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 18 should be the first requirement as the HE			
context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation. IN particular the HE assessment could usefully			
inform the location of new streets and assist in restoring the grain of the area and its relationship with the City Centre,			
especially at the end of Milk Street.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Identify alternative site.			
Move para 18 upwards and insert 'design constraints or' before 'appropriate mitigation'. Ensure that Para 4 references the historic street pattern which was disrupted by bombing and 60s redevelopment.			
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan			

11 May 2016 Page 663 of 956

Respondent Number: 238 Comment Number: Name: Alice Nunn Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment?	Organisation: Nash Partnership Agent Organisation:		
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 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy SB4		
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Policy SB4 sets out the uses considered to be acceptable at Bath Quays North. These include office, residential, retailing, A3 and A4 uses. Hotel use is not mentioned within the policy. The NPPF considers hotel use to be a main town centre use, and it is therefore appropriate to include this within the uses considered acceptable at the site, provided that any proposed development does not prejudice Core Strategy policy B1 (Bath Spatial Strategy), in relation to the quantum and mix of uses required across the central area of Bath. In not including for the possibility of hotel use, which is a town centre use with potential synergies with the office and other uses proposed, the policy risks constraining the potential for appropriate and sustainable development contrary to the provisions of the NPPF. In addition, although the Placemaking Plan's Central Area Strategic Policy (B2) seeks to enable the provision for a new cultural/ performance/arts venue within the Central Area, none of the specific key site policies mention this. This could potentially prejudice the effectiveness of the Placemaking Plan's strategy.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Hotel use should be included within the uses considered to be acceptable at the Bath Quays North site, and should therefore be listed within policy SB4, subject to not prejudicing the delivery of a mix of uses within the central area. The new cultural/performance/arts venue proposed within the Placemaking Plan should be included within the key site policies, in order to provide clear guidance on its delivery.			
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 enable a properly informed examination of these aspects of the Plan.			
Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number:	3		
Name: Cllr Andrew Furse	Organisation:		
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:			

11 May 2016 Page 664 of 956

No

Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Further Information available in the original comment?

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$			
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
127 - SB4 Bath Quays; Coach Park — I note the temporary arrangements for 30minute drop off but there is no detail to the longer term management of coach arriving and leaving the city. The current coach park gives a specific point of access to visitors, containing café and toilet facilities, and walk-able to the city centre. My concern is that without a proper focal drop off point, coaches will try to get as close to the Roman Baths and or Bog Island as possible and create congestion and pollution, and circulate at pick up times. We must not use Royal Victoria Park as a glorified coach park and adequate facilities walk-able from the city centre must be provided. Item 16 states "The redevelopment of this site requires the current coach parking and drop off facility to be provided in an alternative location".			
SB4 – item 4 - there is no discussion about impact to local residents in Riverside Gardens, Watermead Close, Trinity Close and Milk Street. This is one of the most densely populated areas in the city centre and likely to be significantly impacted by construction works of the new road and associated activities. The design should be sympathetic to this residential amenity and heights and bulks of building development adjacent to this area. And no mention of the impact of pollution from passing vehicles. The plan should include an analysis of this and potential mitigations. SB4 – item 14 – there should be a requirement to retain a minimum number of parking spaces on this site as it is accessible by car from the west and south of Bath. In addition access should be designed so that vehicles access it directly and do not have to circulate Southgate.			
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?			
Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 8 Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB4 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			

11 May 2016 Page 665 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Avon Street Car Park is essential for students moving into the accommodation blocks of Carpenter House, John Wood Court, John Wood Building, and, from 2016/17, Green Park House. During this time, with most students arriving over the same September weekend, the car park is already extremely stretched (and will be more so with the introduction of Green Park House) and so a significant reduction in car parking spaces could cause a huge amount of difficulty for students and their families and would be likely to require families to park further away from the accommodation and therefore require the use of parking space for a longer period of time.

accommodation and therefore require the use of parking space for a longer period of time.			
Q5 Change Requested			
The Council should aim to retain the majority of car parking with significant consideration given to the impact on near student accommodation blocks.			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			

11 May 2016 Page 666 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 135

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 22				
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd				
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey				
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 2 Bath , Para 135				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
As a point of fact, it should be made clear that there is no public realm associated with Newark Works other than the public highway and associated footpath on adjoining highway land to the south. The present draft text could be misleading in suggesting otherwise				
Q5 Change Requested				
Delete the words in paragraph 135: "and the associated public realm."				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$				

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

11 May 2016 Page 667 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 140

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 23				
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd				
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey				
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 2 Bath , Para 140				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Regarding para 140 bullet 2, delivery of a pedestrian route close to the river edge may not be feasible or desirable given the very large area of public realm to be provided east-west through the central part of the site, the character of the				
area referred to at para 135 ("Buildings in the vicinity tend to form bold relationships with their surroundings; butting up				
to the river's edge at the eastern end of the South				
Quays site"), public safety and security and the maintenance of a dark river corridor for bats, (as required under other				
policies). Bath Quays Waterside Project provides a major pedestrian route on the north bank of the river in this location. However, it is envisaged that more limited access close to the river edge may be possible on the South Quays site.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Delete the words in paragraph 14, bullet 2: "and deliver a pedestrian route close to the river edge.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				

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

11 May 2016 Page 668 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB5

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 52 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust				
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB5				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 6 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Move paragraph 6 upwards.				
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan				
Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number: 21				
Name: Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd				
Agent Name: Martin Bailey Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey				
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 2 Bath , Policy SB5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				

11 May 2016 Page 669 of 956

\cap	1/1	Sai	ındı	2291	Com	ment
u	14	- N 11	1111111	1677		1110111

- 1) Part of the eastern section of the site marked as "public realm" on Diagram 8 is likely to stay as car parking serving Maritime House adjoining it to the east.
- 2) The eastern site access marked "pedestrian cycle link" is an existing vehicular access and it is likely that it will need to remain as such to serve limited access for parking and servicing both to the site and to Maritime House.

Q5 Change Requested

- 1) Amend the eastern part of the site (currently Maritime House car park) so that the eastern half is unannotated.
- 2) Amend the eastern site access point by adding to the diagram an additional vehicular access at this point (in addition to the pedestrian/cycle access annotation).

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

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

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Number:	: 25			
Name:	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd			
Agent Name: Martin Bailey	Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey			
Further Information available in the original comment?	t? 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 2 Bath , Policy SB5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy item 4: Delivery of a pedestrian route close to the river edge may not be feasible or desirable given the very large area of public realm to be provided east-west through the central part of the site, the character of the area (especially to the east), public safety and security and the maintenance of a dark river corridor for bats (as required under item 8 of the draft policy). Also, Bath Quays Waterside Project provides a major pedestrian route on the north bank of the river in this location. However, it is envisaged that more limited access close to the river edge may be possible at Bath Quays South.

Policy item 5: The reference to: "The group value of the buildings on the South Quays site" is inaccurate and misleading. The listing description for Newark Works is explicit, making it clear that the buildings are not listed as a group. The listing actually refers (in general terms) to group value of Newark Works alongside other buildings in the wider area of industrial development along the river and railway. The distinction is significant.

Policy items 12 and 15: The reference to "maintaining the quayside character" is inaccurate and misleading as that is not the present character – indeed buildings abutting the river edge are more characteristic.

Policy item 13: The permitted Bath Quays Waterside project has optimised the opportunities to improve the city's flood conditions. It is unreasonable and unnecessary to seek additional off-site enhancements unconnected to development of the site.

11 Mav 2016 Page 670 of 956

Q5 Change Requested
1) Delete final sentence of SB5 Item 4.
2) In SB5 item 5, delete the reference to "The group value of the buildings on the South Quays site"
3) In SB5 items 12 and 15 delete the reference to "quayside character".
4) In SB5 item 13 delete the requirement for additional works to "optimise the opportunities to improve the city's flood conditions".
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 5162 Comment Number: 3
Name: Varian Tye Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
SB5 -South Quays. Site of Former Stothert and Pitt The listed Corn Market in the Walcott /Cattlemarket Placemaking site is identified as Building at Risk due to its vacant, neglected, and poor condition and it would appear that the buildings at Stothert and Pitt also justify Building at Risk status in particular the historic former foundry.
Why are the listed buildings at the historic Stothert and Pitt Site not identified as Buildings at Risk in the text? The text states, "The group value of the buildings on the South Quays site (particularly the Grade II listed Newark Works, curtilage listed buildings such as the Foundry, and the associated public realm) is important as a legacy of the city's less well known industrial heritage." However, it then goes onto read "The riverside building at the eastern end of the South Quays site (whether new or whether the Foundry building is reused) should present a bold frontage to the river." What riverside new building does this sentence refer to, it is unclear, and it appears to raise a question about the

I understand that as a result of previous proposals for the site concerns have already been expressed by national and local amenity societies, and members of the public, re the need to incorporate the restoration /repair of the former Foundry in future Placemaking Plans for the site. I would hope that the Council shares this view in future Placemaking plans for the site.

future reuse of the former foundry, whether the Foundry building is reused?

The text fails to mention specifically the historic importance of the former foundry yard to the west of the former foundry. Furthermore in diagram 8 a large rectangular blank space is noted in this area and directly to the west of the historic foundry. What is this intended to represent? A location for a new building?

11 Mav 2016 Page 671 of 956

Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The blank space should be shaded as the rest of the immediate surrounding area, a further extension of the public realm, and then noted as a public space on diagram 8. The Vision under paragraph 140 talks about the opportunity to create a new routes though the area but it fails to recognise the potential for a new larger public space which could be centred on the historic former foundry yard, which retains features such as rail tracks. The new public space would then lead down from the historic machine workshops facing Lower Bristol Road, pass the frontage of the retained and hopefully restored former Foundry, and onto to the historic quayside edge.

The design, height massing of any new development must respect the setting of the historic buildings and spaces (former foundry yard) present on the Stothert and Pitt site

Diagram 8 refers to a relatively large new green infrastructure improvement area which continues at the riverside edge and directly adjacent the historic foundry yard and former foundry.

Although accepting in principle the Councils vision of a green corridor adjacent the river in Bath this approach is not justified in this particular case, the quayside should have priority given to an appropriate hard landscaping scheme. The continuation of a green corridor in this area is not appropriate bearing in mind the industrial character, history of the site, and its historic relationship with the river.

The present quayside has vegetation but it appears self-seeded and poorly maintained. Furthermore the uncontrolled vegetation growth in some areas appears to be causing damage to the bank of the river.

Q5 Change nequested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

Respondent Number: 7098 Comment Number:	1	
Name: Alice Nunn O	Organisation: Cranmore Limited	
Agent Name: Mel Clinton A	Agent Organisation: Nash Partnerships	
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? N	Ю
Does the respondent consider the document is legally consider the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	No	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SB5	Policy SB5	

Q4 Soundness Comment

The NPPF at paragraph 21 states that investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations. The inclusion of a public access walkway through the Riverside Court site was not originally part of the masterplan, and has serious practical repercussions which could potentially prejudice the redevelopment of the site. Details are set out within the attached covering letter.

Cranmore Limited, the majority landowners of the Riverside Court office development (which immediately adjoins the Newark Works site) wish to object to the Policy SB5 Development Requirements and Design Principles insofar as these have been expressed in the draft document for Bath Quays South and Riverside Court.

The Enterprise Area Masterplan prepared by the Council and diagram 8 "Bath Quays and Riverside Court" in the Placemaking Plan draft highlight the primacy of the east to west spine which will connect with the new footbridge at the

11 May 2016 Page 672 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

east of South Quays, then run right through South Quays and Riverside Court with the firm intention that this pass also through the westerly sites as they come forward to development, right up to the Pinesway roundabout.

This route was a strong feature of the Masterplan's ambitions for south of the river, largely because the present pavements along Lower Bristol Road are narrow and create an environment hostile to pedestrians. Lower Bristol Road is not wide enough to have dedicated cycle lanes, yet is narrow for its status. So, from the point of view of safety, to underwrite the case for funding the footbridge, creating an attractive alternative east to west route in which pedestrians and cyclists have priority is an important Masterplan ambition.

Paragraph 1

On this diagram 8 although the text seeks the introduction of a riverside walk, no provision is made in the diagram for how this should connect with the footbridge and its ambitions are clearly seen as secondary to ease of circulation. Neither is the now proposed riverside walk shown as physically connecting to the cul-de-sac of Riverside Road to the west.

Paragraph 2

The policy ambition is that Riverside Court should retain, at a minimum, the existing levels of employment floorspace (currently circa 28,000 square feet). However, the government's intention to extend the 'office to residential' permitted development (by prior approval) provision undermines the validity of this as a policy goal. Insofar as a land use and a quantum policy goal is stated it should identify that it is subject to the PD provision.

Paragraph 3

The present studies to redevelop Riverside Court and those ongoing involving South Quays have both been prepared on the understanding they would be able to proceed quite independently of each other with regard to timing or any other considerations. We confirm it is Cranmore's intention that the route passing through the centre of the site created as a result of their current redevelopment proposals would provide pedestrian and cycling connection from South Quays to Riverside Road.

Paragraph 4

We believe this paragraph is ambiguous in its wording and should be amended.

It says there should be "other" publicly accessible pedestrian and cycling routes through the sites, connecting the bridge to the other development sites and to the other residential communities in the south. This could be interpreted as meaning there should be another fully connected east to west route. Alternatively, it could be interpreted as seeking to provide cross links such as between the new spine and the Lower Bristol Road so that they are not limited to a cross link at Riverside Road to the west. This matter would be addressed by deleting the word "other" in line one of the paragraph.

The stipulation that there should be public access to the riverside and along the river's edge was not originally part of the masterplan. It has serious practical repercussions which are likely to prejudice whether redevelopment of Riverside Court would be able to proceed. These are explained as follows:

- The current Riverside Court redevelopment proposals have come about following the issue of the Masterplan which seeks to create the east to west route through the heart of the site. Riverside Court is at present a substantially occupied office investment whose value is underwritten by the permitted development, from office to residential use situation. This being so the viability of redevelopment that would deliver this central route should be a strong consideration for the Council.

Several aspects of this new proposal seriously undermine the prospects of viability.

- The scheme has been designed to accommodate car parking in a semi-basement situation. This is specifically because of the need to raise the floor levels of the habitable space above the 1:100 year plus CC level, i.e. Approximately the top of the new protective riverside wall. It is because these floor levels are raised up in this way that basement car parking on a "half in/half out" basis is practical and allows the necessary natural ventilation to be achieved.

11 Mav 2016 Page 673 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

As a consequence the plan form of the buildings needs to strictly relate to the grid of a car park which in its most efficient form is circa 16 metres. Trying to squeeze these buildings down to fit on to a smaller site would mean this level of car parking efficiency cannot be achieved as the 16 metre dimension is already where the present floor layouts and their access decks are.

In the proposals the new spine road is shown up to 6 metres wide with 2 metre pavements on either side. The ramps and staircases and incidental visitor car parking are all shown as at the existing ground levels and so occupy the zone not required by the upstanding car parking zone with no flexibility to diminish them. As this zone contains on both sides, rising from back of pavement, the parapets of pedestrian access ramps the perceived width of the roadway and pavements for those passing along it will be 10 metres. The arrangements have been designed specifically to create areas between the buildings where substantial urban trees can grow. The presence of these trees will be important to the quality of the low vehicle use environment here and will be particularly important, because, through Newark Works, retaining an industrial character and avoiding disturbance of original cobbles and railway tracks is being judged important to the public realm design.

- The gap in this scheme's western plan between the five story buildings is 20 metres widening at the eastern end to 30 metres. These separating distances are reasonable as inter-visibility distances between residential and residential or office use, but we do not believe they should be further squeezed down without prejudice to amenities of the perceived quality of the development.

If these inner building faces of the plan were to be retained as they are, but the north residential development proposed was to be narrowed in width to create the space a riverside walkway requires, (circa 3 metres), it would reduce the width of the development block down to 10 metres ruling out the possibility of having apartments banked on the northern and southern frontages with internal corridor access.

Such changes would seriously affect the viability of this development, possibly to the point progressing the PD option becomes preferable, in which case there would be no central spine route available at all.

Paragraph 8

As part of the riverside wall proposals being undertaken by the Council a band of riverside planting is proposed with a minimum of 5 metres width, but taking place within a spatial zone between wall and waterline of a minimum of 6 metres, in some places 8 metres. This is sufficient to establish a reasonably dense tree and shrub regime which can create a zone of shadow to the water to avoid light levels being disadvantageous to the bats known to fly along this important corridor.

But the effectiveness of tree planting here is dependent on minimising and controlling light levels from the development side. This could be done through consideration of window size, the shadow effects of protective balconies and tree planting proposed close to the buildings in tree pits, all of which have been carefully considered. If however a riverside walkway is to be created it would have to take place on the southern side of the wall (otherwise the vegetation screen would be diminished) and would normally be at least 3 metres wide.

Because in our proposals balconies already penetrate this zone it would be likely to push the building line back by at least 4.5 metres with unacceptable knock on effects on all of the points already made. This assumes it is acceptable to a developer to have the building line only at most 1.5 metres from any public walkway and some more spatial separation would probably be required.

Paragraph 17

If a riverside walkway is provided there would be an expectation from the point of view of health and safety and personal security that it be publicly lit. In the scheme we have designed we had thought to design this zone (i.e. Between the building face and the riverside end of tree planting), to be a bat attractive route secondarily to the use of the river's edge. But with a public walkway, and one lit too, only the latter would be in place. Lighting on the walkway would put the tree planting scheme under very considerable pressure to create a sufficient width of all year round dense greenery to create suitable conditions for the bats.

It would seem undesirable to offer a riverside walkway only to find that the landscaping between it and the river needs

11 Mav 2016 Page 674 of 956

to be so dense people could not readily view the river through it.

We believe the introduction of a riverside walkway south of the river is a late and ill thought through policy ambition. The sites to the west of Riverside Court are narrower than those to the east and it will already be challenging to developers to accommodate the central spine road. We think the prospects of the development of all these sites coming forward should not be prejudiced by the disadvantages of seeking such a route which are detrimental to the prospects of Riverside Court coming forward in accordance with the Placemaking Plans ambitions. If provided it would diminish the value and character of the central spine and the health of the Newark Works employment hub as a new employment game change for the city.

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?

Edward Nash of Nash Partnership considers it necessary to participate at the oral part of the Examination in order to enable a properly informed examination of these aspects of the Plan, and as such, please could you keep us updated on progress.

11 May 2016 Page 675 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: Part: Policy SB6 2, Bath Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 53 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB6 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 15 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation. Q5 Change Requested Move paragraph 15 upwards. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

Respondent Number: 262 Co	omment Number: 5				
Name: Justin Milward	Org	ganisation: Wo	oodland Trust		
Agent Name:	Age	ent Organisatio	n:		
Further Information available in the	original comment?	No A	Attachments sent with the	comment? N	0
Does the respondent consider the do	ocument is legally com	pliant? (Tick if	indicated 'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the do	ocument is sound? N	No			
If the respondent considers the Draf	t Placemaking Plan is ι	unsound, is it b	ecause it is (ticked where	indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓ N	lot Justified 🗸	Not Consiste	n ☐ Not Effective	V	
The representation relates to: Volum	ne 2 Bath , Po	olicy SB6			
·	ie 2 datii , PC	лісу зво			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					

11 Mav 2016 Page 676 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
Commercial development. "Option 1 assumes the development of about 25,000 sqm of floorspace and the relocation of Sainsbury's to Sydenham Park. Options 2 & 3 and assume that Sainsbury's remains in situ. The development capacity is therefore significantly lower."
Ancient Tree (Ash) at ST7459064738.
Adjacent – at 10 metres distance approx.
Q5 Change Requested
The ancient tree should be specifically protected in accordance with Policy NE6.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 677 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Diagram 11 Land Ownerships at Sydenham Park

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Numbe	r: 24
Name: John Webb	Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	nt? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	ly compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d?
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Placemaking	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Diagram 11 Land Ownerships at Sydenham Park
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Diagram 11 shows Land Ownership for the Home Base, of the river corridor?	/Sainsbury's site. Is this information available for the entire length
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examir	nation (ticked if yes)? \square
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	ipate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 678 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Policy SB7 Volume: 2, Bath

Respondent Number: 166 Commer	nt Number: 1			
Name:	Organisation:	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Lt	d	
Agent Name: Sarah Hawkins	Agent Organis	sation: WYG Planning and De	sign	
Further Information available in the origina	I comment? No	Attachments sent with the	e comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the documen		ck if indicated 'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document	nt is sound? No			
If the respondent considers the Draft Place	making Plan is unsound, is	s it because it is (ticked where	e indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗹 Not Just	ified 🗹 Not Con	sisten 🗸 Not Effective	e 🗸	
The representation relates to: Volume 2	Bath , Policy SB7			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				

Policy SB7 (Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park)

Sainsbury's has a major landowning interest within the Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park site (Policy SB7) and, as such, it is vital that Sainsbury's plays an active role in developing a viable and deliverable strategy for the site.

In this regard, it is noted that Policy SB7 sets out two potential options for the Green Park Station area. Our client supports the first option to allow the Green Park Station area to be redeveloped but only on the basis that the Sainsbury's store is relocated within the wider Green Park Station West & Sydenham Park site. It is important that the Placemaking Plan sets this out clearly and clarifies that the move would only be within the wider Sydenham Park site, thus ensuring the site is allocated appropriately as this is the only

viable solution. In terms of the second option, our client objects to the introduction of an expanded programme of temporary events and activities in the store car park.

The first option is proposing a mixed use regeneration in the event that Sainsbury's moves from the Green Park Station area. As noted above, our client has no intention of moving from the wider Green Park Station site, rather Sainsbury's has an ongoing aspiration for a larger, replacement foodstore as part of a wider mixed-use scheme at the Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park site. A relocation off site is not an option Sainsbury's would wish to pursue; moving offsite would not be commercially viable.

Conversely, an on-site larger, replacement store would contribute towards the convenience floorspace requirement identified in the Bath & North East Somerset Retail Study 2014 – Stage 2 Report and other development requirements identified within the Core Strategy. Moreover, an on-site relocated and an enlarged Sainsbury's store will enable the tremendous potential to deliver a mixed-use environment on the Green Park Station area, as identified in the Pre-Submission Draft Placemaking Plan Document.

As the Council will be aware, a hybrid application was submitted in February 2013 for a viable mixed use development on the majority of land now covered by Policy SB7.

That application was submitted following extensive and thorough consultation with the Council and key stakeholders. It sought a mixed use redevelopment of the site which included the erection of a new foodstore, 280 residential units, new commercial uses (uses classes A1, A2, A3, A4 & A5), new office space and related enhancements of the public realm

11 May 2016 Page 679 of 956

اء ء، ؎	:	a+.a		works	
വഥ	IIIII a	SILI	CHILE	WOIKS	

That application was subsequently withdrawn in September 2013 owing to outstanding matters of difference with the Council and statutory consultees. A scheme along similar lines to the previous application remains Sainsbury's aspiration for delivering a viable development on the Policy SB7 site. It is noted that the Council would in principle support Sainsbury's relocation to the Sydenham Park area if it is feasible. Therefore, this should be taken forward within the Placemaking Plan.

The second option looks to introduce an expanded programme of temporary events and activities, or the construction of temporary pods that could house specialist and small scale employment, retail or market activities. This is subject to Sainsbury's remaining in their current location and reviewing the management of Sainsbury's car parking area. At the outset, it is important to highlight that the Sainsbury's store at Green Park Road is one of the main locations to undertake a bulk food shop in Bath and, as such, the car

park is central to our client's business. It is a busy car park, and well used at all times throughout the week, not only by Sainsbury's customers but also by visitors to Bath city centre. Consequently, the introduction of an expanded programme of temporary events and activities on the car park is an unviable proposition and one that Sainsbury's will not support. It would significantly impact upon the existing car parking arrangements in an already well used store car park.

In summary, our client, a major landowner in the Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park site would only support the first option to allow the Green Park Station area to be redeveloped on the basis that the Sainsbury's store is relocated within the wider Green Park Station West & Sydenham Park site as this is the only viable solution. Sainsbury's does not support the second option which looks to introduce a programme of temporary events and activities, or the construction of temporary pods in the store car park.

The Council are reminded that for Plans to be found to be sound, they need to be positively prepared, justified, effective and in line with national planning policy. A viable solution for the Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park site has to be followed; only a scheme which works with Sainsbury's will deliver a viable solution.

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?			
Respondent Number: 167 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Homebase Ltd			
Agent Name: Gareth Roberts Agent Organisation: GR Planning Consultancy			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			

11 Mav 2016 Page 680 of 956

Policy SB7 – Green Park Station West & Sydenham Park

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Our clients do not object to the overall aims of this Policy or again the inclusion of the Homebase store within the mixed use allocation referred to as 'Sydenham Park'. Our clients also welcome the inclusion in this Policy under part '(B)' of the support that will be given to the retention of the existing DIY retailing as part of any redevelopment proposals. This responds to previous comments we submitted on earlier versions of this Plan, which argued that there was in principle no planning or design reasons to prevent Homebase from being reincorporated within the redevelopment of this part of the site through providing a new modern store that met its customer and operational requirements and was viable. Our clients also note the Council's suggestion that a smaller scale DIY offer might be more suitable, but are of the view that the Plan should be flexible and not overly prescriptive, and should not preclude a DIY offer on a similar scale to existing – there is at present no evidence or planning reasons to suggest why a DIY store of a similar scale to the existing Homebase could not be accommodated within a redevelopment scheme that was compatible with the future role and design of this area. Given the above, the reference to a "smaller scale DIY offer" in part '(B)' of the Policy should be deleted.

Part '(A)' of this Policy confirms that the Council will support the relocation of Sainsbury's to Sydenham Park if feasible, but also acknowledges that Sainsbury's may remain on their current site and, if the latter, suggests various improvements that could still be brought forward to this area. Similar provisions should be included in part '(B)' of the Policy in the event that Homebase remain on their current site.

In addition, to be compliant with Policy 'B2 4 h' the Plan must attempt to give some consideration to where existing businesses on 'Sydenham Park' could be relocated too, assuming they cannot be accommodated within the redevelopment of this site itself. At present, the Plan is completely silent on whether there are any such opportunities, the area of search or the parameters (criteria) that the Council will adopt in assessing the merits of alternative sites.

the area of search or the parameters (criteria) that the Council will adopt in assessing the merits of alternative sites.
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?
Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 23 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
After Paragraph 151 allocating the River banks as "Green Infrastructure" is mentioned and in particular to the Homebase Site. All very laudable but management is needed for this. The stretch through the Homebase Car Park is uncared for, litter strewn and worst of all rat infested.

11 Mav 2016 Page 681 of 956

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

Q5 Change Requested

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

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 53 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 10 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation.
Q5 Change Requested
Move paragraph 10 upwards.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: 4
Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
SB7 – Green Park Station area – on the assumption that Sainsbury's move from their current location, the removing the

11 May 2016 Page 682 of 956

surface level car park is seen as a positive move, but regeneration through additional retail space is questionable. The first objective would be to remove the current Sainsbury's building and re-instate something more in keeping with the Green Park station building and canopy.

Undertaking more use of the area under the canopy – although this is welcome and probably one of the largest covered (external spaces) in Bath, there has been an issue of noise impact to neighbouring residential areas. For example, the canopy concentrates the noise and the louvers of the canopy roof directs it down into the gardens of Green Park. This needs further consideration as to how this intrusion can be mitigated.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 9
Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Removal of car parking spaces at Sainsburys and/or Homebase, in addition to the proposed removal of car parking spaces at Avon Street Car Park could be problematic for students moving into the accommodation blocks of Carpenter House, John Wood Court, John Wood Building, and, from 2016/17, Green Park House. During this time, with most students arriving over the same September weekend, a significant reduction of car parking spaces could cause a huge amount of difficulty for students and their families and would be likely to require families to park further away from the accommodation and therefore require the use of parking space for a longer period of time.
Q5 Change Requested
The Council should aim to retain the majority of car parking spaces with significant consideration given to the impact on nearby student accommodation blocks.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6402 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: Pinesgate Investment Company

11 Mav 2016 Page 683 of 956

No

Agent Organisation: GVA

Attachments sent with the comment?

No

Agent Name: Jo Davis

Further Information available in the original comment?

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$					
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 2 Bath , Policy SB7 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					

Q4 Soundness Comment

We write on behalf of our client, Pinesgate Investment Company, to make representations to the Bath and North East Somerset Council (B&NES) Placemaking Plan (PMP) Options Document (December 2015). This follows on from our previous letter of representation made to the PMP Launch Document and the November 2014 Placemaking Plan Consultation.

Pinesgate Investment Company is the freehold owner of land at Pinesgate, Pines Way, Bath. Presently, the Pinesgate site comprises two medium-sized modern office buildings, sandwiching an area of surface-level car parking. The site is bound by the Pines Way gyratory system in its whole circumference.

Pinesgate Investment Company is keen to realise the development potential of Pinesgate; a sentiment echoed by the identification of the site for redevelopment in previous iterations of local policy and masterplanning by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). As a substantial site located at a key juncture between the central area and western riverside area, this site presents a considerable opportunity to deliver the spatial vision proposed for Bath city centre.

An application is currently pending (ref. 15/05026/EFUL) for the erection of an office building, and a purpose-built educational campus, comprising academic accommodation (Use Class D1) and integral student accommodation (Use Class C2).

The proposed redevelopment of Pinesgate is not a standalone development opportunity; it is at the core of the Council's strategy for this part of the city to provide regeneration and knit together the neighbouring development and regeneration opportunities at Bath Western Riverside East and Green Park. Our client is therefore keen to ensure that emerging policy places the site and its wider context in the best position to contribute to this strategy.

Policy SB7: Green Park, Station West & Sydenham Park - Generic Mixed Use

The PMP states under point 1 that the area's mixed use development will comprise employment, residential and retail. Although this view is not disputed and we believe that a varied mix of uses is important to enable a thriving area, we do however believe that this statement should also include the term 'education' or 'non-residential' uses which can complement employment and housing. These uses can also positively provide for an active public realm during all hours of the day.

It is considered that the provision of a major new tertiary education establishment in this location presents a unique opportunity to introduce a vibrant alternative use into the central area and this location of the River Corridor. As a major educational establishment, the range of activity that the proposed college will bring to the site will be a significantly positive diversification to the range of uses in this location, supporting the long-held local ambition to establish this location as a new city quarter and destination in its own right. The use would act as a focal point of activity, and has the potential to catalyse further development in the area.

It also presents opportunities for synergies with the local economy and the existing higher education offer in Bath, promoting the City's international profile.

Public Realm Design

11 Mav 2016 Page 684 of 956

Point 5 states that the design of the public realm should be informed by the Bath Pattern Book. Whilst we are supportive of the principle of good urban design, we raise objection to the requirement to comply with the 'Bath Pattern Book' in designing public realm. This document has not been through public consultation and therefore does not constitute a sound evidence base for compliance. It is not listed as part of the evidence base for the PMP and it is unreasonable to infer compliance to a document has not been consulted on.

With regard to the financial contributions sought for public realm infrastructure improvements under Policy D10 the Council is reminded of advice set out in the NPPG in particular ID 23b-004-20150326. The Council is also reminded that the use of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) should not introduce additional costs and it is inappropriate to hide policy requirements in an SPD.

Policy SB7: Green Park, Station West & Sydenham Park - Sydenham Park Specific Strategic Viewpoints and Green Infrastructure

The existing open character of the central area of the site is purely a function of its use as a car park on a large area of the site. Such character is partially limited by the surrounding and enclosing brick wall, which prevents any clear views or access through the site from the adjoining street. Such a characteristic of openness is not identified as being of value in any B&NES character appraisal or BWR SPD. Indeed such spaces are generally considered as negative spaces within urban environments and efforts to accommodate car parks within undercrofts or basements, as proposed in the development, are usually welcomed as allowing better urban form to be provided.

The existing trees on site are those which relate to its current development. Their removal and the replacement strategy, as part of the landscape proposals accords with the BWR SPD and reflects the local context along the Lower Bristol Road.

The cemetery comprises a landscape well enclosed by trees and vegetation with limited visual relationships with the surrounding townscape. There is no indication of guidance within the BWR SPD or other B&NES document that views out of the cemetery are a key consideration to inform development proposals. Such views are ad hoc and ancillary to the informal enjoyment of the cemetery which will continue following development.

B&NES acknowledge and accept in BWR SPD that development across the area will have impacts and that it will not be possible to protect all views, which will necessarily, include a range of views of and toward the green hillsides. The proposed development is considered to be of an overall scale and form which is consistent with these aspirations.

The pending proposals will provide a high quality built form in a key location which will establish a positive feature in the local area in terms of streetscape presence. Whilst some views from the immediately adjoining roads of green hillsides beyond the site will be affected, it is considered that wider views across the city from elevated positions will not be materially affected and that the wider green setting of the city will still be fully appreciated and continue to provide the related aspect of OUV to the Bath WHS.

Student Accommodation

During the initial introduction describing the broad strategy to the Sydenham Park site the second paragraph states 'purpose built student accommodation is not acceptable as this would impede the delivery of other council objectives'. Although there may be an argument that isolated student accommodation would have no benefit to the allocation site, in the case of the pending application, the proposed student accommodation serves a purpose in enabling students to be located nearer education facilities thus enhancing their education prospects and reducing the need to travel unsustainable distances.

The proposed use of an educational establishment would be compatible and complimentary with existing neighbouring uses, and also those projected to come forward through the long term strategic masterplan.

Please note: Diagram 19 incorrectly describes Pinesgate as 'Proposed student accommodation'. This must be updated to

11 May 2016 Page 685 of 956

include reference to the proposed teaching space in parallel to the accommodation.

Building Heights

The generic design principles expressed for the Sydenham Park area highlight the need to undertake analysis of viewpoints to ensure an appropriate response and steer for height, massing and orientation. We recognise this as an appropriate approach to ensure good design.

The document also references The Bath Building Heights Strategy, expressing that this should be used as an evidence base for the analysis of viewpoints, as expressed above. With the area being within Zone 3 ('The Valley Floor'), it states that new development should be four storeys, with potential for a further storey set back within the roofscape.

We have accepted that the Bath Building Heights Strategy represents the most up-to-date guidance from B&NES on the appropriate height of development in the city, and should therefore be considered a material consideration for appraising the acceptability of the height of new development. The emerging development proposals at Pinesgate sit within the parameters set by the Bath Building Heights Strategy. As such the emerging development proposals at Pinesgate accord with the parameters set out within these generic design principles.

Lower Bristol Road Frontages

We note that point 18 expresses a need for clearly defined frontage on lower Bristol road.

We are supportive of measures to ensure that the public realm remains lively and engaging; there however is a distinction that should be made between Active Frontages and Active Uses. The former can be achieved through sensitive design of ground floor facades, ensuring inter-visibility and activity at a ground floor level, and avoiding blank facades. It is therefore entirely possible that this could be achieved through design alone, without prescribing uses.

Active Uses typically imply a narrow scope of uses, focussed primarily on retail, food and drink uses. Due to the lack of specificity on point 18 we would have deep reservations about any obligation to provide smaller scale retail uses in this location for two reasons. Firstly occupiers for such uses are likely to be difficult to secure at Pinesgate; and secondly with point 6 referencing the riverside corridor as a key component, it is thought that the area would be best served with a well-placed active core as opposed to a dispersed selection of units.

The pending application for Pinesgate proposes a building set back along Lower Bristol Road from the boundary- again this creates a large amount of public realm space for pedestrians, cyclists and landscaping. All ground and first floor accommodation have been given large window openings so that activity can be easily viewed.

Pinesway Gyratory

Point 19 expresses a need for development proposals to provide a positive frontage to Pinesway gyratory. We note that during the preparation of the pending application, the council's stance upon the gyratory has varied. As a result of this our proposals have been developed in a way that will enable a scheme of landscaping to be undertaken upon completion of development. Should the council no longer see a need for the gyratory, our proposals will enable our spare land to be utilised should it be needed. It is considered this is the most appropriate manner to future proof this principal route into the city.

Proposed Prescriptive Breakdown of Development Quantum

The Pinesgate site falls under policy SB7, an area identified as 'Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park'. This covers a number of sites, including the Pinesgate site and gyratory in totality, as well as Green Park Station and the Sainsbury and Homebase land interests. As such, it covers a large area, with a diverse range of ownerships, as well as being subject to physical, planning and environmental constraints.

11 May 2016 Page 686 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The approach of the PMP is to apply both general principles that would apply across the wider area as well as site and area specific principles. This would sit alongside the adopted and endorsed masterplans for Bath Western Riverside and the River Corridors.

In general, our client seeks a degree of flexibility about the precise mix and quantum of uses across the area, rather than designating prescriptive quantum for individual plots. Previously the PMP listed a number of options for development, which lacked this desired flexibility. In contrast the new PMP only gives one set of figures; however the terminology used such as 'around 7,000 sqm of net sales floorspace' indicates the figures may be adjustable. Overall we feel that providing a prescriptive quantum of floorspace may unnecessarily stymie or constrain such opportunities from coming forward. Furthermore, with the allocation covering such a broad area, it is unclear how the proposed quantum of floorspace would be divided among the various land interests at this location. As such, we do not feel that this presents the best approach to optimise synergies with the development of the central area, or to deliver a coordinated approach in this location.

Proposed Quantum of Retail Floorspace

We note that the development option presented for the Sydenham Park section of the site has been presented with a significant element of retail uses, 7,000 square metres net sales floor space. This excludes any provision of retail within the Green Park Station section of the site, which shows no numerical identification of a capacity for retail, food and drink uses.

We are concerned about the express expectations by the Council for the Sydenham Park, which may place an unattainable expectation upon future development proposals at Pinesgate. We acknowledge there is some potential to accommodate 'bulky goods' retail and similar uses with a larger floorplate at the adjacent sites at Homebase and Pines Way Industrial Estate sites; however, there is no extant critical mass for smaller scale retail uses, given the out-of-centre location of the site away from existing retail centres and primary frontages.

The divided nature of landownership as well as the constraints of infrastructure requirements presents a real risk of suboptimal planning outcomes. Provision of smaller retail units will be difficult to achieve through the piecemeal development of the area, without obliging Pinesgate Investment Company or other developers to including a potentially unviable use at their own risk.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the draft policies expressed within this consultation have given cause for concern. In particular, we have a concern that the policy places an onerously prescriptive breakdown of development which could potentially exclude alternative uses that complement the overall area masterplan and other regeneration objectives in the City Centre. In addition, there is a repetitive emphasis on policies (particularly design) which are covered sufficiently with National Planning Guidance. Within the PMP, the Council have sought to include this as both general policies, site specific allocations and made reference to the production of future SPD's to provide even more prescriptive policies.

For the BANES Placemaking Plan to be found sound under the four tests of soundness as defined by paragraph 182 of the NPPF, the Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. It is suggested that the Council gives further consideration to the aforementioned matters in order to produce a sound Plan.

Q5 Change Requested

Point 1 of Policy SB7 should be altered to include the term 'education' and 'non-residential' uses when referring to the mix of uses permitted.

Remove direct requirement to comply with Pattern Book. Align use of planning obligations and SPD to national planning guidance.

In considering strategic viewpoints, the Council must recognise that this area of the site is both a regeneration area and

11 May 2016 Page 687 of 956

an Enterprise Area. Therefore, it is reasonable to permit commercial scale redevelopment to achieve these economic objectives. In doing so, it must be recognised that there may be a localised impact on views, but this should not automatically be assessed as a negative impact on the WHS.

Diagram 19 incorrectly describes Pinesgate as 'Proposed student accommodation'. This must be updated to include reference to the proposed teaching space in parallel to the accommodation.

We recommend that the phrase 'purpose built student accommodation' be altered to acknowledge the ability to deliver 'on campus' teaching accommodation and private colleges. In doing so the document will enable sustainable movement, create employment and an active public realm.

The PMP notes that the heights guidance is a recommendation only and is subject to modifiers. It should also recognise circumstances where additional height is required for development viability purposes and where increased storey height can be acceptable if there is no identified harm to the Outstanding Universal Values of the World Heritage City.

We also consider it is paramount to recognise the following statement from the BBHS, when considering these proposals: "... unlike other areas of Bath, the heritage assets in the valley floor are limited and much altered over time. The development of this area was influenced by Victorian industrialisation and has seen waves of change throughout its history. It is therefore visually distinct from the Georgian City with its fragmented townscape and a variety of building heights.... Unlike other zones, this zone provides the opportunity to maximise development potential while ensuring the protection of the OUV of the Georgian City and its primacy within the urban form. The Georgian city centre with its compact urban form provides the highest densities in Bath and should provide a good model for new urban development to make the most of the opportunities..."

Future iterations of the development and design policy for Sydenham Park should distinguish between Active Frontages and Active Uses. Active Uses should be limited to the pedestrian stretches of the proposed 'Sydenham Park Street' and riverside corridor, with no requisite to deliver these on Lower Bristol Road.

The focus on active frontage in this area should be the pedestrian crossing and route to Green Park and the future Sydenham High Street. This is considered to suit pedestrian movement patterns as well as allowing longer term enhancement if the gyratory is closed.

Future iterations of the overall development approach at Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park should retain a flexible approach to the overall type and quantum of development and uses, which are acceptable.

We would strongly advise the LPA to reconsider the quantum of retail development proposed for the Sydenham Park element of allocation SB7. We would not support any approach that placed a prescriptive requirement for the delivery of retail floorspace, particularly of a large scale, and encourage the LPA to ensure that policy has a flexible and measured approach to any future delivery.

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

Respondent Number:	6541	Comment Number:	Т	

Name: Organisation: British Land Plc
Agent Name: Tim Rainbird Agent Organisation: Quod

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 Mav 2016 Page 688 of 956

Somedate of Bary Wade comments received (in Flam Gracif
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 2 Bath , Policy SB7
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
We have been instructed by our client, The British Land Company pic ('British Land'), to submit representations to the consultation on the Submission Version of the Bath & North East Somerset Placemaking Plan (the Draft Plan). The consultation runs until Friday 3 February 2016 and on the basis that our comments are being made within the prescribed timescales, we trust they will be taken into account.
As we have already advised on the initial consultation of the Draft Plan in January 2015, British Land own a number of retail assets within Bath including the Homebase unit on Pines Way to the east of the Sainsbury's store at Green Park, and a 50% stake in the Southgate scheme which is within Bath city centre. British Land also own Weston Lock Retail Park. These assets complement each other in terms the retail offer and it is important that the relationship is maintained and

It is acknowledged in the Draft Plan that the Sydenham Park area has a number of landowners and that the site will likely come forward in a phased or piecemeal manner. This recognition is welcomed by our client and although they support the idea of an Urban Design Framework for the wider Site, this Framework must be commercially realistic in order for the various land owners to bring forward redevelopment opportunities. Concepts that go way beyond existing landownerships can be unhelpful in Plan making as they create a preconception of how an area should be developed. This in turn can frustrate development coming forward.

not prejudiced in the context of any policy aspiration at Sydenham Park, or indeed any other edge of centre or out of centre location. In particular, any proposed retail uses outside of the city centre must complement and not compete

In addition to our previous representations submitted in January 2015, we have further comments to make in this letter, particularly in regard to the feasibility of the Concept Diagram and the difficulties around the complex land ownership in this area. We remain of the view that it is far more commercially realistic to consider the Sydenham Park site and the Green Park Station site as separate redevelopment opportunities going forward, which has been somewhat acknowledged in this version of the draft Plan.

Our comments are set out below.

with the town centre offer.

a)Concepts Diagram

Green Park Station West and Sydenham Park should come forward for development as separate sites and if necessary the Sainsbury's overflow car park could be relocated out of the Sydenham Park area to facilitate a redevelopment of Sydenham Park. Creating a public realm link between the two sites is unrealistic and unnecessary, and will hinder and delay development of the Sydenham Park site.

Furthermore, the Concepts Diagram proposes a linear "green infrastructure improvement" which runs along the south eastern edge of our clients' site as well as two "potential options for a link" proposed within the north and west of the site. The proposals for excessive paths and links as shown on the Concepts Diagram will erode a significant proportion of the developable area and again is likely to hinder a viable development coming forward. The four new routes which are proposed to cut through or affect our clients' site will also dissect the site into smaller parcels, creating unnecessary physical constraints British Land's site. This is likely to place a considerable constraint on scheme viability and with the Council clearly recognising the delivery issues given the complex land ownerships, there should be an appreciation of this

11 May 2016 Page 689 of 956

when preparing the Concepts Diagram.

We consider that the Concepts Diagram as proposed in the draft Local Plan is highly aspirational which will make it very difficult for a viable development to come forward on our clients' site. The concepts diagram should allow for the realistic possibility of the two sites functioning separately without a public realm link which is currently proposed through the existing Sainsbury's car park and vehicle access road.

That the Concepts Diagram is unrealistic and not reflective of what can be achieved on the Site is contrary to the requirements for the Local Plan to be 'Positively Prepared' and 'Effective' and the Draft Plan cannot therefore be considered sound in this regard.

b)Sydenham Park Street

Policy SB7.3 proposes the creation of a linear public realm, to be known as Sydenham Park Street, running from Green Park Station to the east, through the Sainsbury's car park and into the Sydenham Park site to the west. The policy proposes that this street will be designed to act as a public transport corridor. We understand that there is a historic plan to bring a MRT (rapid bus) route through the site, but that this is no longer being progressed. This concept of a public transport route down Sydenham Park Street is financially unrealistic, given the further impact this would have on the site's developable area, of which British Land would be most affected.

Furthermore, it is an impractical proposal as it is highly unlikely that the existing narrow bridge over the river Avon could accommodate a bus or other public transport vehicles and significant infrastructure investment would be required to facilitate an upgrade of the bridge. In addition, this proposal will result in the removal of a vehicle access route into the Sainsbury's car park and the rail station.

Without the cooperation of all of the landowners this concept of a public transport route through the Site and along "Sydenham Park Street" is unrealistic and undeliverable. Notwithstanding that it will significantly reduce the developable area of our clients' site, and that it is unlikely to be technically feasible without significant investment, it also appears to rely on the creation of a new vehicle route into Sainsbury's which has not been considered.

Finally, if the proposals are to be retail led, they need to complement and not compete with the existing town centre offer. Car parking is vital to the success of an edge of centre development in this location and Sainsbury's vehicle access and car parks should remain or replacement car p=ing provided.

Green Infrastructure Corridor

The green infrastructure corridor between Norfolk Crescent Green and St James Cemetery is no longer a requirement, but an aspiration which is now encouraged. The removal of the requirement for a 20 metre wide corridor is wholly welcomed by our client who will work with the LPA in this regard.

d) Sydenham Park (B)

i)Building Heights

Building heights in Sydenham Park should not be limited by policy and should be assessed on merit having regard to the scale and massing of surrounding buildings. It is significant that the Bath West Riverside SPD states that British Land's site can accommodate up to 6 storeys and the specification of a maximum of 4 or even 5 stories will restrict the potential of the site, limiting the amount of commercial floorspace and number of residential units which can be accommodated.

The 4/5 storey limit is also too low for certain parts of the site which are bound by higher density development.

No specific height should be stated in the draft Plan and we consider that the acceptability of scale and massing in terms of visual impact will depend on the quality of the design of any future development coming forward.

ii)Improvements to the Pinesway Gyratory

11 Mav 2016 Page 690 of 956

Paragraph 3.7.19 suggests that all development proposals will be required to contribute towards improvements to the Pinesway gyratory and implement improvements to the public realm to improve th cycle and pedestrian experience. The scale of these improvements, which would become apparent following transport assessments based on each individual development coming forward, should be defined as far as possible to add clarity. It also seems more appropriate for land within the gyratory (which is in single ownership) to be responsible for the majority of these improvements, which should be secured from current planning applications.

iii)Mix of Uses

It is envisaged that 7,000 square metres net retail floorspace will come forward on the site subject to it no* - competing with the retail offer of other centres. The principle of this is wholly supported by British Land albeit we believe that explicit reference to Bath City Centre as the highest order centre in the retail hierarchy should be made. British Land also support the wider mix of uses proposed including residential, a hotel and complementary food and drink uses.

British Land does not support the retention of the existing large format DIY store given this would be a lost opportunity, but it is agreed that a much smaller DIY store would be far more appropriate.

The retail space in this edge of centre location would require good accessibility by car and appropriate levels of car parking. Sainsbury's vehicular access and car park should therefore be retained.

e) Conclusion

British Land supports the principle of Sydenham Park being a more intensively developed site for a mix of land uses including residential, retail, leisure and complementary food and drink uses. British Land also supports the idea of the Green Park and Sydenham Park sites coming forward separately so that the Sydenham Park site has no reliance on the relocation of Sainsbury's. Our client also supports the idea of an urban design framework which promotes the comprehensive redevelopment of the Sydenham Park site but that development will come forward on a site by site basis. However, in order for this Plan to be found sound, any policy aspirations and urban design framework for the site must be deliverable.

The urban design framework remains very ambitious and has significant challenges which have not been overcome since the Options version of the Draft Plan. In order for the Plan to be found sound, it must be a deliverable. A realistic urban design framework and Concepts Diagram for the redevelopment of both Sites should be prepared separately with the input from the various land owners.

input from the various land owners.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 Mav 2016 Page 691 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 153

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 25 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 153 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Where the Western Riverside Development is discussed and whilst the favourable picture of where the SSP's have been cut down is exhibited no mention is made of doing this for Phase 2.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 6 Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson
Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills
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 2 Bath , Para 153 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 153 states that Western Riverside 'is a complex site that has, inter alia, required remediation works to

11 May 2016 Page 692 of 956

is still operational and there remains underground pipework in use on this site.

Paragraph 153 states that 'Much of the land is derelict or vacant but other parts are occupied'. This is not a factual statement. The Council must be clear which parts of land they consider to be 'derelict or vacant', as overall, across the Western Riverside area, as a matter of fact more of the land is occupied or operational than not.

Paragraph 153 states that 'Not all areas within the Western Riverside zone may be regenerated during the Pan (sic) Period e.g. part of the Lower Bristol Road frontage where there are car showrooms that are successfully trading and investing in their estate. Any associated non-business related development as part of the reorganisation of an estate, including building above the primary business shall be for residential use'.

The Plan Period is due to run until 2029, this suggests that the Council are prepared to wait more than 13 years for the remainder of this land to be built out and it is not suggesting that it needs to be built out in accordance with Crest's approved masterplan. The Council should be taking a proactive approach to effect the delivery of this major regeneration site in accordance with the BWR SPD (2008) and the outline planning permission that it approved in 2010, and which is being delivered by Crest in accordance with that consent. If a departure is sought for this area for a change of use which is not in accordance with the current consent, then this should be made in the context of comprehensive development of the whole of BWR.

Finally, Paragraph 153 states in its final sentence that Western Riverside has the estimated housing potential for the plan period of around 2,200. However, Policy SB8(1) refers to the provision of 'around 1,500 dwellings' as does paragraph 157. Clarification is required regarding the amount and distribution of residential development across Western Riverside to address this inconsistency.

Q5 Change Requested

We object to Paragraph 153 and suggest that the following changes should be made:

- 1)The text should recognise the land still has operational gas infrastructure
- 2)The text should be revised to correct the erroneous statement that much of the land is derelict or vacant;
- 3)The Council must take positive steps to enable the delivery of the Western Riverside development in accordance with the SPD and the extant outline planning permission; and
- 4)Clarification must be provided on the amount and distribution of residential development across Western Riverside (i.e. 1,500 dwellings or 2,200 dwellings).

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?

There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.

11 May 2016 Page 693 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 157

Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Number: 7 Name: Fareen Lalani Organisation: Crest Nicholson Agent Name: Stuart Garnett Agent Organisation: Savills 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 157 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
This boundary seeks to exclude the land east of Midland Road, with paragraph 157 noting that 'much of the area benefits from outline or full planning permission'. For clarification, not all of the extant reserved matter approvals on the Crest land have yet been implemented, and a reserved matters application also needs to come forward on Stothert Avenue to complete block B10 (south side of the site). Clarification from the Council is required to confirm whether Diagram 13 should be amended to reflect this to ensure a consistent policy approach prevails across the Western Riverside site in its entirety. Rather than Paragraph 157 which states 'the extent of this area may change during the examination phase on Draft Plan (sic) and therefore need to evolve (contract) to reflect change on the ground', it might instead be necessary to expand the area as shown in Diagram 13.
Q5 Change Requested We object to Diagram 13 and Paragraph 157 and suggest that the following changes should be made: 1)Diagram 13 – the Council to review retaining land east of Western Riverside within the shaded area for the Western Riverside site boundary; and 2)Paragraph 157 to be amended to revise wording of sentence starting 'The extent of this area' to remove reference to 'evolve (contract)'.
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?
There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.

11 May 2016 Page 694 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 26

Plan Order Reference

Organisation:

Agent Organisation:

Part: Policy SB8 Volume: 2, Bath

194

Respondent Number:

Name: John Webb

Agent Name:

	t 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 (tick	ed where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not	Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
On Page 71 we have a picture of the river with the Student Accommodation Blocks in Lowe They contributed nothing by wat of Section 106 monies and a close up would reveal that the is scruffy and a wasted asset. It then goes on to talk of the river banks being an important we the impediment to flow by unmanaged vegetation or the need to make the riverside path so could mention all this fails to sit with the commitment to no longer turn their back on the r	ne river frontage behind them wild life asset. No mention of safer and more user friendly. I
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 54	
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 54 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation T	rust
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation T	rust
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Agent Organisation:	rust t with the comment? No
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sen Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sen Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No	t with the comment? No
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sen Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	t with the comment? No
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sen 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)	t with the comment? No
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sen 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)	t with the comment? No w ed where indicated):
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sen 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 Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Preservation To Agent Preserva	t with the comment? No w ed where indicated):
Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment? 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 Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Preservation T Agent Organisation: Attachments sen No Attachments sen No If the respondent considers the document is sound? No If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked Not Positively Prepared Not Justified Not Consisten Not The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Preservation T	t with the comment? No w ed where indicated): Effective

The Historia Environment assessment paragraph 15 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 15 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation.
Q5 Change Requested
Clarify numbers and acceptability or otherwise of student housing.
Move paragraph 15 upwards.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number: 5
Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
SB8 - Western Riverside Site boundary — North Bank requirements need to further emphasise enhancing access to the river and ensuring appropriate pedestrian access. Developments should be set back from the development boundary/river path so to enhance the openness of the river-scape. Sensitivity of lighting is noted. Developments should add to the permeability of access to the river path.
The area known as the Westmark site has recently had planning permission come forward. As with other sites around Bath and as part of the context of Western Riverside, the plan should form a view as to student accommodation. As other sites exclude the possibility of student accommodation — this places more pressure on those sites that remain silent on the matter. In my view a mixed development would be preferential on the Westmark site, a proposal containing students, private residential and social housing should come forward, this must include a significant element for key-worker accommodation.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 696 of 956

Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 5
Name: Helen Woodley Organisation:
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB8
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Please include requirement for new in-site allotments as there are large residential developments, in line with para 460
of part 1. Unsound because not postively prepared.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Miles de cethe Descendant feel it is accessor to monticipate at the Franciscation?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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')
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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?
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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):
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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?
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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):
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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 Consisten Not Effective
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Policy SB8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Policy SB8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Old Malthouse, Upper Bristol Road, Bath, BA1 3AJ. The site contains a mix of modern industrial buildings set around a 1920's workshop in the middle.
Respondent Number: 1544 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Hunt Organisation: St John's Hospital Trustees 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB8 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Old Malthouse, Upper Bristol Road, Bath, BA1 3AJ. The site contains a mix of modern industrial buildings set around

11 May 2016 Page 697 of 956

Firstly, as the freeholder for an active part of the allocation, St John's Hospital supports the approach and general thrust

of the Policy. This is a key redevelopment area/objective of the Placemaking Plan and its contribution to the overall vision for the authority area is recognised.

Within the policy text specific reference is made to the land on the North Bank of the Western Riverside area. In general the text is supported and the key issues outlined appear appropriate. The Council is urged to ensure that the final wording of the Policy provides sufficient flexibility to adapt the design scheme where necessary to respond to site constraints and provide greater assurance of delivery.

The Western Riverside SPD is rightly referenced in the Policy and is key to delivering the proposal. The provision of around 1500 dwellings is a significant contribution to the city's stated future housing need.

Other significant benefits include the increase in connectivity, and an education use which are vital to this section of Bath. All efforts should be made to making sure that this development area is deliverable and planning policy and support from the local planning authority is essential.

BANES Council is respectfully asked to continue engagement with the landowners of the wider site to ensure that the specific individual site constraints/considerations are included in the promotion of the regeneration scheme.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Ex	xamination (ticked if	yes)?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to p	participate at the Exam	mination?	
Respondent Number: 4708 Comment Nu	ımber: 8		
Name: Fareen Lalani	Organisation:	Crest Nicholson	
Agent Name: Stuart Garnett	Agent Organis	sation: Savills	
Further Information available in the original con	nment? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is l	legally compliant? (Ti	ick if indicated 'yes') ✓	
Does the respondent consider the document is	sound? No		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaki	ing Plan is unsound, is	s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	

Not Consisten

Not Effective

Q4 Soundness Comment

Not Positively Prepared ✓

The representation relates to: Volume 2

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q5 Change Requested

Crest supports the principle for (3) a primary school at Western Riverside, subject to this being achieved as part of comprehensive development through a phased approach and the provision of necessary infrastructure (access, roads, services, etc), such as that already secured through the current outline planning permission and its associated Section 106 agreement.

, Policy SB8

Not Justified

Bath

Crest supports criterion (6) that any application needs to demonstrate how it is consistent with and contributes to the delivery of the comprehensive development of the whole site by reference to the BWR SPD. This is emphasised by Paragraph 1.6.2 of the BWR SPD, with the 6th bullet which states 'To ensure that appropriate phasing and sequencing of development is secured to enable the regeneration of the area as a whole and not on a piecemeal basis'. The consented masterplan for the Crest proposals includes the provision of significant infrastructure, which can only be achieved through a comprehensive delivery of the site. Piecemeal development will risk the delivery of the important facilities, infrastructure and residential development that has been consented and committed to by the Council.

11 Mav 2016 Page 698 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Crest objects to criterion (7). The statement that retention of such businesses will be permitted provided it does not prevent necessary vehicular access to the core of the site is completely contrary to the Council's target for the redevelopment of the Western Riverside area and in direct conflict with the preceding criterion (6). The explicit acceptance of residential above the businesses is confusing and this should only be encouraged as part of the comprehensive development of the area which meets all the aspirations of the outline planning permission. The Council should be taking direct measures to effect the delivery of this land as part of the proposals envisaged within the BWR SPD and Crest's outline planning permission.

Criterion (8) is inconsistently applied relative to other allocations. It states that lighting 'must be designed to safeguard the important ecological function of the river corridor, to include the retention of a dark corridor for bats' whilst, Policy B3(d) does not make reference to lighting.

Q5 Change Requested

We object to Policy SB8 and request the following changes:

- 1)Deletion of criterion (7) in its entirety as it is contrary to criterion (6) as it fails 't contribute to the delivery of the comprehensive development of the whole site...'.
- 2)Ensure criterion (8) is applied consistently to all allocations, for example, Policy B3.

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?

There may be a requirement to provide factual clarification on the development at Western Riverside to address errors or issues identified in the Placemaking Plan which affect its soundness.

Respondent Number: 4797 Comment Number:	1	
Name: Oi	ganisation: Westi	mark (Bath) Ltd
Agent Name: Dan Yeates Ag	gent Organisation:	Savills
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Att	achments sent with the comment? Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally consider the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is Not Positively Prepared □ Not Justified ✓	No	ause it is (ticked where indicated):
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , F The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	olicy SB8	

O4 Soundness Comment

These representations have been prepared by Savills on behalf of Westmark (Bath) Ltd who have an interest in land at Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road, Bath identified on the enclosed plan (Appendix 1). This site is referred to within the Draft Placemaking Plan as 'land within the North Bank'

These representations respond directly to Policy SB8 (Western Riverside), which allocates the site for residential led development, but specifically excludes student accommodation as a potential future use We therefore continue to object to the exclusion of student housing as a potential land use option, specifically on the 'land within the North Bank', and the representations therefore focus on this objection.

In addition, these representations comment upon Policy B5 which sets out the strategy for the provision of student accommodation in Bath.

11 May 2016 Page 699 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The first section of the representations addresses our interpretation of the current student supply and demand, and the following sections outline our objections to the exclusion of student accommodation as a potential future use for the Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road site, covered under Policy SB8, as well as our fundamental concerns with the Council's evidence to justify the proposed residential allocation of the site. The final section draws together our conclusions and explains our interpretation of the evidence and thus concludes our recommended changes to the Draft Placemaking Plan.

The Site The land at Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road has been in a poor, near derelict condition for a number of years. The site was a former gasworks which was purchased by UK & European Investments in 2005. Whilst the eastern part of the site has been occupied by two light industrial units, this covers a small percentage of the overall area of the site. The west side of the site has not been developed but does comprise previously developed land.

It should be noted that a proposal for residential development on the site was previously withdrawn at the planning appeal stage in 2006. The application comprised the demolition of existing buildings, contamination remediation works and redevelopment of the site for 171 residential apartments, 72 car parking spaces, associated landscaping and external works and creation of a new highway access off Upper Bristol Road (Ref.05/00097/EFUL).

Since this time only part of the site has been occupied, however the existing light industrial units are currently in a poor condition. Indeed, it is clear that the whole site is in a very poor condition, and will continue to fall into disrepair unless development, of a use which is viable and deliverable, takes place to bring the site back into use. Furthermore, intrusive ground investigations undertaken by Arup previously to inform the design of the previous development have shown that the ground has been impacted by the historical use of the site as a gas works. Subsequent detailed assessments have indicated that there is a potential risk posed to the adjacent River Avon, and that the development of the site will facilitate the reduction of this potential risk to acceptable levels.

More recently, a planning application has been submitted for the redevelopment of the site for student accommodation with the following development description:

"Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide student accommodation (Sui Generis), comprising 394 bed spaces, ancillary facilities, 149sqm of ground floor flexible space (Class B1 and D1), new access to the river towpath, car and cycle parking provision and landscaping".

The application was validated on 22 December 2015, and is due to be determined by 22 March 2015 (ref: 15/05688/FUL).

Need for Student Housing

Our view on the current supply and demand imbalance in Bath in respect of the provision of student accommodation is set out within the supporting evidence submitted with the December 2015 planning application. In summary, it stated that the existing supply of private purpose built student accommodation in Bath amounts to 5,991 bed spaces, which allows only 32% of the full time student population to access a bed space, with the remainder (68%) making alternative arrangements either in the private rented (HMO) sector, their own home or their parents' home. This therefore demonstrates a need for good quality purpose built student accommodation in Bath. For context, by national standards, a 30.1% supply of students to available bed spaces is considered low. The 32% figure therefore falls into the same categorisation.

Even if it is assumed that all schemes in the current development pipeline are delivered, it would still leave approximately 59.4% of full time students unable to access university provided or private sector purpose built student accommodation. These students will therefore have to rely on the parental home, own home, HMO style accommodation or privately rented accommodation. This therefore puts increased pressure on the private sector rental markets as students will look to occupy the private sector housing stock due to lack of purpose built student accommodation in Bath.

It is noted that the Council has published updated evidence on student need, 'Historic and Future Student Numbers and

11 Mav 2016 Page 700 of 956

Accommodation Requirements in Bath' (December 2015). This report confirms the low level of current provision (2014/15), stating in Table 12 that only 32% of full time students have access to a bed space.

Furthermore, Table 12 also confirms that by 2020/21 the total student housing need will be 24,708 bed spaces, with an anticipated supply of only 7,868 bed spaces (31.8%). It is therefore clear that there is an overwhelming need for additional student accommodation to be delivered in Bath to ensure further stress is not placed on the private housing sector through the need for the conversion of market housing to create HMO's.

The overwhelming need for additional student accommodation is recognised by the Council its own evidence, particularly the Historic and Future Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements in Bath report, and the draft Placemaking Plan consultation documentation. The Placemaking Plan District-wide Strategy and Policies document states that "If the provision of purpose-built student accommodation does not keep up with the growth in the resident student population, more market housing will be needed because of the pressure on the private letting Market".

Volume 2 of the draft Placemaking Plan, within the Chapter covering 'Bath's Universities And Private Colleges', also confirms that the combined student accommodation needs for Bath would increase from 16,300 to 24,800(+8,500) to 2020/21, but that the assumed supply would not cover this, leaving an anticipated residual need of 4,900 student bed spaces to 2020/21.

The Council have also recognised the clear need for student accommodation in the city, and how the provision of purpose built student accommodation could help alleviate pressure on the private rented sector, in a recent Committee Report (Appendix 2) for Green Park House (Application No: 14/00480/FUL), which states that:

"In terms of the principle of development, as part of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), the Council has assessed the need for student accommodation in Bath and confirmed that there is a need to provide between 1,580 to 2873 additional student bed spaces to accommodate the forecasted growth in student numbers in the City over the next 15 to 20 years. Clearly the provision of nearly over 450 bed spaces in one centralised location will go a significant way to meeting the need. Furthermore, it is considered that the provision of purpose built student accommodation could assist with a reversal of existing HMOs back to non-student housing which would generally assist in redressing the balance of recent years in certain areas of Bath where HMO's have proliferated".

Furthermore, the Council's adopted Core Strategy recognises that the growth of student numbers in the last decade has not been accompanied by sufficient on-campus study rooms and that this has led to an expansion of student lettings which has diminished the 'normal' housing stock of the City. Indeed, the proliferation of HMOs is recognised within paragraph 2.37 of the adopted Core Strategy, as the most visible consequence of the mismatch between the growth in student numbers and on-campus development.

This pressure that a lack of student accommodation provision has on the private sector rental market, will result in the displacement of other social demographics from obtaining housing through the private sector rental market in Bath.

Therefore, the provision of purpose built student accommodation will reduce the significant pressure on HMOs and the private sector rental market. HMOs often provide low quality and less secure accommodation which do not meet the needs or expectations of students. By increasing the number of purpose built student accommodation in Bath, it will ease the pressure on HMOs and allow this accommodation to be utilised by families. For example, large areas of HMOs develop in areas due to the lack of university or private sector provided student accommodation.

Overall, there is a clear identified need for off-campus purpose built student accommodation in Bath, and the land at Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road provides an opportunity to deliver such accommodation on a highly sustainable site.

Policy SB8: Western Riverside

Whilst we support an 'in principle' allocation for the development of the Western Riverside site, we object to the allocation of land at Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road in the form currently drafted within the Draft

11 May 2016 Page 701 of 956

Placemaking Plan for residential-led development only as this lacks flexibility and will impact on delivery. Instead, we

strongly advocate the allocation of land at Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road ('land within the North Bank') to also allow for the provision of student accommodation.

We set out below our reasons for the objection to the proposed residential allocation, and instead why the site should be allocated for private student accommodation, including viability and deliverability considerations.

Principle of Development

We support the allocation of the site for development in principle and welcome the Council's conclusion that the site is suitable to accommodate a proportion of the city's growth.

The site is approximately 1.5 km west of the city centre, and benefits from good transport and pedestrian links, therefore enabling any future residents the chance to easily reach a range of local services and facilities via sustainable travel modes.

The majority of the site is currently vacant and derelict, therefore providing a sustainable brownfield redevelopment opportunity.

Furthermore, a planning application has now been submitted for the redevelopment of the site for student accommodation. This application, submitted in December 2015, is accompanied by a number of technical assessments to support the development of the site for student accommodation.

Viability

Paragraph 173 of the NPPF addresses viability and deliverability, stating that "pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened".

The landowner has assessed the viability of residential development on the site, and has found that this would not be a viable and indeed deliverable use. To demonstrate this, a detailed viability assessment has been commissioned to support the planning application submitted in December 2015 which has assessed different landuse scenarios for the site, including a 100% student accommodation scheme, a student/residential mixed use scheme, and a 100% residential scheme.

The Assessment confirms that the proposed student accommodation is a viable and wholly appropriate development option for the subject site. However, in comparison to a student scheme, the use of the site as a 100% residential development is unviable based on the proposed scheme, and a mixed use scheme also produces a negative land value. In particular, the mixed use scheme of residential and student accommodation, on a relatively tight site, are not an ideal combination in terms of incompatibility issues. There are a number of reasons for the negative land value for the 100% residential option, including the need to provide a percentage of affordable housing in line with adopted planning policy, parking requirements including the potential for an underground car park, contamination and the poor site access.

In all cases, there are abnormal costs involved with the excavation and remediation of the contaminated land onsite which could see this value eroded further.

It is noted that the Council has published a high level Viability Assessment to support the latest consultation, specifically to test the financial viability of the sites being considered for allocation in the Placemaking Plan.

However, we have fundamental concerns with this Viability Assessment which supports the residential allocation of the site. In particular, it is concerning that whilst the report refers to high level assumptions there are a number of important assumptions that have been overlooked and must be considered to ensure the analysis reflects the reality on the ground.

11 Mav 2016 Page 702 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Firstly, it should be made clear that the historical use of the land has resulted in the site being heavily contaminated. There are therefore significant abnormal costs and risks associated with the creation of an acceptable development platform as part of any development of the site. The Council's Viability Assessment does not accurately reflect this position, a matter which is critical to the exercise being undertaken.

As part of the technical work undertaken to inform the recently submitted planning application, extensive ground investigations have been undertaken to determine both the extent of contamination and the appropriate remediation strategy required to facilitate development. For example, the December 2015 application proposals will still require an importation of materials due to the offsite disposal of an estimated 1500m3 of hazardous soils to be disposed of off-site, as well as the need to raise the site to a level of 19.5m AOD.

In this respect, it is not clear if these implications have been fully taken into account in the Council's Viability Assessment, however the Council should be aware that the remediation costs are significant. We conservatively estimate that the additional costs to deal with the site amount to between £2m, assuming parking at grade, and £3m, assuming that a basement car park is provided.

It is not also clear what hypothetical scheme has been tested as part of the Viability Assessment and therefore it is difficult to challenge specific assumptions. However, it should be noted that the recently submitted planning application provides for limited car parking at surface level as a result of a clear knowledge of these fundamental constraints. Indeed, any development on the site which includes the creation of a basement car park will require a significantly higher level of remediation, cost and risk, due to the need to excavate into the contaminated ground.

With reference to the previous 2006 application for the residential redevelopment of the site (Ref.05/00097/EFUL), technical evidence provided by Arup as part of the December 2015 application confirms that with the proposed basement parking, there would have been a requirement to dispose of materials, amounting to approximately 7500 cubic metres off-site that would be considered to be non-hazardous or hazardous.

We therefore stress that any assumptions made in relation to basement parking on the site would need to be adjusted.

Furthermore, any assumptions made in relation to the previous 2006 residential scheme would need to reflect the policy and design aspirations and requirements for the site that have come into effect since. In particular, Design Codes set out within the Bath Western Riverside SPD (2008) specify the parameters for an acceptable development on the site, including upper height limits.

In this respect, we have significant concerns over the Council's Viability Testing evidence set out within the Viability Assessment, and consider this evidence fundamentally flawed. The testing is based upon a GIA of 10,320 sqm, very similar to the GIA of the December 2015 application for student accommodation, at 10,925 sqm. However, whereas the December 2015 planning application proposals provide only 8 car parking spaces at grade, the Viability Assessment accounts for 48 car parking spaces.

We have two principal concerns with this approach. Firstly, if it is assumed that the 48 car parking spaces are to be provided at grade, then this would result in a residential scheme of a height sufficient to accommodate undercroft parking. In order to achieve a scheme with the assumed GIA floorspace of 10,320 sqm, this is likely to result in a scheme which is of a height and scale which would be contrary to adopted planning policies and particularly the Design Codes, 'North Bank – Design Code areas', set out within the Bath Western Riverside SPD which prescribes a height limit of 3-5 stories across the site.

Equally, if it has been assumed that the 48 car parking spaces are to be provided as part of a basement car park, then it is considered the Viability Assessment is not accurate in this respect as it does not appear to take into account the significant contamination constraints and excavations and removal of contaminated soil off-site, as already outlined above.

Whichever scenario is meant to be applicable in the Council's Viability Assessment, we have fundamental concerns and

11 Mav 2016 Page 703 of 956

consider the approach taken in the evidence base is flawed.

We also have significant concerns over the build cost assumptions made within the Viability Assessment. It is notes that approximately £16,614,748 has been assumed as the development cost for the hypothetical scenario based on BCIS rates. However, specific cost information has been prepared by Westmark's cost consultants to inform the December 2015 planning application, and this demonstrates that the Council's assumptions do not accurately reflect the correct build cost to be applied to a development of this site. Instead, such development costs would in reality be significantly higher than the assumed level in the Council's Viability Assessment. For example, the assumed development costs for the hypothetical scheme within the Viability Assessment equates to approximately £150 / sq ft. However, our cost plans, notwithstanding any contamination, have been based upon approximately £200 / sq ft. Applying the build costs of £200 / sq ft with a figure of £2m for contamination adds an additional £7.5m f costs to the analysis set out within the Council's Viability Assessment, resulting in a net residual value of approximately £2.328m, far below the Council's assumed figure.

To further emphasise this, extensive pre-application consultation was undertaken with officers at the Council prior to the submission of the December 2015 planning application, which ensured considerable input was received in relation to the scale and massing which would be acceptable on the site along with acceptable materials at this important gateway site. It is important to note that the recently submitted application currently being considered by the Council proposes a high quality development and the majority of the scheme is proposed in Bath stone, reflecting the aspirations of officers in relation to the development of this site. It has been made clear by officers that there is limited scope for achieving a lower quality finish in this important location, and therefore this clearly influences the build costs assumptions that need to be carefully considered as part of the viability testing.

Overall, we have significant concerns over the Council's viability evidence to support the proposed residential allocation of the site. Their approach taken and assumptions made are not robust and not backed up by evidence of the reality on the ground.

Deliverability

Student Scheme

A planning application for the redevelopment of the site for student accommodation was submitted in December 2015 following extensive pre-application discussions with officers at Bath and North East Somerset Council. Such discussions have taken place over a period of more than 20 months.

The submission of the planning application demonstrates a commitment from Westmark (Bath) Ltd to pursue the student accommodation as a deliverable use. Significant time and cost has already been invested in the application proposals and these are driven by evidence on both student need / demand, and viability advice taking into account the significant costs likely to be involved in bringing the site forward for development.

Furthermore, the student proposals, now being determined by the Council, are consistent with the specific requirements for 'land within the North Bank' as set out within Policy SB8 of the Draft Plan. In particular, the application proposals introduce an active built frontage onto Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road, as well as providing a link to the river towpath. In addition, the height and massing is consistent with the design code principles set out in the Bath Western Riverside SPD. Indeed, the application proposals respond to the seven draft policy criteria set out in Policy SB8.

Residential Scheme

Notwithstanding the significant viability concerns relating to a residential scheme, there are a number of deliverability issues, some of which have already been covered within the Council's SHLAA. These constraints include the need for junction / access improvements alongside a detailed assessment of vehicular trip generation. In addition, the SHLAA recommends that development on the site be designed to provide parking to a "substantially reduced standard".

Furthermore, specialist highways advice provided by Curtins confirms that any access from Upper Bristol Road should be

11 May 2016 Page 704 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

avoided due to its close proximity to the signalised junction of Upper Bristol Road and Windsor Bridge Road. Vehicular access at this point is likely to result in a significant impact on the capacity of an already busy junction. Further to this, it is apparent that any traffic exiting/entering the site to/from the eastbound carriageway of Upper Bristol Road would need to cross two lanes of traffic, resulting in an increase to highway safety risk. In addition, any use of Midland Road would require improvements.

If parking is required, the only access to the scheme is from Midland Road, located to the rear of the site, which is neither desirable nor is it conducive to delivering a scheme which is on a par with values being achieved elsewhere. The access arrangements from Midland Road will affect achievable values. Furthermore, as already outlined, in order to meet required parking standards for a residential scheme this is likely to result in a significant area of the site being required for parking particularly as excavation to create a basement level parking will be compromised as a result of land contamination issues. The requirement for parking is therefore likely to significantly impact on the viability of a residential scheme. In addition, whilst it is unclear what housing mix has been assumed within the Council's Viability Assessment, such a residential scheme would need to provide for sufficient parking to meet the Council's required parking standards, including a requirement for visitor parking.

It is strongly considered that, notwithstanding the viability concerns relating to a residential-led development, that student accommodation would be a more appropriate use for the site given that concerns over highways and parking could be alleviated. Whereas a residential development would be required to provide a specific level of onsite parking, student accommodation could be provided with limited or zero on-site parking, removing concerns over vehicular movements in and out of the site, impacts on the local highways network, and available space for on-site parking.

Indeed, some of the key benefits of the site in delivering student development over residential include:

- ② Would facilitate the redevelopment of a predominantly vacant brownfield site, bringing the site back into a viable reuse;
- 🛮 Address the significant need for additional student bed spaces in Bath;
- ●☑Would assist with the reversal of existing HMO's back to non-student housing (based on the Council's assumption of 4 students per HMO, a student scheme on the site has the potential to release up to 101 HMO's back to normal residential development, contributing to the Council's housing land supply);
- 12 Would reduce vehicle movements to from the site in comparison to a 'normal' residential scheme which would require a significant number of vehicular parking spaces;
- 2 Would generate a level of employment;
- 2 Would enable significant landscape and environmental improvements to be made.

Summary

Given the above, we therefore object to the allocation of the Western Riverside – Land at Upper Bristol Road /Windsor Bridge Road in the form currently drafted within the Draft Placemaking Plan, for residential-led development only. Instead, we strongly advocate the allocation of the site for student accommodation too and consider that Policy SB8 should be amended to include the potential for this use class on the site.

We acknowledge the need for the Council to balance the growing need for student accommodation against the limited land available for such development and the competing objectives within the city, particularly the need to ensure the strategic housing requirement is met, including affordable housing. However, the proposed land allocations and strategic policies for off-campus student accommodation should carefully consider viability and deliverability to ensure sustainable brownfield land within the city is not stifled.

The Viability Assessment undertaken on behalf of the landowner to inform the December 2015 planning application demonstrates that the proposed student scheme is viable, in comparison to the unviable options of a mixed use scheme and 100% residential scheme.

It is acknowledged that Policy B5 of the adopted Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy states "that proposals for off-campus student accommodation will be refused within the Central Area, the Enterprise Area and on MoD land where

11 May 2016 Page 705 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

this would adversely affect the realisation of other aspects of the vision and spatial strategy for the City in relation to housing and economic development". However, the latest viability evidence demonstrates that a residential development on the site is not deliverable, and it is therefore considered that the benefits of providing student accommodation on the site significantly outweigh the Council's desire to 'reserve' the site for an unviable residential use.

The site is heavily contaminated which will result in abnormal build/development costs. To achieve a position from which a development can be successfully progressed an end value must be created which overcomes these constraints and delivers a return on investment.

Paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires that local planning authorities should "identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements".

In the footnote to paragraph 47, the NPPF outlines that "to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable".

It is entirely inappropriate for the Council to allocate a sustainable brownfield site within Bath for a use which is not currently viable or deliverable. Indeed, the lack of flexibility within draft allocation SB8 may result in the allocation of a site for a use which will not be delivered and is therefore contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

The draft Placemaking Plan states that "the Council cannot direct the Universities not to aspire to grow. It can only look to achieve the full scope of all needs /requirements/ aspirations affecting the city and seek to meet them in a sustainable way within its unique collection of environmental constraints. In a place such as Bath that may also involve a scheme of prioritisation of uses". We not contest the need for a 'prioritisation of uses' but this should not result in the Council allocating sites for a single use (residential) which is not viable. This is clearly contrary to the principles of the NPPF.

Given the undeniable need for additional student accommodation in Bath, and the suitability of the land at Upper Bristol Road / Windsor Bridge Road for student accommodation, it is strongly recommended that Policy SB8 be amended accordingly.

Q5 Change Requested

It is considered that Policy SB8 should be amended to allocate the site for student accommodation, or as a minimum should include reference to student accommodation as one potential use to enable flexibility in the future delivery of the site. Including such flexibility within the Policy will ensure that, based on the detailed viability evidence submitted with the December 2015 planning application, the progression of development proposals for the most deliverable use will not be prevented.

Residential use considered to be unviable ... It is entirely inappropriate for the Council to allocate a sustainable brownfield site within Bath for a use which is not currently viable or deliverable. Indeed, the lack of flexibility within draft allocation SB8 may result in the allocation of a site for a use which will not be delivered and is therefore contrary to paragraph 47 of the NPPF ... We not contest the need for a 'prioritisation of uses' but this should not result in the Council allocating sites for a single use (residential) which is not viable. This is clearly contrary to the principles of the NPPF ... It is considered that Policy SB8 should be amended to allocate the site for student accommodation, or as a minimum should include reference to student accommodation as one potential use to enable flexibility in the future delivery of the site. Including such flexibility within the Policy will ensure that, based on the detailed viability evidence submitted with the December 2015 planning application, the progression of development proposals for the most deliverable use will not be prevented.

It is therefore requested that the following changes are made to draft Policy SB8:

- 1) Delete reference "not including student accommodation" on p71;
- 2) Amend draft allocation to include the potential for "student accommodation, and/or residential development".

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



11 May 2016 Page 706 of 956

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

To provide the Inspector with information relating to the site, along with comments on specific policies within the draft Placemaking Plan.

11 May 2016 Page 707 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 6

Plan Order Reference

2, Bath Part: Policy B3 Volume:

256

Respondent Number:

Name: Clir Andrew Furse	Organisation:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:		
Further Information available in the original comment	i? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant? (Tid	ck if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Cons	isten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Policy B3		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
B3 – Twerton and Newbridge riversides. The area from and is generally known as Lower Weston, not Newbrid west of this.			
B3 f; Windsor Bridge Junction on the Upper Bristol Rd a congestion and traffic volumes here need to be included not ideal. B3 Newbridge Riverside 3.4; for improved accessibility t	d. Pedestrian cr	ossing facilities either side of Windsor Bridge	
Q5 Change Requested			
Q3 Change Nequested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if y	es)?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	oate at the Exan	nination?	
Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number	: 11		
Name: Nicholas Stubbs	Organisation:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organis	ation:	
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant? (Tid	ck if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? No		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸 Not Justified 🗸	Not Cons	isten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy B3		
11 Mav 2016		Page 708	of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

This is a combined observation on the evidence and justification for the Plan's higher education and industrial policies taken together, which make the Plan, in these respects, unsound.

Paragraph 474 opines that 'Due to the fact that these [industrial] sites will have been allocated for such a use, based on evidence of need, the presumption will be that this is the case, unless current market signals are sufficient to challenge the need for continued long term protection.'

That an industrial allocation in the past, at least as old as the evidence phase of the Adopted Local Plan, if not before, should be presumed to be evidence of industrial demand over the Plan Period, is unsound.

In 472, the Plan acknowledges the need to manage the contraction of manufacturing, which has steadily declined in the UK since the 1950s as repetitive, high-volume, low-value-added manufacturing has migrated to lower-cost nations. Now, even previously low-cost economies such as China, as they have grown more wealthy because of the strength of their manufacturing success, are losing the cost-advantage to even cheaper competition. What advantage does the BANES District have against this global trend? And yet low-volume, high-value-added manufacturing still flourishes in the UK: witness Romarsh Ltd in Wilshire, who are bringing back their manufacturer of high-end motors for applications like trains and wind turbines from China because, inter alia, of the competitive advantage achieved by the flexibility, reliability and capability of UK employees. The key to the UK's industrial advantage is skill.

UK markets are less about physical products and more about intellectual ones, such as education, law or music. Figure 1.3, p6 of BIS Economics Paper No. 17, 'UK Trade Performance across Markets and Sectors' February 2012, shows that UK global export of 'Art Work and Related' comprises a staggering 22percent total, dwarfing all other sectors and even exceeding Germany's proportional export of cars! Again, the common thread to the UK's advantage is skill.

The District is privileged to have two excellent universities: the University of Bath is a selective university attracting students firmly established as a top ten UK university with a reputation for research and teaching excellence; Bath Spa University is popular for social creative disciplines, again with a reputation for high quality teaching: both directly contribute to the District's economy now and into the future.

UK students not only represent direct economic spend in places where they study and in the education they pay for, they are also the foundation of the nation's future export potential and wealth underpinning the UK's ability to create and make world-beating products and services. Every foreign student educated in a UK university represents an export, assisting the balance of payments. Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 distinction between education and industry does not properly represent any longer the complex, diverse mix of contemporary economic activity.

In the light of this evidence, it must be fundamentally unsound for the Plan to favour industry over higher education when the evidence so firmly points in the opposite direction that education is the lifeblood of UK industry.

Q5 Change Requested

To make it sound, the Placemaking Plan narrative and policies for both higher education and industry should be reassessed in the light of properly prepared evidence and, either leave market forces to determine which use has need or, better, to positively allocate land, including removing land from or permitting development within Green Belt if necessary, to meet the needs of both universities and of industry.

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?

It appears that the quality of the evidence and the policies derived therefrom in respect of higher education as well as its relationship to economic evidence and industrial policy are the least competent in the draft Placemaking Plan and it might be nece

11 May 2016 Page 709 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 158

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 27
Name: John Webb Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 158 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 158 mentions Western Island but fails to grasp the nettle that using it as a Bus Depot is a classic example of an opportunity lost. Under the pre Laming River Corridor Group we had identified this as a site for affordable housing and live/work units.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 710 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB9

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number:	55
Name: Caroline Kay	Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 of 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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy SB9
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 11 shou development, not merely relate to mitigation.	lld be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	ate at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive su at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have placemaking plan	bmissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared ve significant matters to raise on certain points of the

11 May 2016 Page 711 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 164

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 29			
Name: John Webb Organisation:			
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') $\ \Box$			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 164			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
I am uncertain what after Paragraph 164 is meant by the Riverside Ecological Node apart from it being planned adjacent to Windsor Bridge Road.			
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			

11 May 2016 Page 712 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 167

Respondent Number: 828 Comment Numbe	r: 24
Name:	Organisation: Deeley Freed Estates Ltd and DFE Projects Ltd
Agent Name: Martin Bailey	Agent Organisation: Martin Bailey
Further Information available in the original commer	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall Does the respondent consider the document is sound	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 167
Q4 Soundness Comment	
of level differences, it is not feasible to construct pede	n for regeneration of Roseberry Place demonstrated that, by virtue strian/cycle bridges over Lower Bristol Road and Windsor Bridge and misleading to suggest in the draft plan that "There is potential nese main roads, which could also serve as a key Green
Q5 Change Requested	
<u> </u>	ections to be provided as bridges over these main roads, which
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examir	ation (ticked if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 713 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 30

Plan Order Reference

Organisation:

Part: Policy SB10 Volume: 2, Bath

194

Respondent Number:

Name: John Webb

Agent Name:	Agent Organi	sation:	
Further Information available in the original commen	nt? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	y compliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes')	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Placemaking	an is unsound, i	s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Con	sisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy SB10		
Q4 Soundness Comment			
On Page 81 we have talk of the ecological function of t	he river and the	retention of a dark corridor for bats. Fine as	long
as this is not used as an easy excuse to do nothing. Wh an asset to be devoted solely to this function. Like ever sensible planning of say lighting allows this asset to be of Bath who fund its existence.	ilst I am sure th rything else veg	is can be accommodated our river is to impo etation needs control and management and	rtant
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	nation (ticked if	yes)?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	ipate at the Exa	mination?	
Respondent Number: 4434 Comment Number			
Name: Ian Wheaton	_	Network Rail	
Agent Name: Further Information available in the original common	Agent Organi nt? No	Sation: Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Further Information available in the original commen	it: NO	Attachments sent with the comment:	INO
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	y compliant? (T	ick if indicated 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? Yes, Yes, w	ith minor changes	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Placemaking	an is unsound, i	s it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified □	Not Con	sisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Policy SB10		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Policy SB10 states the Councils current understanding t	that the Stabley	ard site, which includes the 'warehouse' site	to the

south, is not currently available for development. This is not the case. Part of site in question annotated as being a warehouse is known as Chivers House (owned by Network Rail) and is available for development. It is considered the inclusion of the site would help form a more coherent and sustainable location, with the draft plans views to develop 'Roseberry Place'.

Q5 Change Requested
In summary, Chivers House (the warehouse) should form part of the Policy SB10 - Roseberry Place site allocation.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 715 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 185

Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Curo Group Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore 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 2 Bath , Para 185 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Paragraph 185 makes reference to the trees on site being subject to a TPO. Whilst this is true, the text should be amended to reflect that many of the trees covered by this TPO are shown to be removed within the planning permission for the site and as such, are not required to be retained in perpetuity.
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?
To fully explain the reasons for the requested changes and expand on the context of these representations.

11 May 2016 Page 716 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 189

Respondent Number: 300 Comment Number Name:	r: 2 Organisation: Curo Group		
Agent Name: Peter Roberts	Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore		
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No		
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')		
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plac	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):		
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective		
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 189 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
number of dwellings that have been approved in the fi	ted permission for on the site. There is a factual error in the rst phase Reserved Matters, which currently refers to 276 ying submission and during the consideration of the application.		
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	nation (ticked if yes)? \square		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	pate at the Examination?		

11 May 2016 Page 717 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB11

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 42 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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		
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	Name: Caroline Kay Agent Name:	Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Organisation:
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 8 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation. Q5 Change Requested Move paragraph 8 upwards. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 6 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Policy SB11	Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	No is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 8 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation. Q5 Change Requested Move paragraph 8 upwards. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: Agent Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Policy SB11	·	Policy SB11
OS Change Requested Move paragraph 8 upwards. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 6 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Policy SB11	Q4 Soundness Comment	
Move paragraph 8 upwards. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 6 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath Policy SB11		be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 314	Q5 Change Requested	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 6 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective	Move paragraph 8 upwards.	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 6 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective	Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examinati	on (ticked if yes)?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 314		
Name: Helen Woodley 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB11	The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive sub at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to hav	omissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □ The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB11	Name: Helen Woodley Agent Name:	Organisation: Agent Organisation:
	Does the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	Yes, with minor changes is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
		Policy SB11

11 May 2016 Page 718 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
Please include requirement for new in-site allotments as there are large residential developments, in line with para 460 of part 1. Unsound because not postively prepared.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6580 Comment Number: 9
Name: Andrew Lord Organisation: Cotswolds Conservation Board
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB11
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
In relation to Policy SB11 the Cotswolds Conservation Board have made comments to the Planning Application in
relation to potential impacts from this development on the setting of the AONB. Issues over building heights, advance planting, and lighting in particular may result on impacts on the AONB.
Q5 Change Requested The Cotswolds Conservation Board recommend inclusion of reference to particular care being taken over potential
impacts on the setting of the Cotswolds AONB (as other SB policies have done where relevant).
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 3 Comment Number: 3
Name: Organisation: Curo Group
Agent Name: Peter Roberts Agent Organisation: Barton Willmore Further Information available in the original comment? No. Attachments sent with the comment? No. Attachments sent with the comment?

11 May 2016 Page 719 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box			
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 Consisten Not Effective			
The control of the co			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB11 The Site Reference (if applicable) ic: SB11			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SB11			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Policy SB11 - Former MoD Fox Hill All text in respect of this policy should reflect the extant and implementable planning permission. In order to reflect this, minor amendments are required to the current policy and supporting text, as set out below. Curo Group have secured outline planning permission for: Outline Planning Permission for up to 700 dwellings. up to 500 sqm retail (Use Class A1. A2. A3. A4. A5) up to 1,000sqm employment (Use Class B1). up to 3.500 sqm community/education (Use Class D1). single form entry primary school. open space and all associated infrastructure.			
They have also secured reserved matters consent for the first phase of development at Foxhill MoD Site for 275 dwellings.			
In order to be consistent with the planning permission for the site, we recommend the following changes (see other reps and below):			
Changes are also required to draft Policy SB11, as follows (numbers used correspond with the 'Development Requirements and Design Principles' from the draft policy:			
1 – it is important that references to the development includes a fair reflection of the planning permission. Specifically, the s106 for the planning permission requires provision of at least 1ha of land for a primary school. The wording of the policy should therefore be amended to reflect this, rather than the 1.1ha it currently refers to.			
2 – references to the amount of employment and B1 employment space should be termed as 'up to' figures rather than absolute figures, as detailed within the planning permission.			
4 – whilst the text refers to buildings being a maximum of 4 stories, the permission allows for development up to a height of 176m AOD. The reference to storey heights should be deleted and the text should only make reference to AOD heights. If the Council consider it necessary to refer to storey heights to aid understanding, it should be made clear that such heights are 'indicative only'.			
8 – detailed historic environment investigation has been undertaken and the relevant condition for the site has been discharged and as such the requirement for further investigation is not necessary and should be deleted.			
Q5 Change Requested			
As described in Q4.			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?			

11 May 2016 Page 720 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 191

Respondent Number: 194 C Name: John Webb Agent Name: Further Information available in the	Comment Number: 31 Organisation Agent Organi original comment? No		No
·	locument is sound? ft Placemaking Plan is unsound, i	ick if indicated 'yes') s it because it is (ticked where indicated): sisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 191 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment On Page 92 Warminster Road MoD sit	te is discussed. No mention is m:	ade of the fact that it backs onto the canal.	
-	te is discussed. No mention is me	de of the fact that it backs onto the canal.	
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to particip Why does the Respondent feel it is no	·	,	

11 May 2016 Page 721 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB12

Comment Number: 43

224

Respondent Number:

Name: Caroline Kay

Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commer	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy SB12
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 8 sho development, not merely relate to mitigation.	uld be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the
Q5 Change Requested	
Move paragra upwards.	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examir Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partic	
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive	submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared nave significant matters to raise on certain points of the
Respondent Number: 262 Comment Numbe	r: 6
Name: Justin Milward	Organisation: Woodland Trust
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commer	
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') 🔽
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pl	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy SB12

11 May 2016 Page 722 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
"Concept Statements were prepared and endorsed by the Cabinet in September 2012. These Concept Statements outline the planning policy framework for and key requirements in redeveloping the sites primarily for housing led mixed use redevelopment. The Concept Statements are material considerations in the determination of planning applications. They were prepared in advance of disposal of the sites by the MoD. Since that time all three sites have now been sold, planning applications have been submitted in relation to all three sites". Ancient trees in the vicinity (Ash) at ST7618665798. Within/Adjacent (there are no detailed plans).
Q5 Change Requested This ancient tree should be protected under Policy NE6 and national planning policy
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 7 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB12 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Please include requirement for new in-site allotments as there are large residential developments, in line with para 460 of part 1. Unsound because not postively prepared.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 723 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB13

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 44
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB13
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Lansdown cemetery gates are referred to in para 7 erroneously as grade II (they are actually grade II*) The relationship between the gates and Beckfords Tower, and their relationship as part of Beckford's historic garden and ride, should also be mentioned in the context section. The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 15 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation
Q5 Change Requested
Correct text as suggested left.
Move paragraph 15 upwards.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 8
Name: Helen Woodley Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 724 of 956

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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB13 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Please include requirement for new in-site allotments as there are large residential developments, in line with para 460 of part 1. Unsound because not postively prepared.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 725 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Part: Policy SB14 Volume: 2, Bath Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 45 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB14 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment No mention is made of continuing to provide a location for the market should it be displaced. Q5 Change Requested Refer to need to retain market at this or some other location. 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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan Respondent Number: 274 Comment Number: Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB14 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 726 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Twerton Park

We support the allocation and if redevelopment is proposed, it must be demonstrated that it meets Sport England policy (E4):
"The playing field or playing fields which would be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of the development."
And the NPPF (para 74).
Q5 Change Requested
Failure to demonstrate E4 would lead to a Sport England objection in line with policy and para 74 of the NPPF.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 727 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB15

Respondent Number: 274 Comment Number: 8 Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☑
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
MoD/Royal High Playing Field
We object to the proposed loss of the playing field at Royal High (school) without mitigation to meet Sport England policy (E4):
"The playing field or playing fields which would be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of the development."
And the NPPF (para 74).
Q5 Change Requested
The Royal High playing field should be protected from development or the proposal should demonstrate meeting E4: "The playing field or playing fields which would be lost as a result of the proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or playing fields of an equivalent or better quality and of equivalent or greater quantity, in a suitable location and subject to equivalent or better management arrangements, prior to the commencement of the development."
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 728 of 956

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

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB16

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 46 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB16 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
No mention is made that the current temporary, but long standing metal fencing detracts from the conservation area and should be improved in any development.
Q5 Change Requested
SB6 should mention appropriate treatment of the site boundary and reinstatement of a stone wall perimeter where not built on.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 7070 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: London Road Nottingham Ltd
Agent Name: Sophie Matthews Agent Organisation: Walsingham Planning 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 2 Bath , Policy SB16
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 729 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

I am writing on behalf of London Road Nottingham Ltd, the owner of part of the above site, to make representations on the proposed SB16 allocation in the Placemaking Plan draft plan. Certain corrections and clarifications need to be made to ensure the policy is sound.

Site Name

The site is referred to as Hartwells Garage but actually also incorporates the Hanson concrete batching plant. It would be more accurate to refer to the site as "Land south of Newbridge Road", or similar.

Constraints

It should be noted that the constraints noted (sharp level change, sewer main easement and sustainable transport route) make the site more challenging and costly to redevelop.

Residential Density

The recommended residential density is overly restrictive. The Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development granted in 2009 allowed that a density of up to 80 dph would be appropriate i.e. up to 136 dwellings. There have been no changes to the surroundings in that time to suggest that the density should be reduced to 80-100 dwellings on the site, as proposed within the allocation. The recommend density should remain at the level allowed by the Certificate subject to design and other considerations.

Student Accommodation

Draft Policy SB16 explicitly excludes student accommodation from the proposed range of residential uses. However, no explanation or justification for this is given.

The site allocation was originally proposed as Policy SB18 in the Placemaking Plan options document. This was a hastily prepared allocation, proposed in direct response to the planning application for student accommodation at the site (which was subsequently withdrawn). The allocation was proposed in the context of Paragraphs 2.25-2.27 of the Placemaking Plan options document which indicated that new proposals for purpose-built student accommodation would not be considered until the Local Plan review in 2019.

The Historic and Future Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements in Bath document, which was published in December 2015, provides up-to-date evidence on the student accommodation required to meet the needs of the projected growth in student numbers over the next plan period. As a result, the Placemaking Plan draft plan does not preclude new purpose-built student accommodation. This is illustrated by the number of new student accommodation schemes being proposed.

In light of this change in policy direction on the matter of student accommodation, it is inappropriate to explicitly exclude this type of residential development in draft Policy SB16. The Hartwell site represents an excellent opportunity to significantly boost the supply of purpose-built student accommodation in Bath and is ideally located to serve Bath Spa University.

Other Uses

The draft policy does not give any consideration to other potentially suitable uses such as hotel or retail use (subject to sequential assessment) or a residential-led mixed-use development, potentially including student accommodation. Limiting the allowable uses to residential, nursing home or older persons housing is overly prescriptive, is not justified and would not make for an effective policy allocation.

Q5 Change Requested

Typographical Errors

There are various typographical errors at the 8th line of Paragraph 186 and at the 2nd, 16th and 22nd lines of the policy paragraph. The 3rd and 9th lines of the policy paragraph refer to Upper Bristol Road when it should refer to Newbridge Road.

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?

11 Mav 2016 Page 730 of 956

11 May 2016 Page 731 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference
2, Bath Part: Policy SB18

Volume:

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 47 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB18
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Should a priority for non healthcare uses be keyworker housing?
The Historic Environment assessment paragraph 7 should be the first requirement as the HE context need to inform the development, not merely relate to mitigation.
Q5 Change Requested
If so alter para 3 in SB18.
Move paragraph 7 upwards.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $lacksquare$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 9
Name: Helen Woodley Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □

11 May 2016 Page 732 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB18
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Supportive, but please add the historic allotment site just beyond the red boundry on the nothern edge, as a local green space. It was an active site till about 15 years ago used by staff and local residents also, i believe allotments are needed in this locality. Iternativley it could be an informal growing space managed by the local school and residents and nursing staff. To be in line with para 460 of pt 1.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 733 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: Part: Para 221 2, Bath

2 Respondent Number: Comment Number:

Name: Chris Beezley Organisation:

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Attachments sent with the comment? Further Information available in the original comment? Yes 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 Justified **✓**

Not Consisten **✓**

Not Effective ✓

The representation relates to: Volume 2

Bath

, Para 221

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Not Positively Prepared

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Universities section (paras.221-274) of Volume 2 (Bath) of the Placemaking Plan (PMP) is considered unsound for the following reasons. Each is discussed in the attached Supplementary Information file: CJB16 Unsoundness.pdf

It is not positively prepared

- -Not based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development;
- -Rejects a dedicated Student Housing Strategy which would, for example, respond to changing student number forecasts, monitor effectiveness of Article 4 Direction, define specific limits for numbers of HMOs and city accommodation blocks, properly assess core campus capacity and decide on a sustainable limit for student population.

It is not justified

- Not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives;
- Article 4 Direction is ineffective in controlling HMOs;
- Policy B5 is inadequate to control city accommodation blocks;
- University of Bath on-campus capacity is not properly assessed.
- Not a sound and credible evidence base;
- Evidence base out-of-date and unconvincing.

It is not effective

- Plan is not deliverable;
- Plan is inflexible;
- Has national (AONB) planning barriers to delivery.

It is not consistent with National policy

- -Inconsistent with NPPF;
- Insufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change;

-Out-of-date:

- -Does not identify specific deliverable sites;
- -Fails to give great weight to protecting the landscape and scenic beauty of AONBs.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that:

11 May 2016 Page 734 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change (para.14);
- Plans should be kept up-to-date (Core Planning Principle para.17, paras.157, 209);
- A Local Planning Authority should submit a Plan for examination which it considers is "sound" namely that the Plan: o should be positively prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements (para.182);

o should be justified, being the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives (para.182).

The Planning Advisory Service's Soundness Self-Assessment Checklist1 translates these requirements into the following questions:

-Is the Plan based on a strategy which is the most appropriate when considered against the alternatives?

- Is the Plan justified by a sound and credible evidence base which is up-to-date and convincing?
- Is the Plan flexible?
- Is the Plan deliverable, e.g. Is there evidence to show that there are no national planning barriers to delivery?
- Is the Plan consistent with national policy?

FoBRA contends that, in assessing the need for and proposing the delivery of student accommodation in the Placemaking Plan (PMP), the answer to each of these questions is 'No'. Each is discussed below.

- Is the Plan based on a strategy which is the most appropriate when considered against the alternatives?

The PMP suggests (para.221) that the strategic planning framework within which the Universities need to operate comprises:

o Article 4 Direction on HMOs;

o Policy B5 on the management of further higher education-related space in certain key areas of the city [the Central and Enterprise Zones only]; and

o on-campus capacity, e.g. For the University of Bath on land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007.

Article 4 Direction

FoBRA argues (in a separate representation against para.221) that the Article 4 Direction threshold (25% of properties) has been ineffective in delivering a return to balanced communities, having simply allowed established 'studentification' hot spots to expand. It further argues that the 25% property threshold should be reduced significantly and should be accompanied by, for example, a 20% occupant threshold (i.e. A limit on the proportion of HMO occupants in a given area).

Policy B5

FoBRA has submitted a separate representation covering shortcomings of Policy B5 which it considers, as proposed to be amended, to be inadequate, being the only element of the 'strategic planning framework within which the universities need to operate' to provide any formal, if limited, control on the proliferation of city student accommodation blocks. To achieve the PMP's stated aim of preventing a further proliferation of student accommodation blocks, FoBRA considers that Policy B5 should be expanded to

cover the whole of the city. Without such amendment it seems to FoBRA that there will be no control over the number of future 'windfall' sites for which the PMP makes the unsubstantiated claim (para.242) that scope 'is limited' outside of the relatively

small Central and Enterprise areas. At the time of writing there are already known to be planning applications to build student accommodation blocks on the sites of the former St John's School, Pulteney Road and of the former gas works at the junction of Upper Bristol Road/Windsor Bridge Road, both marginally outside the Central/Enterprise Areas.

On-campus capacity

In a separate representation against Policy SB19, Beech Avenue Residents' Association maintains that, in preference to B&NES' apparent obsession with encouraging it to build student accommodation on the Cotswolds AONB, the University of Bath should be encouraged to find novel ways of intensifying the existing core (i.e. Non-AONB) areas of the campus. Examples include the use of decked car parking (in line with General Development Principle (h) of Policy SB19), by intensifying areas of older student accommodation (particularly near the northern campus boundary) and/or utilising areas of the self-styled 'Green Zone' (p.127) which enjoys no national designations, such as Green Belt or AONB. Thus each of the three elements of the 'strategic planning framework' within which B&NES suggests the Universities need to

11 Mav 2016 Page 735 of 956

operate has been shown to be flawed and lacking in content.

1 http://www.pas.gov.uk/local-planning/-/journal content/56/332612/15045/ARTICLE#Soundness checklist

Q5 Change Requested

As a minimum, reissue the Universities section of the Placemaking Plan (PMP), based on an updated (2016) Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements evidence base information paper. Include a comprehensive assessment of the potential for intensifying development on the University of Bath core campus, including decked parking. If (as expected) this yields the result that student accommodation need not be built on AONB land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007, delete all reference to this suggestion from the PMP.

Recognising that any student numbers forecast included in the PMP will rapidly become out of date, transfer such data to a dedicated Student Housing Strategy document and restrict the PMP to high level policy which needs to be expanded in its scope

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

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

I stand ready to participate at the oral part of the Examination if the Inspector so wishes.

Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: 3

Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FoBR

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') **V**

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 2

Bath

, Para 221

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

PMP para.221 defines three disparate elements of a 'strategic planning framework' within which the universities need to operate. No such framework is known to exist in practice and FoBRA (separately) contends that a robust Student Housing Strategy should be produced. To be effective this should include a modified version of the existing Supplementary Planning Document: HMOs in Bath (attached) which is flawed, claiming that 13% of Bath's student population are not housed in halls when in fact this should read 74%. The resulting Article 4 Direction threshold beyond which applications for HMOs will not be permitted has been set at 25% of properties. It is therefore not positively prepared.

FoBRA presents evidence (attached) to show that in just 2 years, Article 4 Direction with its 25% threshold is unjustified and ineffective, having simply resulted in a doubling of the HMO hotspot in the Oldfield Park, Westmoreland and Widcombe areas of the city, resulting in further unbalanced communities (inconsistent with NPPF para.50).

FoBRA contends that, in line with National HMO Lobby research, balanced communities become unbalanced when HMOs comprise more than 10% of properties in a given location and/or HMO occupants comprise more than 20% of the local population. FoBRA therefore suggests that the HMO SPD should be amended to include these lower threshold figures; also that Policy B5 is ineffective and should be expanded to cover the whole of the city as regards restrictions on

11 May 2016 Page 736 of 956

further inappropriate student accommodation blocks. FoBRA also contends that the Student Housing Strategy should include the up to date version of B&NES' Student Numbers and Accommodation Information Paper.

Q5 Change Requested
Rewrite the 3rd sentence of para.221 to read as follows:
'The strategic planning framework within which the universities operate comprises B&NES' Student Housing Strategy which, inter alia, comprises: •Supplementary Planning Document for HMOs in Bathamended (see Note 1); •Policy B5expanded (Note 2); •Policies SB19 & SB20modified (Note 3); •Information Paper 'Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements'updated (Note 4)'.
Notes:
(1)Amend the 2013 HMO SPD to reduce the Article 4 Direction threshold from 25% to no more than 10% of properties being HMOs within 100 metres of an application site, and to add the additional threshold of no more than 20% of the local population being HMO occupants (Justified, Positively prepared, Effective). This would result in more balanced communities (Consistent with National policy).
(2)Expand Policy B5 Section 2 to apply to the whole city and B5 should include accommodation block controls such as reduced parking standards, safeguarding the amenities of local residents, not adversely affecting the character and appearance of the surrounding area, appropriate levels of student security & personal safety and high quality accommodation design (Positively prepared, Effective).
(3)Noting that General Development Principle (h) requires UoB to use decked parking to maximise development potential of the existing built campus, modify Policy SB19 to reflect the requirement that substantially more than the 1,700 further bed spaces (not 1,000 as claimed) included in the Campus Masterplan 2014 Update should be built on the non-AONB part of the campus before land released from the Green Belt in 2007 (which still enjoys AONB protection) is even considered for any such development (Justified). The Campus Masterplan is listed in the PMP Evidence Base.
(4) Update the Information Paper at least 6-monthly to be formally agreed by the universities (Justified). As well as their growth aspirations and student accommodation requirements, it should include the universities' build plans for future campus bed spaces, with timescales (Positively prepared).
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?
FoBRA seeks to participate at the oral examination to explain the necessity for a Student Housing Strategy in Bath
Respondent Number: 2429 Comment Number: 8 Name: Nicholas Stubbs Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 737 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 221 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
p109 221, last sentence, typo, should read " and are often"
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 1
Name: Jill Herrett Organisation:
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 221 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Article 4 should be brought in for the whole of Bath to protect communities from degenerating into student ghettos.
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?
Respondent Number: 6532 Comment Number: 3 Name: Richard Luetchford Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 738 of 956

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 2 Bath , Para 221
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The stated aim of the Draft Placemaker Plan is to allocate sites for development for housing, employment and "other uses", and will be used to determine planning applications up to 2029. One specific use not allocated sites is student housing. The Plan accepts that "this is one of the most high profile issues affecting Bath" yet does propose any realistic solutions such as a planning strategy. This is at odds with the evidence submitted in the Plan, with student numbers at Bath Spa and Bath Universities predicted to rise by about 8,000 over the next 5 years with the majority demand for accommodation in the city and not on campus. The Plan does not go into whether this is sustainable in a city that already hosts one of the very highest proportions of students per head of population in the UK. The Plan offers no answers. It vaguely talks about possible further accommodation blocks on "windfall" (i.e. undefined) sites not identified for other uses - like the former St John's School on Pulteney Road - and/or a likely increase of up to 1,200 HMOs across the city - with their attendant negative effect on challenging new housing targets set by central government - and an increasing financial burden on permanent residents of BANES to pay for local services since all students are exempt from Council Tax. In addition, these paragraphs do not address the effect of an unregulated increase in student numbers living in Bath on the area's transport network. With up to 5,000 additional students needing to travel to and from the central Bath to Bath University each day, it is unclear how the existing bus services, already fully stretched, will cope. The only viable route they can take is up and down Bathwick Hill, which in sections is very steep and too narrow for two buses travelling in opposite directions to pass each other. If large numbers of students can no longer get to their lectures on time due to increasing transport delays, the reputation of this University amongst the general student population across the UK will pl
Q5 Change Requested
Set out a proposed solution to the problem of dealing with increased demand for student accommodation in Bath, such as developing a specific policy on this subject.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Perpendent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 739 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 222

Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 2 Name: Jill Herrett Organisation:						
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 Blacemaking Blan is unsound is it because it is (ticked where indicated).						
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 2 Bath , Para 222 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
Universities are not so much Halls of Learning as Big Businesses and, as with any business, profit is the main driver. Without control, Bath will become a city of students who do not contribute to the Council's coffers. A ceiling needs to be put on the numbers before it is too late.						
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?						

11 May 2016 Page 740 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 223

Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 3
Name: Jill Herrett Organisation:
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 \(\Boxed{\boxed} \text{Not Justified } \Boxed{\boxed} \text{Not Consisten } \Boxed{\boxed} \text{Not Effective } \Boxed{\boxed}
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 223
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
On campus, development is limited. Bath Spa could pull down their low rise residential blocks and replace with higher rise blocks. The proposal to meet the increase in numbers to build the equivalent to 11 New Green Park Houses in the city is simply not acceptable as this would have a very detrimental impact on the landscape.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7065 Comment Number: 1
Name: Barbara Leutchford Organisation:
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 223
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
When discussing the impact of expansion the plan only considers the impact on the housing market. The impact on transport is ignored. Students already experience difficulty in getting to the campus on time for lectures because of
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

11 May 2016 Page 741 of 956

congestion on all routes in to university but most particularly on Bathwick Hill. The pollution created by large numbers of buses struggling to pass each other on the hill is already unacceptable and will only get worse as expansion goes ahead.

11 May 2016 Page 742 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 225

Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 4 Name: Jill Herrett Organis	ation:					
3	rganisation:					
Further Information available in the original comment?						
rattier information available in the original comment:	Attachments sent with the comment:					
Does the respondent consider the document is legally complian	nt? (Tick if indicated 'yes')					
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes	, ,					
·	und is it become it is (tisked where indicated).					
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unso	und, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):					
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) No	t Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 225 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:						
Q4 Soundness Comment						
The residential population of Bath is contracting. It is the transient no monetary contribution to the city but puts increased pressure is the norm for households but student HMOs regularly put out	on Council services, i.e. refuse collection. One 61K bag					
Q5 Change Requested						
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (tick						
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?						

11 May 2016 Page 743 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 226

Respondent Number:	2	Comment Number:	2						
Name: Chris Beezley			Organisation:						
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:								
Further Information availab	le in tl	he original comment	? No	Attachments se	nt with the c	comment?	No		
Does the respondent consid	der the	e document is legally	compliant? (Ticl	k 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 Consi	sten 🗌 No	t Effective	✓			
The representation relates to	\/al	umo 2 Doth	Dava 226						
The representation relates to			, Para 226						
The Site Reference (if applica	ble) is	:							

Q4 Soundness Comment

Studentification is a term coined to identify the process and product of concentrated student settlement in university towns and cities. With 24,000 students exceeding a quarter of its population (one of the highest proportions in the UK), Bath already experiences severe 'studentification'.

I suggest that the lack of effective planning via an agreed Student Housing Strategy (as called for by the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations for at least 10 years) is one of the main causes of the seemingly intractable student accommodation problem in which Bath finds itself.

Forecasting student numbers is a highly inexact science given the range and scale of many variables, as clearly demonstrated in the Placemaking Plan (PMP). Para.228 suggests that enrolment [at both universities combined] would increase by 9,200 from 2011/12 to 2020/21. But this information was gathered from the universities in early 2015 - and things have inevitably moved on.

For example, the Bath Chronicle dated 14th January 2016 reports that Bath Spa University claims this number to be overstated by 2,700 following the launch of a new Strategic Plan in September 2015, and that the University of Bath plans to stabilise its undergraduate intake (rather than increase it annually as assumed by the PMP) from 2016. Thus, the PMP is significantly out of date and misleading, even before adoption.

I contend that the PMP is an inappropriate document in which to predict student numbers – they change far too quickly – and that it would be far more effective to decouple such detail from paras.226-230 in favour of keeping predictions up to date in a linked Student Housing Strategy - as in many other university towns and cities - which is updated regularly to reflect the extremely volatile nature of such predictions.

The PMP itself should be limited to high-level policy for a range of possible future student number scenarios, covering the extremes of recent forecasts – for example with an expanded Policy B5 and Policies SB19 & SB20.

The Student Housing Strategy would decide the appropriate balance of student accommodation options (between further HMOs, private sector accommodation blocks and/or university-managed bed spaces) for a realistic forecast, informing PMP reviews accordingly.

Q5 Change Requested

1. Delete detailed predictions of student numbers and their accommodation requirements from the PMP (paras.226-230).

11 Mav 2016 Page 744 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

2. Urgently produce and regularly review a Student Housing Strategy to decide the appropriate mix of HMOs, accommodation blocks and/or campus accommodation, thereby applying the high-level PMP policies to credible forecasts. (Positively Prepared, Justified, Effective)

3. Reword paras 234 & 235 to reflect the existence of a Student Housing Strategy.

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?

I stand ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

Canada and Normalia and 15

Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number:	; 15		
Name: Robin Kerr	Organisation: Fe	ederation of Bath Residents' A	Associations (FOBR
Agent Name:	Agent Organisat	ion:	
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Attachments sent with the c	omment? 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 Pla	n is unsound, is it	because it is (ticked where in	idicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consist	en Not Effective	V
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Para 226		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			

Q4 Soundness Comment

Daniel de la Maria

Studentification is a term coined to identify the process and product of concentrated student settlement in university towns and cities. With 24,000 students exceeding a quarter of its population (one of the highest proportions in the UK), Bath already experiences severe 'studentification'.

FoBRA suggests that the lack of effective planning via an agreed Student Housing Strategy (as called for by FoBRA for at least 10 years) is one of the main causes of Bath's seemingly intractable student accommodation problem.

Forecasting student numbers is highly inexact, given the range and scale of many variables, as demonstrated in this Placemaking Plan (PMP). Para.228 suggests that enrolment [at both universities combined] would increase by 9,200 from 2011/12 to 2020/21, but this information was gathered from the universities in early 2015 - and things have inevitably moved on. For example, in the Bath Chronicle dated 14th Jan 16 Bath Spa University claims this number to be overstated by 2,700 following the launch of a new Strategic Plan in Sept 15, and that the University of Bath plans to stabilise its undergraduate intake (rather than increase it annually as assumed by the PMP) from 2016. Thus, the PMP is out of date and misleading, even before adoption.

FoBRA contends (a) the PMP to be inappropriate for predicting student numbers, as they change too quickly, and (b) that it would be more effective to transfer such detail from paras.226-230 to a regularly updated Student Housing Strategy linked to the PMP, as in many other university towns/cities

Q5 Change Requested

The PMP itself should be limited to high-level policy for a range of possible future student number scenarios, covering the extremes of recent forecasts – for example with an expanded Policy B5 and Policies SB19 & SB20. The Student Housing Strategy would decide the appropriate balance of student accommodation options (between further HMOs, private sector accommodation blocks and/or university-managed bed spaces) for a realistic forecast, informing PMP reviews accordingly. Thus:

11 May 2016 Page 745 of 956

230).
b. Urgently produce and regularly review a Student Housing Strategy to decide the appropriate mix of HMOs,
accommodation blocks and/or campus accommodation, thereby applying the high-level PMP policies to credible forecasts. (Positively Prepared, Justified, Effective)
c. Reword paras 234 & 235 to reflect the existence of a Student Housing Strategy
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?
FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.
Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 5
Name: Jill Herrett Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 226
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
It is more than possible both institutions will grow beyond 2020. Both are targeting overseas students, i.e. China and America. More money (> twice as much) can be secured from an overseas student than a British student.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 746 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 227

Respondent Number: 2 Comment Number: Name: Chris Beezley	Organisation:
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 227
Q4 Soundness Comment	
•	nts Evidence Base that feeds the Placemaking Plan's (PMP) dation requirements to 2020/21 quotes the following total 2015:

This rate of increase averages approximately 3.6% per annum.

At a minuted meeting of the University of Bath Local residents' Forum held on 2nd February 2016, the UoB's Director of Policy Planning, when questioned as to how these figures might change as a result of the UoB's more recent change of strategic priorities to stabilise undergraduate numbers and grow postgraduate numbers, stated that there would be no significant change.

At the same meeting the Director of PolicyPlanning declared the Dec 2015 number of postgraduates to be 4,322. If undergraduate numbers stabilise as planned, that means that the UoB expects the number of postgraduates to increase by a very high average of approx 11.5% pa across those 5 years as follows:

2015/16 4,322

2016/17 5,041 (+719)

2017/18 5,643 (+602)

2018/19 6,112 (+469)

2019/20 6,719 (+607)

2020/21 7,429 (+710)

I submit that the university should be invited to justify such a high annual increase in postgraduate numbers.

In a separate representation against PMP para.229, Beech Avenue Residents' Association suggests that, rather than 3%, a 1% pa total student increase would be more reasonable to reflect UoB's revised strategic priorities, resulting in the following total student figures.

2015/16 16,184

2016/17 16,346 (+162)

11 May 2016 Page 747 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

2017/18 16,509 (+163)
2018/19 16,674 (+165)
2019/20 16,841 (+167)
2020/21 17,010 (+169)
This would equate to the current number of postgraduates (4,322) increasing by an average of a more reasonable 4% pa
across the same 5 year period as follows:
2015/16 4,322
2016/17 4,484 (+162)
2017/18 4,647 (+163)
2018/19 4,812 (+165)
2019/20 4,979 (+167) 2020/21 5 148 (+160)
2020/21 5,148 (+169)
Again, the PMP is out-of-date in forecasting student numbers that do not take into account the UoB's recent change in
strategic priorities. It is therefore inconsistent with National planning policy (NPPF paras.12,14) and is therefore
considered unsound.
Q5 Change Requested
Require UoB to amend and justify its total students forecast to reflect its significant change in strategic priorities, and
modify the effect on the PMP via its evidence base accordingly.
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?
I stand ready to participate if required by the Inspector.
Respondent Number: 2 Comment Number: 4
Name: Chris Beezley Organisation:
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 227
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
·
Notwithstanding the integrity of its student number forecasting (the subject of other representations), the consultation
Notwithstanding the integrity of its student number forecasting (the subject of other representations), the consultation draft Placemaking Plan (PMP), as written, forecasts a shortfall of 4,900 student bed spaces to 2020/21, plus a possible
Notwithstanding the integrity of its student number forecasting (the subject of other representations), the consultation draft Placemaking Plan (PMP), as written, forecasts a shortfall of 4,900 student bed spaces to 2020/21, plus a possible 5,500 more by the end of the plan period (paras.229/230).
draft Placemaking Plan (PMP), as written, forecasts a shortfall of 4,900 student bed spaces to 2020/21, plus a possible 5,500 more by the end of the plan period (paras.229/230).
draft Placemaking Plan (PMP), as written, forecasts a shortfall of 4,900 student bed spaces to 2020/21, plus a possible 5,500 more by the end of the plan period (paras.229/230). One of the soundness tests is that the plan should be effective, i.e. deliverable, over its period. A common interpretation
draft Placemaking Plan (PMP), as written, forecasts a shortfall of 4,900 student bed spaces to 2020/21, plus a possible 5,500 more by the end of the plan period (paras.229/230).

The Plan, as presented for consultation, patently fails this test in the case of student accommodation since development

11 May 2016 Page 748 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

of this magnitude can neither be accommodated in the city in HMOs or accommodation blocks nor on campus due to

Green Belt and/or AONB protections which preclude such major development (NPPF paras.115/116).
Q5 Change Requested
Rewrite paras. 227-230 to reflect the universities' latest thinking regarding student numbers and accommodation requirements. These are known to be very significantly reduced compared to those assumed in the consultation draft PMP.
If sufficient suitable, available, achievable and viable sites still cannot be identified in the city (in terms of a sustainable number of additional HMOs and/or accommodation blocks) and/or on-campus (in terms of sustainable development within the non-Green Belt/AONB areas of the campuses), then invite the universities to investigate novel solutions, e.g. outside Bath with sustainable transport links.
Failing this, the universities should modify their growth aspirations accordingly, if necessary through additional measures/policies such as those alluded to in para 237 of the PMP: 'Banes has considered additional measures/policies such as refusing teaching space when dedicated accommodation
supply is generating a need for more than a certain number of HMO bedrooms. Such an approach is in place in Oxford, but it is not considered to be a tool to be deployed yet in Bath. Such a mechanism will, though, remain an option for future plan reviews.'
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Please note that I wish to be notified at my email address above that the Draft Placemaking Plan has been submitted for
independent examination; the publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent Examination of the Placemaking Plan; and the adoption of the Placemaking Plan.
Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 11
Name: Matt Humbertone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 227
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The growth aspirations and changing demographics of both universities in Bath have changed recently and so the figures for student numbers and accommodation need require some changes.
05 Change Requested

The most recent growth aspirations of both universities should be included in the Placemaking Plan so that it is a relevant document for future planning

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

11 May 2016 Page 749 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

There is significant concern that student housing needs will not be met

Respondent Number:	7237	Comment Number:	5			
Name: Chris Beezley		(Organisation	: Beech Aven	ue Residents' Association	
Agent Name:		,	Agent Organ	isation:		
Further Information ava	ilable in	the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent co	nsider tl	he document is sound?	No		d 'yes') is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified 🗸	Not Co	nsisten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relate	es to: V	olume 2 Bath ,	Para 227			
The Site Reference (if app	olicable)	is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

University of Bath Student Number and Accommodation Requirements

Introduction

A minuted meeting of the University of Bath (UoB) Local Residents' Forum took place on 2nd February 2016 between senior UoB management and local residents' representatives. Chaired by the UoB Vice President (Implementation), the calling notice invited agenda items (see Annex A.pdf attached). In response, the BaNES Placemaking Plan (PMP) was suggested, including the following questions (which were provided in advance of the meeting):

- 1) On what aspects of the Placemaking Plan has the University submitted comments? Does it have any plans to change the use of any of the land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007
- 2) The Placemaking Plan predicts that by 2020/21 University of Bath total student numbers will rise to 19,300 of which 15,000 will need accommodation. By how much will these numbers change as a result of the university's latest policy to stabilise undergraduate numbers and grow postgraduate numbers?
- 3) The Campus Masterplan identifies the capacity to build 2,400 more student residences between 2009 and 2026. To date 700 have been built (The Quads). Exactly where and when is it planned to build the remaining 1,700?

Regarding 1), no response was provided by the university.

Regarding 2), the university's Director of Policy & Planning was unwilling to change the numbers that appear in the PMP up to 2020/21 despite confirming the significant change in strategic priorities regarding the future balance between undergraduate and postgraduate numbers. Beyond 2020/21 the university wishes to disassociate itself from the PMP numbers which it considers simply represent unsubstantiated assumptions on the part of the LPA.

Regarding 3), the university reported that the only plan for future campus student accommodation comprises 293 ensuite bed spaces at Polden Corner, no earlier than 2017/18. There are currently no plans to provide any of the Masterplan balance of about 1,400 bed spaces.

The answers provided to these questions have been incorporated into Annex B.pdf (attached as supplementary information) which increases the residual need for private sector bed spaces by about 700 beyond the number assumed in the PMP.

Paragraphs 14 and 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework require LPAs to:

- positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change; and

11 Mav 2016 Page 750 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

- identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements.

The PMP, in its current form does neither as regards student accommodation and therefore must fail the soundness test, being inconsistent with National planning policy.

A. From 2015/16 to 2020/21

At para.227 (Base Demand and Aspirations for Growth), the Placemaking Plan (PMP) forecasts that the University of Bath (UoB) 'aspires to grow from around 14,000 registered students in 2011/12 to around 19,300 in 2020/21' and that 'the [accommodation] need is currently for around 10,300 bed spaces and this could rise to around 15,000'.

The more precise numbers supporting these statements are contained in Evidence Base document: Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements in Bath (December 2015) which shows (at Table 4a) that in 2011/12 the 14,000 total students when factored by 73.5% produces a housing need of 10,290; also that in 2020/21 the equivalent numbers are 19,291, 77.8% and 15,013.

Thus the 'around 10,300 bed spaces' quoted above is not the current need, but the need in 2011/12. The current need (2015/16) is shown in Table 4a as 16,184 total students factored by 75.7% to give a housing need of 12,248.

Thus the forecast increase in housing need from today to 2020/21 is 15,013 minus 12,248, i.e. 2,765.

Table 4a also forecasts an increase in UoB campus beds of 250 in 2017/18 (from 3,156 to 3,406) and a further 750 in 2020/21 (from 3,406 to 4,156).

The result of these predictions is that, between now and 2020/21, residual private sector bed demand rises from 8,109 in 2015/16 to 9,699, i.e. by 1,590.

However, at the minuted meeting between the University and local residents on 2nd February 2016 (referred to above), the Director of Policy and Planning stated that the only new campus accommodation that is planned in the foreseeable future is likely to be 293 bed spaces (near Polden Court), no earlier than 2017/18, i.e. there are no plans to provide the 750 additional bed spaces assumed by the PMP in 2020/21.

This means that the PMP's assumption (see above) that residual private sector bed demand will increase by 1,590 over the next five years should more properly read 2,340. The Evidence Base document (and therefore the PMP) is therefore unsound, being already out of date, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which requires the Plan to be justified by a sound and credible evidence base which is up-to-date and convincing.

I also question the assumed increase in UoB student numbers which were supplied by UoB before it announced (to B&NES' Bath City Forum on 21st January 2016 and at the above meeting) that its 'Strategic Priorities' have changed to stabilise undergraduate numbers and concentrate on postgraduate teaching. When questioned on the effect of this radical shift in policy, the UoB was reluctant to change its total student forecast to 2020/21 from the 19,291 figure quoted above. In a separate representation (against PMP para.229), Beech Avenue Residents' Association suggests that this number could be significantly overstated in this new era. I strongly agree.

B. From 2020/21 to 2028/29

Although the PMP contains a caveat at para.226, I suggest that it is potentially misleading to attempt to commit to print student numbers and accommodation requirements beyond the period (to 2020/21) for which the UoB is prepared to provide a forecast.

Table 4b of Evidence Base document: Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements in Bath (December 2015) tabulates theoretical future UoB numbers from 2020/21 to the end of the Plan period. It suggests (para.2.48) that Total Students could grow, at 3% per annum, by a further 5,146 (from 19,291 to 24,437), leading to a further increase in Residual Private Sector Beds Demand of 3,999.

The PMP (at para.230) speculates that for the UoB, 'if the trajectory of aspiration to 2021 was achieved and continued to 2029' and 'if the long term annual rate of growth of around 4% is projected forward, it would increase needs by a further 5,500 bed spaces.

At the UoB/Local Residents' Forum mentioned above, in answer to a specific question on the subject, the UoB's Director of Policy and Planning stated that the university does not associate itself with any forecast beyond 2020/21 and that any

11 Mav 2016 Page 751 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

such forecast would simply represent assumptions on the part of the LPA.

Quite apart from the discrepancy between the 4% and 3% per annum figures quoted in the PMP and in the associated Evidence Base document respectively, it is therefore considered inappropriate for the PMP to speculate on student numbers and accommodation requirements beyond the period that a university is prepared to provide data (2020/21 in this case).

Inclusion of para.230 in the PMP therefore renders the document unsound, not being justified, since it relies on unsubstantiated evidence beyond 2020/21. The same applies to Table 4b of the associated Evidence Base document.

Conclusions

The above analysis again demonstrates the volatility of student number forecasting. UoB data has only been supplied until 2020/21, and even this is considered highly questionable since it has not been amended to reflect the university's recent radical change in strategic priorities (i.e. shift towards postgraduate teaching, stabilising undergraduate numbers). The UoB is reluctant to stand by the agreed potential of its core campus to deliver anything like the 2,400 additional bed spaces by 2026 identified in its Campus Masterplan, 2014 update – which forms part of the Evidence Base. Neither does the Masterplan mention the potential additional core capacity that could be provided if the university heeded PMP Policy SB19's General Development Principle (h) which advocates decked parking.

It is considered that a reversal of these two shortfalls in UoB policy versus the PMP could satisfy the likely demand for additional student accommodation until 2020/21.

To effectively overcome these and the uncertainties associated with the university's reluctance to modify even its short-term numbers forecast to reflect significantly changed circumstances, student accommodation demands to the end of the Plan period should be the subject of a dedicated and flexible Student Housing Strategy as called for in a separate FoBRA representation (against para.234).

Within the Student Housing Strategy:

- a) BaNES should define how many more HMOs and/or accommodation blocks (if any) are acceptable within the city;
- b) the universities should declare how many more bed spaces they are able (or prepared) to accommodate on-campus or elsewhere in the district (with locations and timescales); and
- c) only then should any sustainable increase in student numbers be discussed.

Not the other way round as hitherto.

Q5 Change Requested

At para.227 (first bullet point) replace 'is currently' with 'was in 2011/12'. Delete para.230.

Delete all speculative need (based on highly questionable assumptions) for the development of sensitive land that was controversially removed from the Green Belt in 2007 - but remains within the Cotswolds AONB. Failing agreement to do so, make clear that this should be a last resort, i.e. after all attempts to intensify the core campus have been positively shown to have been exhausted.

As many other university towns and cities have, urgently develop a workable and flexible Student Housing Strategy in which:

- a) BaNES should define how many more HMOs and/or accommodation blocks (if any) are acceptable within the city;
- b) the universities should declare how many more bed spaces they are able (or prepared) to accommodate on-campus or elsewhere in the district or beyond (with locations and timescales); and
- c) only then should any sustainable increase in student numbers be discussed.

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?

I stand ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

11 May 2016 Page 752 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 228

Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 12	
Name: Matt Humberstone Organis	ation: University of Bath Students' Union
Agent Name: Agent C	Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? N	o Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally complia	nt? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is regardy compiled. No	itt: (Tick ii iiidicated yes)
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unso	und is it hecause it is (ticked where indicated).
•	ot Consisten Not Effective
Not rositively repared Not sustained [e]	A consistent
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 2	28
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The growth aspirations and changing demographics of both univ	
for student numbers and accommodation need require some ch	anges
Q5 Change Requested	
The most recent growth aspirations of both universities should be relevant document for future planning	e included in the Placemaking Plan so that it is a
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (tic	ked if yes)? ✓
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the	
There is significant concern that student housing needs will not be	pe met
Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 6	
Name: Jill Herrett Organis	ation:
ŭ	Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? N	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally complia	nt? (Tick if indicated 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the document is sound? Yes	
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unso	und, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) No	ot Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 2	28
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	20
Q4 Soundness Comment Bath University aspires to grow to 19,300 in 2020. This is probab	bly a concervative figure and will be doubt be much
Bath Oniversity aspires to grow to 13,500 iii 2020. This is probab	iy a conservative rigure and will no doubt be much

11 Mav 2016 Page 753 of 956

higher by 2020. Bath as a small city cannot support this, let alone the aspirational growth of Bath Spa. The answer could be to build in other areas of B&NES, e.g. Radstock and MSN, or farther afield in towns such as Swindon.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 754 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 229

Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: 12
Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FOBR
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 2 Bath , Para 229
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Placemaking Plan (para.229), states that, according to the University of Bath (UoB) Masterplan (2014 update), capacity for on-campus student accommodation is 'not more than 1,000' future bed spaces. This is at variance with the Masterplan which states in several places (pp.6,8,16) that there is capacity for 2,400 study bedrooms. Since the start of the Plan period, 700 new bed spaces have been provided on-campus ('The Quads'), leaving a balance of 1,700 outstanding, rather than the 1,000 claimed in the Placemaking Plan. Fig.2 of the Masterplan shows 'Proposed development and Parking Courtyards' on the remainder of the existing East Car Park while Fig.3 indicates the potential for an accommodation block of similar size to The Quads (704 bed spaces, marked '3'). In Figure 4 this potential accommodation area no longer appears. If the University has had second thoughts about the loss of the remaining car parking spaces on the East Car Park, it should heed General Development Principle (h) of Placemaking Plan Policy SB19 (University of Bath) and could construct decked parking elsewhere on the campus. In summary, FoBRA believes that the Claverton Down campus has the capacity for at least 1,700 further student bed spaces before any suggestion of building on AONB land removed from the Green Belt in 2007.
Q5 Change Requested
To rectify this: At para.229, replace 'estimated additional capacity of not more than 1,000 within specific areas currently shown for accommodation development in the UoB masterplan (2014 update)' with 'estimated additional capacity of 1,700 within specific areas currently shown for accommodation development in the UoB masterplan (2014 update)'. (Positively prepared, Justified, Effective).
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?
FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

11 May 2016 Page 755 of 956

Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 13 Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 229 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
As Soundness Comment ome of the areas marked for development in the University of Bath masterplan (2014 update) haven't been fully ssessed as to whether they would be suitable for development and would also take away important community acilities. There is currently a strong need on campus for an increase in library space, teaching space, eating space, social pace and sports space and so using the sites for the development of accommodation will prevent them being used for other important purposes
Q5 Change Requested
The sites allocated should be fully assessed both in terms of what could be developed (building height, size etc.) and the mpact that development would have on the student experience and the local community that also use these facilities
Ooes the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? There is significant concern that additional accommodation built on campus could have a detrimental impact on the tudent experience
Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 7 Name: Jill Herrett Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 229 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment

11 May 2016 Page 756 of 956

Both universities should take responsibility for housing their students on campus. As already seen, when local residents

protected about the proposed large block of student accommodation, no-one wants large blocks anywhere near

ordinary residential housing.
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?
Respondent Number: 7237 Comment Number: 4
Name: Chris Beezley Organisation: Beech Avenue Residents' Association
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 2 Bath , Para 229
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Summary The headline messages in the Universities section (pp.107-132) of the Consultation Draft Placemaking Plan (PMP) are that:
-No site-specific solutions can be identified for Bath Spa University's (BSU) future student accommodation needs (para.250); and
-The University of Bath's (UoB) future student accommodation needs should be mainly met by developing land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007 (para.249).
In arriving at these conclusions the PMP uses student number forecasts provided by the universities in early 2015. However, both universities have recently signalled significant reductions in their growth aspirations and the analysis below shows how these revised accommodation requirements could now be fully met without the need to significantly increase private sector student accommodation in Bath (HMOs or accommodation blocks) if at all, or to build on any of the land that was removed from the Green Belt (and remains within the Cotswolds AONB).

Analysis

Para.229 of the PMP suggests that by 2020/21 there could be a 'residual need' for 4,990 more student bed spaces compared to a 2011/12 baseline, split as follows:

- -2,740 University of Bath;
- -2,250 Bath Spa University.

Four years on from the start of the Plan period, in 2015/16 much of this need has already been satisfied and, using data presented at PMP para.227 and the associated Evidence Base, and summarised in 'Annex A.pdf' (attached as supplementary information), it can be seen that from 2015/16 to 2020/21 the need reduces to 4,013, split as follows:

-1,592 University of Bath;

-2,421 Bath Spa University.

For BSU, the Plan notes (para.250) that, although it has been successful in securing much of the purpose-built student housing that has to date been permitted in the city, 'this will not fully accommodate the growth envisaged'. Also: 'No site-specific deliverable solutions to enable further increases in housing supply specifically for BSU can be identified in

11 Mav 2016 Page 757 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

the Development Plan'.

For the University of Bath, the PMP repeatedly suggests that the majority of its future accommodation needs should be provided on-campus, utilising land that was controversially removed from the Green Belt in 2007.

However, both universities are known to be challenging the PMP's interpretation of their expansion aspirations as follows:

-BSU proposes (see Note 1 below) to reduce its increase in student bed space demand

(2011/12 to 2020/21) from 3,835 to 1,100;

-The UoB's Vice-Chancellor has recently signalled (see Note 2 below) that the university's Senate and Council have agreed that 'we will be shifting the balance of our student population towards postgraduates whilst at the same time stabilising the number of undergraduates we recruit'.

Importantly, in assuming, as it does, a 3% per annum increase in UoB total numbers across the Plan period, the PMP does not reflect this fundamental shift of policy, which is likely to have a major effect on future student numbers. Unfortunately, respondents do not have access to any revised figures but if the effect of the UoB's fundamental shift in recruitment policy was to reduce the UoB annual increase to say 1% per annum, then the 2011/12 to 2020/21 'residual need' attributable to UoB reduces from the PMP's 2,740 to just 958 (as shown in Annex A.pdf attached).

Annex A.pdf also shows that, between now and 2020/21, the PMP's assumed remaining UoB residual need of 1,592 (see above) would be more than wiped out under the university's revised postgraduate recruitment policy.

In other words, contrary to the out-of-date conclusions of the PMP it is likely that demand for University of Bath student

In other words, contrary to the out-of-date conclusions of the PMP it is likely that demand for University of Bath student accommodation to 2020/21 could be more than completely met by the planned build of 1,000 further campus bed spaces on that part of the core campus which does not lie within the Cotswolds AONB, in accordance with the 2014 campus masterplan update.

Annex B.pdf (also attached) shows that beyond 2020/21 a continuing 1% per annum increase in UoB postgraduate numbers would result in demand for a further 1,100 bed spaces to the end of the Plan period (from 13,233 to 14,330). If UoB builds the remaining 700 campus bedspaces allowed for in the Masterplan 2014 update (i.e. Total 2,400) in say 2024/25, Annex B.pdf also shows that all but about 200 students could be accommodated on-campus in every year of the Plan period.

A further 200 students could easily be accommodated on-campus if UoB heeded General Development Principle (h) of Policy SB19 and freed up more developable land by utilising decked parking rather than the exclusively surface parking employed hitherto. Alternatively, a single modest 'windfall' city accommodation block (of which two are already in the planning pipeline) would suffice. Under either scenario no increase in HMO numbers would be necessary beyond current levels.

As regards BSU, Annex A.pdf shows that, with its recent bed space forecast reduction of 2,735 (see above), the residual need of 2,421 assumed in the PMP figures will be more than catered for.

Beech Avenue Residents' Association contends that, from the foregoing, the PMP is neither Positively Prepared, Justified nor Effective.

Note 1. Presentation to Bath City Forum on 21st January 2016 by the BSU Director of the Vice-Chancellor's Office.

Https://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteeId=567

Note 2. New Year Message from the UoB Vice-Chancellor dated 4th January 2016.

http://blogs.bath.ac.uk/vc-office/2016/01/04/new-year-vc-message/

Q5 Change Requested

- 1. Reissue out-of-date Evidence Base information paper "Historic and Future Student Numbers and Accommodation requirements in Bath (December 2015)" to reflect the universities' much amended growth and accommodation aspirations (January 2016).
- 2. Rewrite the Universities' section of the Placemaking Plan to reflect this (especially paras.226-230), removing all reference to encouraging the University of Bath to build further student accommodation on AONB land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007 if, as expected, the revised forecast results in student accommodation requirements that can easily be met by developing on a modestly intensified core campus. (Positively Prepared, Justified, Effective)

11 May 2016 Page 758 of 956

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?

Beech Avenue Residents' Association stands ready to participate at the oral examination if deemed necessary by the Inspector. We will be pleased to report on the analysis of any updated student number/accommodation forecasts provided by the universities during 2016.

11 May 2016 Page 759 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 231

Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 8 Name: Jill Herrett Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 231 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Of course the Council wants to see the continued success of UoB and BSU but that "continued success" implies continued growth, and that cannot be contained within Bath's boundary. The universities also COST the city because the number of family homes that have been turned into HMOs means that the Council collects no Council Tax from these buildings, contributing to a very significant loss of income to the Council. At present the Council has a £38M shortfall.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 760 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 232

Respondent Number:	102	Comment Number: 1	3				
Name: Robin Kerr		Or	ganisation:	Federation o	f Bath Residents'	Association	s (FOBR
Agent Name:		Ag	gent Organis	sation:			
Further Information avai	lable in	the original comment?	No	Attachmer	nts sent with the	comment?	Yes
Does the respondent cor Does the respondent cor If the respondent consider	isider th	ne document is sound?	No			ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified	Not Con	sisten 🗸	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates The Site Reference (if appl			'ara 232				

Q4 Soundness Comment

Para.159 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities (LPA) should have a clear understanding of 'all types' of housing need in their area. B&NES' Student Numbers and Accommodation Study 2015 estimates that, by 2020, additional housing could be needed for 4,900 students, though this could vary. The Placemaking Plan (PMP) then assesses whether such demand can be met by:

- more private sector accommodation blocks;
- •increased numbers of HMOs; and/or
- •further on-campus bed spaces.

Regarding accommodation blocks, the PMP concludes (para.242) that opportunities will be limited to undefined 'windfall' sites.

As for HMOs, the PMP states (para.233) that the current size of Bath's student HMO sector is already a concern and that any significant increase in HMO numbers would put the achievement of 7,000 net additional dwellings at risk (para.246); also, it claims that student accommodation needs could be met without the need for the already high proportion of student HMOs to increase (Sustainability Appraisal, Annex E, p.2).

That leaves further on-campus bed spaces. For Bath Spa the PMP states (para.250) that no site-specific deliverable solutions can be identified, while for University of Bath (UoB) it suggests (para.249) that, beyond the 1,000 additional bed spaces already assumed (para.229), there could be scope to utilise land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007. This land remains in the Cotswolds AONB and FoBRA considers it unlikely that development on the scale identified would comply with National policy that requires the features of an AONB to be 'conserved and enhanced'.

It is therefore far from certain that either the Bath Spa Newton Park campus has the capacity to house up to 2,300 more students or the UoB Claverton Down campus up to 2,700, and certainly not by 2020/21, even in the unlikely event that more than the traditional minority of students could be persuaded to live on-campus.

The PMP therefore fails to comply with NPPF paras.14 & 47 which state that LPAs should:

- "positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change; and..."
- "identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements."

11 Mav 2016 Page 761 of 956

FoBRA therefore considers the student housing element of the PMP to be undeliverable, thereby rendering it ineffective and hence unsound, being inconsistent with National policy.

Q5 Change Requested

To rectify this: If the (student) housing demand cannot be satisfied due to other pressures on scarce space, the LPA should define exactly what level of extra City student housing is sustainable (e.g. how many more HMOs and/or accommodation blocks are acceptable, if any) and the universities should decide what is the maximum proportion of their students who could be housed on campus. Only then can an acceptable student growth rate (if any) be defined (Effective/Deliverable). Such a process is the reverse of what the PMP currently attempts to do and should be undertaken in the context of a Student Housing Strategy agreed between the LPA, the universities and residents' representatives.

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?

FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

11 May 2016 Page 762 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 234

Respondent Number:	102	Comment Number:	5		
Name: Robin Kerr			Organisation:	Federation of Bath Residents' A	Associations (FoBR
Agent Name:			Agent Organis	ation:	
Further Information avai	lable in	the original comment?	P No	Attachments sent with the co	omment? Yes
Does the respondent cor	nsider th	e document is legally	compliant? (Ti	ck if indicated 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent cor	nsider th	e document is sound?	No		
If the respondent consid	ers the [Draft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where in	dicated):
Not Positively Prepared	✓	Not Justified 🗸	Not Cons	sisten Not Effective	✓
The representation relate	s to: Vo	olume 2 Bath	, Para 234		
The Site Reference (if app	licable) i	s:			

Q4 Soundness Comment

FoBRA has long pressed B&NES for a Student Housing Strategy but this is declined at para.234, though recognized as necessary in Vol 1 (District-Wide Policies and Strategies). This confusion renders the Placemaking Plan unsound, as the Core Strategy identified the issue: 'Does the Plan make adequate provision for housing based on objectively assessed needs?' as a test of soundness, to which the answer is clearly 'No' in the case of students:

B&NES' Information Paper "Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements" has been updated over the past 3 years, each time with different conclusions, ranging from (in 2013) 'no need for expansion of the private letting market' to (most recently) the need for 4,900 additional private sector student bed spaces. This demonstrates the volatility of student number forecasting. The Placemaking Plan chooses to use the 4,900-bed snapshot as the basis for future student housing need. However, the scale of the student housing requirement can (and does) change at any time (in either direction) and FoBRA therefore considers a Student Housing Strategy to be essential to keep track of variables such as:

- •What is the latest student number/accommodation forecast?
- •What plans exist for further campus accommodation?
- How many more HMOs are acceptable in Bath and is Article 4 Direction working?
- •How many more sites for student accommodation blocks are available and should Policy B5 provide safeguards beyond the Central & Enterprise zones?
- •What maximum size of student population is sustainable?

The generalised approach proposed in the Placemaking Plan addresses none of these crucial questions. The Plan proposes little scope for further accommodation blocks or HMOs in the city, simply hoping that most will be provided on-campus. However, the question of supply and demand is not addressed (the majority of students preferring to live in town) and neither is the fact that this strategy would mean major development within the Cotswolds AONB at Claverton Down, with no guarantee of success at the planning stage.

To rectify this: replace paras.234/235 to commit to a Student Housing Strategy to monitor changing student number forecasts (Justified, Positively Prepared); monitor and manage HMO and accommodation block numbers and locations (Effective); the effectiveness of Policy B5 (Effective, Justified) thereby making proper provision for student housing based on up to date objectively assessed needs (Positively Prepared).

11 Mav 2016 Page 763 of 956

\sim r	Ch	~ ~ D		اء ہـ ــا
us I	cnan	ge Ke	eques	itea

Q5 Change Requested

To rectify this: replace paras.234/235 to commit to a Student Housing Strategy to monitor changing student number forecasts (Justified, Positively Prepared); monitor and manage HMO and accommodation block numbers and locations (Effective); the effectiveness of Policy B5 (Effective, Justified) thereby making proper provision for student housing based on up to date objectively assessed needs (Positively Prepared).

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? FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.
Respondent Number: 102 Comment Number: 11 Name: Robin Kerr Organisation: Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FOBR 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 234 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment FoBRA has long been pressing B&NES to develop a workable Student Housing Strategy but this is rejected at para.234 of the Placemaking Plan (PMP): 'Some stakeholders have requested a dedicated student accommodation strategy to inform planning policy. In the Council's view the reality for Bath is that the approach to this issue cannot stand alone outside of an overall integrated suite of planning policies for the whole city that considers and balances all uses and all issues. The approach to higher education and student accommodation can only make sense against the background of the full spatial planning context and its drivers'. FoBRA disagrees. The generalised approach proposed by B&NES has been proved to be ineffective. In Bath's unique situation of constantly attempting to shoehorn more student accommodation into a highly-constrained World Heritage city that already hosts one of the highest proportions of students per head of population in the UK, and the universities' ever-changing aspirations for growth, FoBRA considers that (a) proactive planning is needed and long overdue, and (b) an effective mechanism for this would be a Student Housing Strategy. Within a Student Housing Strategy: •B&NES should define how many more HMOs and/or accommodation blocks (if any) are acceptable within the city; •the universities should declare how many more bed spaces they are able (or prepared) to accommodate on-campus or elsewhere in the district (with locations and timescales); and •only then should any sustainable increase in student numbers be discussed.
Not the other way round as hitherto.

11 May 2016 Page 764 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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? FoBRA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.	
Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 14 Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union 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 Sustified Not Consisten □ Not Effective □	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 234 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
With student accommodation being a key issue for the city with a strong probability of a number of students being homeless again, the number of students and the places those students could live needs much more scrutiny than the details of the Placemaking Plan. This is especially important as both universities have changed their growth aspirations multiple times in the last few years and so a separate strategy can respond better to this.	
Q5 Change Requested	
The Council to work closely with the universities to create a student accommodation strategy, to manage student numbers and accommodation need and clarifying the best way to calculate future accommodation need based on projected student numbers so that situations of students without accommodation need are avoided.	
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?	
There is significant concern that student housing needs will not be met	
Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number: 9 Name: Jill Herrett Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □	

11 May 2016 Page 765 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 234
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Council cannot direct the universities not to increase their numbers, but Central Government can. A cap was lifted and now needs to be replaced.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 766 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 237

Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 15	
Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union	
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 237	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	_
The University of Bath site is currently limited in library space, teaching space, eating space, social space and sports on the student experience.	
Q5 Change Requested	
The paragraph should be removed from the Placemaking Plan as such a mechanism would have a significantly detrimental impact on the student experience.	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $lacksquare$	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
There is significant concern that the student experience would be detrimentally impacted by this proposal	

11 May 2016 Page 767 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Diagram 19 Student Accommodation & Teaching Space

Respondent Number: 2 Comment Number: 1
Name: Chris Beezley Organisation:
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Diagram 19 Student Accommodation & Teaching Space
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Vol.2 (Bath) Diagram 19 (p113) is a map of part of Bath showing (in blue) sites described as "Promoted student accommodation", including, at far left, Hartwells Garage, Newbridge. On p98 of the same document Policy SB15 clearly states this site is to be for residential development but not student accommodation. Similarly, the Sustainability Appraisal Main Report on pp.52 and 78 (against Policy SB15) states this site to be non-student residential development. Further, there is an inconsistency on the Contents page of Vol.2 (Bath) where Policy SB16 (not SB15) is attributed to Hartwells Garage Newbridge.
Q5 Change Requested
(1) Delete the Hartwells Garage Newbridge site from Diagram 19.(2) Correct Policy numbers on Contents sheet of Vol.2 (Bath).
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Please note that I wish to be notified at the email address above that the Draft Placemaking Plan has been submitted for independent examination; the publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent Examination of the Placemaking Plan; and the adoption of the Placemaking Plan.
Decreased and November 224 Community of the 20
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 29
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓

11 May 2016 Page 768 of 956

, Diagram 19 Student Accommodation & Teaching Space

Bath

The representation relates to: Volume 2

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
iagram shows the Hartwell's Garage site as 'promoted student housing' when in Policy SB15 it is specifically NOT allocated to student housing.					
Q5 Change Requested					
Amend the map or the policy.					
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan					
Respondent Number: 7118 Comment Number: 1					
Name: Deirdre Stainer Organisation: Catholic Church Bath, Clifton Diocese					
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 Consisten Not Effective					
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Diagram 19 Student Accommodation & Teaching Space The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
I wish to comment on a perceived omission in a diagram. I wished to understand the definition of "permitted" in Diagram 19.					
Q5 Change Requested					
In the Plan Reference: Vol 2 - SB16 Burlington St p.100-101, under Development Requirements and Design Principles for the Burlington St site, item 1 states "Residential development, which can include student accommodation". However under See P.116: DIAGRAM 19: Existing, Permitted and Promoted Student Accommodation and Teaching Space in The Enterprise Area, City Centre And Environs Burlington Street site is not marked on this map. I was concerned that it should be. (I understand this may be dependent on the definition of "permitted".)					
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?					

11 May 2016 Page 769 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 238

Respondent Number: 6406 Comment Number	r: 1			
Name:	Organisation:	Student Castle		
Agent Name: James Taylor	Agent Organisa	ation: Nathanie	l Lichfield & Partners	
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No	Attachments	sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legall	y compliant? (Tic	ck if indicated 'y	es') 🗸	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Cons	isten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Para 238			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

In January 2015 we submitted representations on behalf of Student Castle to the Placemaking Plan Options document, relating mainly to the former St John's School site in Bath (which is in the ownership of Student Castle) and also policies associated with student accommodation in general.

Since these representations a formal pre-application submission (15/00005/PADEV) has been made to the Council relating to the redevelopment of the former St. John's School site to provide c.190 student bedrooms and associated ancillary uses. Moreover public consultation has been ongoing, including meetings with local Members and key stakeholder. We held a public exhibition in November 2015, which provided information on the proposals to local residents and businesses, the submission of a planning application is anticipated in spring 2016.

Overall Student Castle consider that this emerging document appropriately recognises the important role which higher education plays within the City, the resultant need to plan for further student accommodation and the challenges in identifying appropriate locations for such accommodation.

The higher education (HE) sector is potentially facing a significant period of change due to deregulation, which will increase competition between Universities and other HE providers. Part of the emphasis of reform is a focus on improving the quality of the student experience, teaching being a major factor. With higher education institutions having to compete for students on a more competitive basis than ever before it could limit their ability to provide modern accommodation oncampus when having to focus on their teaching offer. There is a longstanding tension within many institutions as to whether they are a teaching body or a provider of accommodation; the reality is they are both but often struggle to fulfil both in equal measure at equal speed. In this context the Placemaking Plan must recognise that there is a significant role for PBSA in meeting accommodation needs off-campus which otherwise may go unmet through Bath's Universities and which could have a detrimental impact on the University's themselves, the contribution they make to the economy and a potential increase in HMOs. Flexibility within policy is key to respond to the future demands and trends which are reasonably foreseeable.

The commentary within this section of the Pre-Submission Version acknowledges the fact that further private Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) is required off-campus in order to meet the needs of both Universities and other Higher Education institutions in light of their growth aspirations. The role of PBSA within the City is recognised as playing an important role in reventing increases in HMO accommodation which could detrimentally impact upon the availability of Bath's housing stock.

11 Mav 2016 Page 770 of 956

It is recognised that Bath is a relatively constrained city in terms of its directions for substantial growth and as such the Council's approach to prioritise particular land uses is reasonable. Core Strategy Policy B5 seeks to ensure that traditional city centre land uses, such as office space, are not prejudiced by approval of alternative uses within the Central Area and Enterprise Area. The Pre-Submission Version of the Placemaking Plan expands upon this and confirms that off-campus student accommodation should only be allowed on windfall sites within these areas. This approach is generally considered to be sound and is consistent with the Council's desire to balance competing land-uses. However, given the significant office development targets to capture employment within the central areas, there could be opportunities particularly on mixed use sites where student development does have a role, and could even help enable employment uses coming forward.

Through paragraphs 247-251 the Council acknowledge that the Universities will not be able to meet the required levels of student accommodation through on-campus development for a variety of reasons. The Council's acknowledgement of this is considered important in producing a pragmatic and flexible policy solution to meet the future needs and demands for student accommodation within the City.

In light of the above locational restrictions on PBSA, a flexible policy context to enable the approval of appropriate offcampus student accommodation schemes outside of the Central Area and Enterprise Area is vital to ensure that the number of HMOs within the City is not increased.

Q5 Change Requested

Both Universities are seeking to grow and, coupled with the government's decision to remove the student cap on numbers, this will lead to a higher number of students who require accommodation - paragraph 228 notes that accommodation needs are likely to increase by an additional 50% by 2020/21.

Our client generally supports the Council's approach to PBSA which seeks to limit new developments to land outside of the Central Area and Enterprise Area in line with Policy B5 of the Core Strategy, but would suggest that there could be exceptional opportunities where employment uses can be delivered on the back of student development.

As noted in paragraph 252 of the Placemaking Plan Pre-Submission Version, "opportunities] further afield would be limited in number and scope" albeit sustainable locations must be supported where appropriate developments are proposed.

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: 7152 Comment Number: 3						
Name: Organisation: SC Pulteney Road Ltd (Student Castle)						
Agent Name: James Taylor Agent Organisation: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners						
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 □						

11 May 2016 Page 771 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2	Bath	, Para 238		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

The commentary within this section of the Pre-Submission Version acknowledges the fact that further private Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) is required off-campus in order to meet the needs of both Universities and other Higher Education institutions in light of their growth aspirations. The role of PBSA within the City is recognised as playing an important role in

preventing increases in HMO accommodation which could detrimentally impact upon the availability of Bath's housing stock.

It is recognised that Bath is a relatively constrained city in terms of its directions for substantial growth and as such the Council's approach to prioritise particular land uses is reasonable. Core Strategy Policy B5 seeks to ensure that traditional city centre land uses, such as office space, are not prejudiced by approval of alternative uses within the Central Area and Enterprise Area. The Pre-Submission Version of the Placemaking Plan expands upon this and confirms that off-campus student accommodation should only be allowed on windfall sites within these areas. This approach is generally considered to be sound and is consistent with the Council's desire to balance competing land-uses. However, given the significant office development targets to capture employment within the central areas, there could be opportunities particularly on mixed use sites where student development does have a role, and could even help enable employment uses coming forward.

Through paragraphs 247-251 the Council acknowledge that the Universities will not be able to meet the required levels of student accommodation through on-campus development for a variety of reasons. The Council's acknowledgement of this is considered important in producing a pragmatic and flexible policy solution to meet the future needs and demands for student accommodation within the City.

In light of the above locational restrictions on PBSA, a flexible policy context to enable the approval of appropriate off-campus student accommodation schemes outside of the Central Area and Enterprise Area is vital to ensure that the number of HMOs within the City is not increased. Both Universities are seeking to grow and, coupled with the government's decision to remove the student cap on numbers, this will lead to a higher number of students who require accommodation - paragraph 228 notes that accommodation needs are likely to increase by an additional 50% by 2020/21.

Our client generally supports the Council's approach to PBSA which seeks to limit new developments to land outside of the Central Area and Enterprise Area in line with Policy B5 of the Core Strategy, but would suggest that there could be exceptional opportunities where employment uses can be delivered on the back of student development.

As noted in paragraph 252 of the Placemaking Plan Pre-Submission Version, "opportunities] further afield would be limited in number and scope" albeit sustainable locations must be supported where appropriate developments are proposed.

Q5 Change Requested

Our client generally supports the Council's approach to PBSA which seeks to limit new developments to land outside of the Central Area and Enterprise Area in line with Policy B5 of the Core Strategy, but would suggest that there could be exceptional opportunities where employment uses can be delivered on the back of student development. As noted in paragraph 252 of the Placemaking Plan Pre-Submission Version, "opportunities] further afield would be limited in number and scope" albeit sustainable locations must be supported where appropriate developments are proposed.

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 Mav 2016 Page 772 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 241

Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number:	: 10				
Name: Jill Herrett Organisation:					
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:				
Further Information available in the original comment?	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No				
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	v compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ✓				
Does the respondent consider the document is sound?	? Yes				
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan	in is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):				
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 241				
Q4 Soundness Comment					
population. The provision of further new student accomi	nt. Article 4 should be given to house a permanent working nmodation blocks will NOT release HMOs back to family residence who purchase family houses to cram as many students in as rates which at present they don't.				
Q5 Change Requested					
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if yes)?				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participa					
Respondent Number: 7129 Comment Number:	: 1				
Name: Paul and Trish Perryman	Organisation:				
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:				
Further Information available in the original comment?	t? 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	in is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):				
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Para 241				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment					
Re: DRAFT PLACING PLAN – IN CITY STUDENT ACCOMM	MODATION BLOCKS - PARAGRAPH 241				

11 May 2016 Page 773 of 956

We would like to comment with regard to "HMO's have become one of the most lucrative forms of real estate in the city". This surely cannot be allowed to continue as the city has reached saturation point with the numbers of students coming to the two universities. It is 'lucrative' to the universities to have more students attending - especially from overseas as they pay more - but it would seem that after catering for their needs at first year level in halls of residence, housing them after this is left to HMO's landlords.

This in turn makes affordable housing for hard working Bath residents – either to purchase or rent to families, couples or single people – nearly impossible. Communities thrive on a mix of young and old. Like so many, our children were forced to move out of Bath to live, and now have to commute back into the city.

We would also like to add that we are not against students, just that there are too many allowed to study here in Bath. The universities are expanding at too fast a rate without any thought it would seem for the rest of the residents of this World Heritage City and with no council tax contribution from either landlord or student.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 774 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 244

Respondent Number: 256 Comment Number Name: Cllr Andrew Furse Agent Name:	r: 8 Organisation: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Blacomaking Blacomaking]?
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	nn is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 244
Q4 Soundness Comment	
increases to students numbers should be housed within to come under an Article 4 control. With percentages buniversities' to control and manage the expansion of stoccs because of Student housing limitations. Too often,	ed purpose built accommodation available in the city and all a campus. The plan now needs to consider wider parts of the city eing adapted to the specific locations. This will force the tudents and thus the expansion of houses being turned into multiple expansion of the campuses has been to increase teaching space the students already attending. I think this is what policy B5 is
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	ation (ticked if yes)? \square

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

11 May 2016 Page 775 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 246

Respondent Number: 3149 Comment Number	: 11			
Name: Jill Herrett	Organisation:			
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 Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):			
Not Positively Prepared $\ \square$ Not Justified $\ \square$	Not Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Para 246			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Article 4 should apply to the whole City and be rigorous	ly enforced.			
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if yes)? \square			
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?			

11 May 2016 Page 776 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 247

Volume:

2, Bath

Respondent Number: 2919 Comment Number: 7 Name: Dr David Martin Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 247 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **Q4 Soundness Comment** The University of Bath Masterplan document, updated in 2014, proposes that there is scope for 2,400 additional bedrooms to be built on campus. 700 of these have now been completed, and there is therefore, capacity for 1,700 further bedrooms. Along with other public discussions during the consultation period, it seems likely that all of the UoB's revised future student accommodation requirements can be met within a modestly intensified core campus, comprising the solid purple zone on the map on page 125. It is not justfied, therefore, to proposed that there is a need for building student accommodation on land removed from the Green Belt shown as hatched purple zones on page 125. Q5 Change Requested In view of the sensitivity of building on the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the plan should identify and analyse how intensifying the core campus for student accommodation can be achieved. This will then be consistent with National Policy by examining other viable options before any proposals to build on land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007, and would make the Placemaking Plan sound. The analysis should take into account the UoB's revised future growth plans and the resulting need for student accommodation, because the UoB now expect to stabilise undergraduate numbers and increase postgraduate teaching. 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?

11 Mav 2016 Page 777 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 249

Respondent Number:	7237	Comment Number:	3			
Name: Chris Beezley			Organisation	Beech Aven	ue Residents' Association	
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:					
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the cor					ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsider th	ne document is legally o	compliant? (T	ick if indicate	d 'yes') ✓	
Does the respondent co		σ,	No		, , , , ,	
If the respondent consid	ders the I	Draft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, i	s it because it	t is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared		Not Justified 🗸	Not Cor	sisten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relate	es to: Vo	olume 2 Bath ,	Para 249			
The Site Reference (if app	olicable) i	is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

In a separate representation (against para.229), Beech Avenue Residents' Association (BARA) contends that the Placemaking Plan (PMP) states that, according to the University of Bath (UoB) Masterplan (2014 update), capacity for further on-campus student accommodation is 'not more than 1,000' bed spaces. This is at variance with the Masterplan (part of the Evidence Base) which clearly states that there is capacity for 2,400 further study bedrooms between 2009 and 2026, i.e. 1,700 beyond the 700 (The Quads) already built.

Irrespective of any argument as to whether 1,700 or 1,000 is the 'correct' figure, the PMP (para.249) suggests that, beyond developing on that land which has been identified as available in the masterplan within the core parts of the campus, the UoB has the scope to utilise AONB land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007.

As well as confirming that 'great weight should be given to conserving the characteristics of AONBs, which have the highest status of protection' (para.115), NPPF (para.116) requires that an assessment of the scope to develop elsewhere is undertaken before any major development is permitted in an AONB.

No such assessment has been undertaken in respect of General Development Principle (h) of Policy SB19 which seeks to optimise campus development capacity by employing decked parking. Decked parking features nowhere in the campus Masterplan.

The PMP repeatedly simply promotes further accommodation development on AONB land (beyond 1,000 more bedspaces on the core campus) before any assessment of the scope for intensifying the core campus by employing, for example, decked parking has been undertaken.

BARA therefore contends that the PMP is unsound, being inconsistent with National policy and not justified, not representing the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.

Q5 Change Requested

In view of the sensitivity of building on the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, carry out a comprehensive assessment of the scope for intensifying the core campus before any suggestion is made to build on land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007 (Justified, Consistent with National Policy).

Other representations demonstrate that all of the UoB's revised future need for student accommodation throughout the Plan period is likely to be able to be met within a modestly intensified core campus. If this is confirmed, as expected,

11 May 2016 Page 778 of 956

with revised UoB growth aspirations (i.e. stabilising undergraduate numbers and concentrating on postgraduate teaching), delete from the PMP all reference to building student accommodation on land removed from the Green Belt.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
BARA stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it appropriate.

11 May 2016 Page 779 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy B5

Respondent Number:	102	Comment Number: 1	.6				
Name: Robin Kerr		0	rganisation:	Federation o	f Bath Residents'	Associations	(FOBR
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:						
Further Information avail	the original comment?	No	Attachme	Attachments sent with the comment?			
			l: .2./=				
Does the respondent cor	isider th	ie document is legally co	mpliant? (1	ick if indicated	'yes') 🗸		
Does the respondent cor	isider th	ne document is sound?	No				
If the respondent conside	ers the I	Oraft Placemaking Plan is	s unsound, i	s it because it	is (ticked where ir	ndicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	✓	Not Justified 🗹	Not Con	sisten 🗌	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates	to: Vo	olume 2 Bath , l	Policy B5				
The Site Reference (if appl	icable) i	s:					

Q4 Soundness Comment

As proposed to be amended, Policy B5 is inadequate to address the significant student housing challenge that faces Bath. A more effective student housing strategy is urgently required.

A.Forecasting student numbers and their accommodation requirements is inexact. It is inappropriate for the Placemaking Plan (PMP) to present a single snapshot of how it interpreted the universities' forecasts based on evidence provided at some date in the past. Both universities already claim the PMP's assumed student numbers to be out of date. The PMP therefore fails the required test: "To be justified, a Plan needs to be founded on a robust and credible evidence base. A key question is 'How up to date is the evidence and how convincing is it'?"

The Plan is therefore unsound, being unjustified.

FoBRA suggests that a more effective approach would be for the PMP simply to refer to the up to date version of the Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements report and respond to the most appropriate of a range of possible future scenarios – a modest, significant or high annual increase in private sector demand.

B.As currently drafted, Policy B5 protects only a small area of the city from the spread of accommodation blocks and gives no indication as to how many more HMOs would trigger the need for 'compensatory provision' if achievement of 7,000 net additional dwellings for the city is at risk.

Policy B5 should be expanded to include the following:

- Expand the area for which proposals for student accommodation blocks will be refused if they would adversely affect the delivery of housing (or result in unbalanced communities) to cover the whole city;
- Set an annual limit for the number of additional HMOs beyond which further conversions will be refused (in addition to Article 4 Direction).
- If demand for private sector bed space becomes significant, initiate 'compensatory provision' to deliver the commitment to the Government's net additional housing allocation;

If the universities continue to aspire to grow at a rate that would result in a high annual increase in private sector bedspace demand, B&NES could emulate policies cited from Oxford, such as refusing permission for additional teaching space.

In summary, FoBRA contends that Policy B5 (as proposed to be amended) is inadequate to address the significant student housing challenge that faces Bath, and therefore renders the PMP unsound.

11 Mav 2016 Page 780 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

A more effective student nousing strategy is urgently required, incorporating further controls including those suggested above.
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?
In summary, FoBRA contends that Policy B5 (as proposed to be amended) is inadequate to address the significant student housing challenge that faces Bath, and therefore renders the PMP unsound.
Respondent Number: 148 Comment Number: 3
Name: Ian Bell Organisation: The Initiative in Bath and North East Somerset
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 Consisten Not Effective
Not oblively Frepured Not sustince Not consisten Not Elective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Finally, we believe the plan should say more about the subject of student accommodation. Our Universities are prized assets, contributing to the area in a variety of ways, not least through employment and the creation of much sought after graduates. It is clear they will both continue to grow in the future and we very much welcome that. At the same time we recognise the impact of student accommodation in the City centre and the concentrations of houses of multiple occupancy in some places. We believe the answer is not to restrict the growth of the Universities, attempting to cap their student numbers, but rather look for imaginative and flexible solutions to the challenges they and we are facing.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 152 Comment Number: 3
Name: Organisation: Corston Parish Council
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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective 🗸

11 May 2016 Page 781 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
It is understood that the Bath University at Newton St Loe needs to build extra accommodation for its students. The Council is concerned that unless such building can be restricted to the University campus alternative sites may be sought in the local area. In the unlikely event that the developments at paragraphs (a) and (b) are not approved any proposed building development by the Bath University along the A4 corridor would still be very unwelcome by the Corston Parish Council.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 5 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment Policy B5 states that it wishes to assist the Universities in meeting their aspirations. There is however a significant imbalance between likely student numbers in the plan period and availability of student housing, with consequent knock on effects to the HMO market and the housing number aspirations.
We are sympathetic to the Council's dilemma that there is insufficient room in Bath for all the demands placed upon it but it is imperative that a solution is found for student housing even if it is outside Bath itself. In the case of bath Spa University the consideration of sites in Keynsham and Radstock, with appropriate public transport supplements, could assist the Council in the regeneration of those towns. In the case of Bath University appropriate intensification oncampus together with possible solutions in West Wiltshire may form part of the supply. These solutions should preferably be agreed in a statement of common ground before the Examination. As it stands the likely loser will be housing and affordable housing which represents a significant priority for the City.
Q5 Change Requested
Rewrite policies B5, SB 19 and SB 20 on the basis of: - Agreed figures on student numbers - Agreed locations for purpose-built student housing into meeting these numbers, in specific sites on or off campus and in Bath/out of Bath.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? ✓

11 May 2016 Page 782 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 6
Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust
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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
(see also reps by the University of Bath and Bath Spa University, though we do not think that they have provided a sufficient solution).
We sympathise with the planning dilemma faced by BaNES due to growth in student numbers, however we do not think the plan positively address it.
Policy B5 states that planning decisions should enable as far as possible the aspirations of [the Universities]. However the development briefs for various sites explicitly exclude student housing. There is a growing housing crisis in Bath exacerbated by HMOs and holiday let accommodation which means that for 'positive planning' the Council and the Universities must actively respond to the Student housing crisis by identifying sites, not necessarily within Bath or in the University of Bath's case even the district which will help to solve this by means of more purpose-built accommodation. The use of student accommodation as a regenerative tool in the market towns of Keynsham and Radstock (for Bath Spa University) and possibly in West Wiltshire (for the University of Bath) should be considered and positively brought forward, as should detailed plans for campus intensification.
Q5 Change Requested
Alter policies B5, B19 and B20 actively to meet the aspirations of the two universities.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the Placemaking Plan.

11 May 2016 Page 783 of 956

Respondent Number:	224	Comment Number:	8					
Name: Caroline Kay		(Organisatio	n: Bath Preserv	ation Trust			
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:								
Further Information avai	lable in	the original comment?	No	Attachmei	nts sent with the o	comment?	No	
Does the respondent cor Does the respondent cor If the respondent consid Not Positively Prepared	nsider the	ne document is sound?	No is unsound,		•			
Trock ositively repared			1101 00		THE EFFECTIVE			
The representation related The Site Reference (if app			Policy B5					
0.1.0								

Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy B5 states that it is policy to try to meet the universities' aspirations (see submissions from Bath Spa and University of Bath) yet all the site specific policies exclude student housing. This means that there is continuous and growing pressure on the let housing market for student beds in HMOs, which in turn removes housing for working young professionals and families. The campus-specific policies are not nearly specific enough about the requirement or intention for intensification at the two campuses. It is possible that purpose-built student housing could assist in the regeneration agendas for the market towns of Keynsham and Radstock (if adequate university bus services were also provided) and potentially, in the case of Bath University, in the market towns of West Wiltshire.

Either the Plan needs to state that it is not possible to meet the growth aspirations of the universities, and back this up with further restrictions across Bath on HMOs through Article 4 directions, or there needs to be a positively planned solution for more purpose built accommodation to be negotiated between the Universities and the Council.

Q5 Change Requested

The plan needs to have an active solution to the problems currently presented in the plan, both from the Universities' perspective and recognising the other housing pressures, preferably though a statement of common ground before the Examination.

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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan (see reps). The Trust is a significant amenity group in the City of Bath with a specific public benefit remit relating to the heritage of the City and its environs. We request to be kept directly involved by PINS at all stages of the Examination

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 40

Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 Mav 2016 Page 784 of 956

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 2 Bath , Policy B5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
It is difficult to see how Policy B5 desire to enable the aspirations of the universities without more specifically addressing their needs.
Unless this matter is addressed the policy cannot be sound therefore more specific allocations/proposals need to be made for Student housing.
Q5 Change Requested
Make specific reference to possible site allocations on and off campus (including in peripheral settlements eg Keynsham and Radstock, with appropriate bus transport) for student housing to minimise effect on HMO growth.
Make specific student housing allocations within B&NES.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 283 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: Prior Park College & Paragon School
Agent Name: Chris Burton Agent Organisation: GVA
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

On behalf of my client, Prior Park College, I wish to provide comments on the Bath and North East Somerset Council Placemaking Plan. Prior Park College is one of the UK's largest, co-educational, Catholic, independent senior schools with some 600 students attending as either day pupils or borders.

The intention of this representation is to ensure that Prior Park College maintain the ability to deliver a range of vital improvements to the school so that they continue to provide a first class education.

11 Mav 2016 Page 785 of 956

Policy B5: Strategic policy for universities, private colleges and their impacts

In our previous representation to the Placemaking Plan Consultation (29 January 2015) we made reference to the recognition of major existing development sites (MEDS) in the Green Belt and that we felt due to the importance of Prior Park College to the City of Bath the same recognition should be given to the site as the two Universities in Bath.

Following our comment that there was no longer a requirement to define the boundary of MEDS in the Green Belt the term has been removed as a designation in the Plan.

Policy B5 is titled as 'Strategic policy for universities, private colleges and their impacts'. Despite the Policy clearly being designed to cover the needs of both the universities and private colleges there is no further mention of private colleges in either the Policy or the explanatory Policy SB20 and SB21. This gives a clear steer to any planning officer in deciding on an application at either Bath Spa University or the University of Bath that it should be considered as a special case and that development, though in the green belt, may be appropriate. The client has no issue with the Universities visibility in the Plan but is disappointed that the Policy does not include actual reference to private colleges.

Prior Park College is an established development site in the Green Belt. The site accommodates a range of listed and non-listed buildings which date back to 1742. Since 2000 the College has been the subject of a programme of refurbishment throughout and reconfiguration which have been secured though a series of planning approvals including the following:

- Erection of a new sports centre (ref. 10/05094/FUL)
- Erection of a gymnasium extension (ref: 07/01305/FUL)
- Extension of two storey extension to the Theatre (ref: 05/02010/FUL)
- Refurbishment and extension to swimming pool (ref: 03/01143/FUL); and
- Erection of a two and a half storey extension to east of the classroom block (ref: 02/02272/FUL).

Prior Park College is likely to require further enhancements in the future in order to maintain an attractive offer for current and prospective students. The College require the reassurance that should they wish to enhance existing facilities on site this could be possible provided that the openness of the Green Belt is retained.

The College is one of the top independent co-educational boarding and days schools in the UK and also one of the largest with a community around 600 students. Prior Park is therefore a key social and economic facility in Bath and its longevity and future sustainability should be supported within the context of its location within a particularly environmentally sensitive area.

While we understand that the NPPF supports, in principle, limited infilling or partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt, a clear policy approach to the site would be helpful to inform any future plans for additional infill development on the Prior Park College site, providing the assurance that any future proposals that meet the established parameters are likely to be positively received by the Council.

The NPPF advises that the planning system plays a key role in encouraging sustainable economic growth (paragraph 19). In line with this the Council planning policies should demonstrate a clear policy approach to supporting the economic growth of key local and social facilities such as Prior Park College. In addition, we consider that agreeing the area around Prior Park College to which paragraph 89 of the NPPF would apply would not only provide clarity to the College but would also assist Planning Officers in determining applications for any future development proposals on the site.

Q5 Change Requested
We therefore consider that there is strong case for justifying the greater visibility in the Policy for the Prior Park College site and that amendments are made to the Policy wording to clarify that it covers both universities and private colleges.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
,

11 Mav 2016 Page 786 of 956

Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 25

Name: Organisation: University of Bath

Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd

Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

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 Consisten **✓**

Not Effective ✓

The representation relates to: Volume 2

Bath

, Policy B5

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The following is a summary of the objection and should be read in conjunction with the attached full objection (ref. UoB Rep to PMP Policy B5), plus Appendix 1a (attached) and Appendices 1b and 1c that have been emailed directly to the LPA for reference due to an online error:

The University of Bath (the University) is a major driver of educational opportunity and economic growth in the City and District, and the Place Making Plan (PMP) should play a critical role in supporting its continued success and sustainable growth through the provision of a positive planning policy context. This positive planning context should allow the expedient determination of future planning applications for key investments planned for the campus and facilitate the realisation of potential off campus development opportunities to meet identified needs.

However, Policy B5 does not provide that positive planning framework. The University objects to the policy, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

-has not been positively prepared and does not seek to meet assessed development and infrastructure requirements, notably in relation to the required growth of the University;

-is not justified in that it is not the most appropriate strategy and has not considered reasonable alternative strategies; -is not effective in that restricting the sustainable growth of the University it will not allow the PMP's own strategic objectives to be realised; and

-is inconsistent with national policy in that it does not reflect the Government's Higher Education priorities and policies, and seeks to limit University related sustainable development outside of its own campus.

Q5 Change Requested

Delete "Overall Approach" and "Off-Campus Student Accommodation and Teaching Space" text.

"The University of Bath:

Add:

The strategy seeks to support the operation and sustainable growth of the University of Bath and enable the provision of replacement and additional teaching, research and related support space, student residences and associated infrastructure at its Claverton Campus and the Sulis Club subject to Policy SB19, and elsewhere within the city through the identification and allocation of appropriate sites or subject to Policy XX.

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?

This information is fundamental to the soundness of the PMP and should be discussed thoroughly at the examination with the University.

11 May 2016 Page 787 of 956

Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number: 16
Name: Matt Humberstone Organisation: University of Bath Students' Union
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The growth aspirations of both universities in Bath in combination with this policy will not provide sufficient housing putting students at risk of homelessness.
Q5 Change Requested
The policy should be reviewed to ensure that it does not risk preventing the development of essential accommodation.
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?
There is significant concern that student housing needs will not be met
Respondent Number: 3539 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: Eagle One Ltd
Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
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 2 Bath , Policy B5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

The University of Bath is one of the key drivers of the local economy in terms of direct employment. The indirect impact is also very substantial indeed in terms of the service industries and businesses that it supports, including the attraction of knowledge-based businesses the enhancement of which is central to the economic strategy of the Core Strategy. Moreover, through its involvement in contract research for some of the most important companies in the UK, and internationally, the University contributes directly to developing the knowledge-based economy in the city. It is therefore absolutely imperative that the Plan makes sufficient provision for meeting the objectively assessed needs for both academic and student accommodation.

11 May 2016 Page 788 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

It is acknowledged in the Plan that the University's growth, and associated development requirements, are now likely to exceed previous expectations. However, it is equally apparent that the 'supply' of development opportunities to meet the increased 'demand' is reducing. There are a number of components to the contraction in supply, including:

- Introduction of the city-wide article 4 Direction restricting HMO growth, which will impact significantly upon the availability of student accommodation to meet the increased demand.
- -Contraction in the available development area at the main Claverton campus through the introduction of a 'clear zone' in which development will be restricted, and which is effectively a cordon sanitaire reducing the extent of the development area excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for development under Policy GD.1/B11 of the Bath and North-East Somerset Local Plan.
- Introduction in the emerging policy framework of a raft of environmental policies with which on campus development must comply.
- Exclusion in Policy B5 of not only further purpose-built student accommodation, but now also teaching space, from both the Central Area and Enterprise Zone, and therefore from many of the key development sites in the city that could contribute to their delivery.

The emerging policy framework is surprising, and indeed of considerable concern, in terms of the apparent lack of priority given to accommodating the requirements of the University. The tenor of Policy B5, and the reasoned justification by which it is supported, is that accommodating the growth requirements of the University is subordinate to other development requirements and environmental protection, and will only be accommodated where it does not interfere with other priorities. Given the importance of the University to the local economy, and its central role in delivering the economic strategy of the Plan, not least in terms of growth in knowledge-based sector, that is considered to render the Plan unsound since it would be contrary to each of the soundness criteria set out at paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Policy B5 therefore requires fundamental amendment since, as currently worded, it fails to Plan for meeting in full the objectively assessed needs of the Universities. Since those institutions are central to the economic strategy of the Plan, the Plan is unsound in consequence. It would also be contrary to national policy in the NPPF, a core planning principle of which is to "... proactively drive and support sustainable economic development" through making every effort to objectively "... identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth" (para. 17).

It is simply not an option, as implied in Policy B5, to put a brake on the further growth of one of the jewel's in the city's economic crowns, and that is of much wider national, and increasingly international, importance for its teaching, research and business capabilities and expertise. The fact that the policy framework indicates that could be a consequence, indicates that the importance of the University has not been properly weighed in the balance against environmental constraints and other development requirements.

Policy B5 should therefore be positively expressed to plan to meet the requirements of the Universities in full. The Plan is currently unsound when tested against all four of the soundness criteria inconsequence of the flaws in Policy B5. However, subject to amendment to confirm that there will be a strong presumption in favour of development to meet the requirements arising from the expansion of the Universities on sites outside the Central Area/Enterprise Zone, then the current representors support its provisions.

Q5 Change Requested

Amend Policy B5 to include a clear and firm commitment to planning to meet the growth requirements of the Universities in full, including purpose-built accommodation for students, on sites outside those parts of the city in which the Council is seeking to restrict it (Central Area/Enterprise Zone).

The reasoned justification also requires amendment to make it clear that meeting the objectively assessed growth requirements is an imperative, is subordinate to neither environmental constraints nor other development needs

11 May 2016 Page 789 of 956

outside, and the Plan will facilitate the continued growth of the Universities on suitable sites within the city outside the restricted areas.

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? Comment Number: 1 Respondent Number: 4139 Name: Susan Lockert Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **O4** Soundness Comment Whilst there might currently be a need at both campuses for sufficient accommodation for the present amount of students I feel that both universities should now set a limit to the number of new students to be admitted each year. The accommodation which the students occupy on campus is only available to them for one year. After this they have to find housing in areas of the city which would otherwise be used by private individuals and families who have beeh disenfranchised because of the amount of students in the city. Landlords who let property out as student accommodation do not pay Council Tax and students do not pay Council Tax either so the city is losing considerable revenue. 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? Respondent Number: 4797 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Westmark (Bath) Ltd Agent Name: Dan Yeates Agent Organisation: Savills Attachments sent with the comment? Further Information available in the original comment? No 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 ✓

11 May 2016 Page 790 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Given the concerns expressed above in relation to draft Policy SB8, we are concerned that Policy B5 within the Draft Placemaking Plan also provides no flexibility for the delivery of off-campus student accommodation on sites where it has been demonstrated that other competing uses, specifically residential, are found to be unviable.
It is important to note that the Council's evidence base has been updated since adoption of Core Strategy, and the adoption of Core Strategy Policy B5. In particular, there is clear recognition within Volume 2 of the Draft Placemaking Plan to the growing demand for student accommodation.
In our view, the policy should provide flexibility in circumstances whereby there are viability and deliverability issues surrounding non-student development, to ensure that such a site does not become long term vacant, thereby impacting on the overall spatial strategy for the city.
Policy B5 is too restrictive and doesn't recognise viability issues.
Q5 Change Requested
We therefore consider that an amendment to Placemaking Plan Policy B5 is required to read: "Proposals for off-campus student accommodation (whether in the form, C2, C4 or sui generis residential units) or teaching space will be refused within the Central Area and the Enterprise Area where this would adversely affect the realisation of the vision and spatial strategy in relation to for delivering housing, and economic development (in respect of office, industrial, retail and hotel space), unless viability considerations indicate otherwise"
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? To provide the Inspector with information relating to the site, along with comments on specific policies within the draft Placemaking Plan.
Respondent Number: 6338 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Watkin Jones Group
Agent Name: Claire Durbin Agent Organisation: PlanningSphere Limited
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') \Box
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 2 Bath , Policy B5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

3.1 The role of the Placemaking Plan is outlined in the Introduction to the Pre-Submission Version. It is the Council's intention that the Placemaking Plan will complement the strategic planning framework provided in the Council's Core Strategy which was formally adopted by BANES in July 2014 and will deliver the housing and employment requirements established in the Core Strategy and its strategic objectives. The Council's Placemaking Plan focuses more on the

11 May 2016 Page 791 of 956

specifics, including detailed design principles and development aspirations and updating the planning policies used in determining planning applications.

National Policy Context

- 3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF) together with the more technical advice found in National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) sets the context for both the overall development plan and more specifically policies to support the delivery of housing (including student housing). Key to the NPPF is the emphasis on delivering sustainable development, based on the five guiding principles of the UKs Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future. The NPPF definition of sustainable development as set out at Paragraph 7 defines sustainable development as having three dimensions; Economic, Social and Environmental. This commitment is implemented through the document's presumption in favour of sustainable development, set out in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF. For plan making this means that: "Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change unless: Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted...."
- 3.3 Paragraph 47 clearly sets out the government's key planning objectives to boost significantly the supply of all sources of housing. This includes the requirement for local authorities to meet local housing requirements through their Local Plan by identifying objectively assessed need, and by being able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 3.4 Planning practice guidance in the NPPG (paragraph 021 Ref: ID: 2a-021-20150326) states that plan makers '...should look at the household types, tenure and size in the current stock and in recent supply, and assess whether continuation of these trends would meet future needs'. In respect of Student housing provision the NPPG states: "Local planning authorities should plan for sufficient student accommodation whether it consists of communal halls of residence or self-contained dwellings, and whether or not it is on campus. Student housing provided by private landlords is often a lower-cost form of housing. Encouraging more dedicated student accommodation may provide low cost housing that takes pressure off the private rented sector and increases the overall housing stock. Plan makers are encouraged to consider options which would support both the needs of the student population as well as local residents before imposing caps or restrictions on students living outside of university-provided accommodation. Plan makers should engage with universities and other higher educational establishments to better understand their student accommodation requirements."
- 3.5 Given our more detailed comments set out below we contend that because of its lack of flexibility the Placemaking Plan will not be able to be in compliance with the adopted Core Strategy as it will not enable the delivery of the required level of housing across the plan period, nor will it be able to maintain a five year supply of housing as required by the NPPF and NPPG. We therefore consider that as drafted the Placemaking Plan would not be in accordance with national policy, and as such could not be found sound.

 Draft Placemaking Plan Policy B5
- 3.6 The supply and demand of student bed spaces, as summarised in the Council's own evidence base, indicates that shortfall in required bed spaces is now more acute than was anticipated at the time the Core Strategy was examined. This is due to a higher than anticipated rate of growth in student numbers at both the University of Bath and Bath Spa University.
- 3.7 It is also noted that the assessment of student numbers does not take account of Norland College which is affiliated with the University of Gloucester, and has commenced a 3-year degree course which will be taught from a new teaching block in Upper Oldfield Park which is currently under construction (Ref: 15/04631/VAR). This represents a further 240 students per annum requiring accommodation in Bath.
- 3.8 Noting that the NPPG advises that student housing should form part of the overall housing supply, and the important

11 Mav 2016 Page 792 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

role that the higher education sector has within Bath's economy, it is submitted that the Council should have taken the opportunity of the Placemaking Plan to develop a more flexible approach to the delivery of purpose built student housing under Policy B5 by replacing the blanket presumption against student housing provision in the Central Area and Enterprise Area, which are locations where student housing can be sustainability located at high density, particularly on constrained sites where housing and speculative employment schemes are not deliverable.

- 3.9 We would therefore advocate a more flexible criteria based policy which would retain the presumption in favour of housing and employment uses, but would permit new purpose built student housing on small standalone sites, or forming a component part of a mixed-use scheme to assist with overall viability, where site specific circumstances inhibit the delivery of housing and/or employment schemes. Furthermore, it should be noted that WJG will use a concrete frame to construct their proposed scheme at Midland Road. This would enable the building to be converted to residential (Class C3) or a commercial use such as a hotel in the event that student demand diminished in the future thereby ensuring maximum flexibility of provision.
- 3.10 Implicit in the presumption against off-campus purpose student housing, as stated in Policy B5, is the notion that this form of development does not contribute to economic development. Student accommodation is one of the main criteria that prospective students take account of when choosing a university, and the quality of accommodation is also linked to student performance, and is also a factor in ranking assessments. This in turn contributes to the overall success of the universities, which make a significant contribution to Bath's economy. Additionally, individual students have a significant economic footprint themselves which is estimated by the National Union of Students to be circa £9k per student per annum not including accommodation costs (Ref: Student Contributions to the UK economy: National Union of Students and New Economics Foundation Consulting, 2013).
- 3.11 The need for a flexible criteria-based policy is illustrated in the circumstances of the Midland Road site. This is a standalone small site of 0.13ha. It took several years to negotiate a residential housing scheme of 14 units (6 affordable flats and a terrace of 8 houses). However, as noted above, site marketing has revealed limited interest from housing developers for the reasons explained in Section 2.
- 3.12 The small site size also restricts the quantum of residential development that could be accommodated due to the land requirements for off-street car parking provision and associated manoeuvring. In contrast a purpose built student housing scheme can be provided on a largely car-free basis, which enables significantly more units to be provided. In the case of the Midland Road site it is anticipated that a scheme of circa 100 studio student flats could be provided in lieu of the 14 residential units permitted under the extant planning permission. This represents a much more efficient use of the site and will deliver a greater number of housing units that can count towards completions and reduce the pressure of developing new residential housing elsewhere in the district.
- 3.13 The site is also considered unsuitable for employment use and is likely to remain undeveloped if planning permission cannot be secured for the only viable use, which is a scheme of student housing.
- 3.14 A scheme of student housing would also enable a larger-scale building to be erected on a prominent site that in urban design terms would be more appropriate than the domestic scaled extant housing scheme. In combination it can be demonstrated that the development of the Midland Road site for purpose built student housing, in a studio flatted format, would be more beneficial to the city in terms of housing supply, economic development and urban design than the extant housing scheme.
- 3.15 The Midland Road case study clearly demonstrates that Policy B5, as proposed, is too prescriptive and will prevent the market from delivering optimum development solutions for potential regeneration sites in Bath's Enterprise and Central Areas which are unsuitable for housing or employment development.
- 3.16 Whilst we accept that the general thrust and intention of Policy B5 is to promote housing and employment uses, we submit that the policy should be amended to include criteria to enable other uses to be permitted in circumstances where housing and employment uses are not viable or suitable, and where student housing is able to make better use of the site.

11 Mav 2016 Page 793 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

It is clear that not only is there a critical need for additional managed and purpose built student housing in Bath, but that this should be considered as part of the Council's overall housing supply, not least because this demand impacts on the availability of open market housing to the non-student population. The approach taken by the Placemaking Plan is insufficiently flexible and does not recognise the contribution to economic development that this type of housing makes, which would result in the Placemaking Plan not being in compliance with the adopted Core Strategy and thus being unsound.

- 4.2 The circumstances pertaining at the Midland Road site demonstrates that Policy B5, as proposed, will sterilize sites that are unsuitable and unviable for employment/housing use.
- 4.3 We suggest that a criteria based policy is formulated to amend Policy B5 to replace the blanket presumption against student housing provision in the Central and Enterprise Areas. This would enable the market to deliver an optimum development solution for the Midland Road site, and other regeneration sites in Bath's Enterprise and Central Areas, by allowing student housing to be developed on sites that are demonstrably unsuitable or unviable for housing or employment development.

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

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

Respondent Number: 7110 Comment Number:			
Name:	Organisation:	StudioUS Investment Manage	ement
Agent Name: Helen Tilton	Agent Organisa	ation: Turley	
Further Information available in the original comme	ent? No	Attachments sent with the	comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is lega		k if indicated 'yes') \Box	
Does the respondent consider the document is sour	nd? No		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking F	Plan is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where	indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Cons	isten 🗹 Not Effective	✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Policy B5		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			

Q4 Soundness Comment

We welcome, in principle, the inclusion of up-to-date evidence as a means of informing the Council's proposed student accommodation strategy. 'Historic and Future Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements in Bath, December 2015' clearly demonstrates a requirement for additional student accommodation that the Plan should provide for, which cannot be met solely through the delivery of existing consents or on sites where a development aspiration has been identified. On this basis, it is our view that Policy B5 and its explanatory supporting text should be revised to properly plan for the known and potentially growing off-campus student accommodation requirement.

Paragraph 2.36 is proposed to be deleted. We suggest that this paragraph should be retained, with amendments, to ensure that there is a clear up-front statement regarding the Council's overarching aim: "The Council seeks to enable the continued success of The University of Bath and Bath Spa University and other educational institutions and the contribution they make to the city's identity and profile". (our additional text is underlined: 'and other educational institutions').

With reference to the identified need for student accommodation, we note the following:

The Plan identifies that future student housing needs are not precisely identified (by the Plan), for a number of reasons, including projections from the Universities extending only to 2020 rather than over the whole Plan period, as well as

11 May 2016 Page 794 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

stated discrepancies between publically available Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data and the data provided by the Universities. Nevertheless, the Plan illustrates that student accommodation requirements represent a clear issue for the city of a 'considerable scale'. This is underlined by Paragraph 228 which advises that it would be prudent for the Plan to assume in total that accommodation needs would increase from 16,300 to 24,800 (+8,500) to 2020/21. Taking into account the known and potential supply (Paragraph 229) the Plan then identifies that this leaves a residual need of around 4,900 bedrooms to 2020/21. Translating this into example developments the Plan indicates that this equates to a need for:

- around 1,225 HMOs to September 2020; or,
- around 11 more city centre type Green Park House developments (461 beds in 13,500m2. i.e. 148,500 sq.m. overall); or,
- around 15 more out-of-centre type Twerton Mill Developments (327 beds on 8,700m2. i.e. 130,000m2. overall) Whilst we do not wish to challenge the above figures at this time, we would suggest that further investigation of the data could result in higher requirements, in order to support the wider objectives as set out in the adopted Core Strategy. In any event the Plan itself, and the up-to-date evidence base, acknowledges that student accommodation requirements could change, and could grow. The Plan will therefore need to assume a scenario in which student accommodation requirements need to be maximised.

Paragraph 242 identifies that the Council's analysis shows there is not the land within the city ('city' does not include oncampus land) to enable the aspirations of the Universities without significant negative effects on other priorities. Paragraph 232 also infers (by reference to retailing capacity), that there are circumstances in which student accommodation needs cannot be met without impacting on other planned objectives. We would suggest that this is a fact that planning policy needs to address with reference to all planning issues: it is not particular to student accommodation, and nor are the identified land pressures specifically directed or led by the need for student accommodation.

Paragraph 234 refers to the possibility of a 'scheme of prioritisation' of uses, but oes not expand on this. If there is any intention to adopt such an approach, it is not defined. It would seem unlikely that such a strategically complex approach could be achieved in the context of the Plan as currently drafted.

The above notwithstanding, we note that Paragraph 243 seems to suggest that the scheme of prioritisation of uses may refer to Policy B5 and the restrictions that the policy imposes on student accommodation in the City Centre and Enterprise Area. If Policy B5 is the intended means of controlling student accommodation, and if student accommodation development outside those areas will continue to be assessed on their merits, then this must be expressly stated and should not be subject to confusion arising from additional text relating to prioritising other uses (as there is no planned policy driver beyond Policy B5 that would direct such an approach).

The market will continue to make its own decisions about privately operated student accommodation and will propose schemes to meet projected demand in the short-medium term. Windfall sites will continue to be identified and should not be 'limited' or otherwise constrained. This would not be justified in light of a lack of planned development options for student accommodation.

We would suggest that planned-for support through Policy B5 for student accommodation outside the City Centre and Enterprise Areas would assist in relieving the pressures of HMO conversion, and it would assist if the Plan could more clearly acknowledge this.

We are pleased to note that Paragraph 252 acknowledges that Bath is a compact city and that there are few places that can be regarded as unsuitable in transport terms in respect of windfall student accommodation beyond the Enterprise Area and Central Area.

Policy B5

With reference to the text of Policy B5 itself, we comment as follows:

The overall approach proposed by Policy B5 is unchanged from the Core Strategy text, and states that planning decisions should enable the aspirations of the University of Bath and Bath Spa University to be met as far as possible. Given that the up-to-date evidence acknowledges that other forms of educational institution (e.g. Language centres) also contribute to student housing needs, we would suggest that this should also be referenced through additional text

We would further suggest that the policy should be re-worded to make it clear that proposals for student

11 Mav 2016 Page 795 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

accommodation outside the City Centre and Enterprise Area will not be refused (subject to criteria) and will be positively assessed based on their merits.

It would be prudent for the policy to refer broadly to the benefits of mixed-use development that includes student accommodation, particularly given that this will assist in offsetting the identified pressures on the availability of land for other uses (such as employment land).

Q5 Change Requested

As set out in our response to Question 4 above, our suggested changes are:

- Paragraph 2.36 is proposed to be deleted. We suggest that this paragraph should be retained, with amendments, to ensure that there is a clear up-front statement regarding the Council's overarching aim: "The Council seeks to enable the continued success of The University of Bath and Bath Spa University and other educational institutions and the contribution they make to the city's identity and profile". (our additional text is underlined: 'and other educational institutions').
- The Plan will need to assume a scenario in which student accommodation requirements need to be maximised, and plan accordingly.
- If Policy B5 is the intended means of controlling student accommodation, and if student accommodation development outside those areas will continue to be assessed on their merits, then this must be expressly stated and should not be subject to confusion arising from additional text relating to prioritising other uses.
- Windfall sites will continue to be identified and should not be 'limited' or otherwise constrained. This would not be justified in light of a lack of planned development options for student accommodation.
- Planned-for support through Policy B5 for student accommodation outside the City Centre and Enterprise Areas would assist in relieving the pressures of HMO conversion, and it would assist if the Plan could more clearly acknowledge this.
- Given that the up-to-date evidence acknowledges that other forms of educational institution (e.g. language centres) also contribute to student housing needs, we would suggest that this should also be referenced through additional text within Policy B5.
- Policy B5 should be re-worded to make it clear that proposals for student accommodation outside the City Centre and Enterprise Area will not be refused (subject to criteria) and will be positively assessed based on their merits.
- Policy B5 should refer broadly to the benefits of mixed-use development that includes student accommodation, particularly given that this will assist in offsetting the identified pressures on the availability of land for other uses (such as employment land).

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?

StudioUS Investment Management has current land interests with the potential to support mixed-use and student accommodation needs close to Bath City Centre.

Respondent Number: 7122 Comment Number:	1		
Name:	Organisation: le	sis Ltd	
Agent Name: Tom Rocke	Agent Organisati	ion: Rocke Associates	
Further Information available in the original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally consider the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan Not Positively Prepared Not Justified		because it is (ticked where indicated):	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Policy B5		

11 Mav 2016 Page 796 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

The University of Bath is one of the key drivers of the local economy in terms of direct employment. The indirect impact is also very substantial indeed in terms of the service industries and businesses that it supports, including the attraction of knowledge-based businesses the enhancement of which is central to the economic strategy of the Core Strategy. Moreover, through its involvement in contract research for some of the most important companies in the UK, and internationally, the University contributes directly to developing the knowledge-based economy in the city. It is therefore absolutely imperative that the Plan makes sufficient provision for meeting the objectively assessed needs for both academic and student accommodation. It is acknowledged in the Plan that the University's growth, and associated development requirements, are now likely to exceed previous expectations. However, it is equally apparent that the 'supply' of development opportunities to meet the increased 'demand' is reducing. There are a number of components to the contraction in supply, including:

-Introduction of the city-wide article 4 Direction restricting HMO growth, which will significantly impact upon the availability of student accommodation to meet the increased demand.

-Contraction in the available development area at the main Claverton campus through the introduction of a 'clear zone' in which development will be restricted, and which is effectively a cordon sanitaire reducing the extent of the development area excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for development under Policy GD.1/B11 of the Bath and North-East Somerset Local Plan.

- Introduction in the emerging policy framework of a raft of environmental policies with which on campus development must comply.
- Exclusion in Policy B5 of not only further purpose-built student accommodation, but now also teaching space, from both the Central Area and Enterprise Zone, and therefore from many of the key development sites in the city that could contribute to their delivery.

The emerging policy framework is surprising, and indeed of considerable concern, in terms of the apparent lack of priority given to accommodating the requirements of the University. The tenor of Policy B5, and the reasoned justification by which it is supported, is that accommodating the growth requirements of the University is subordinate to other development requirements and environmental protection, and will only be accommodated where it does not interfere with other priorities. Given the importance of the University to the local economy, and its central role in delivering the economic strategy of the Plan, not least in terms of growth in the knowledge-based sector, that is considered render the Plan unsound since it would be contrary to each of the soundness criteria set out at paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Policy B5 therefore requires fundamental amendment since, as currently worded, it fails to Plan for meeting in full the objectively assessed needs of the Universities. Since those institutions are central to the economic strategy of the Plan, the Plan is unsound in consequence. It would also be contrary to national policy in the NPPF, a core planning principle of which is to "... proactively drive and support sustainable economic development" through making every effort to objectively "... identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth" (para. 17).

It is simply not an option, as implied in Policy B5, to put a brake on the further growth of one of the jewel's in the city's economic crowns, and that is of much wider national, and increasingly international, importance for its teaching, research and business capabilities and expertise. The fact that the policy framework indicates that could be a consequence, indicates that the importance of the University has not been properly weighed in the balance against environmental constraints and other development requirements.

Policy B5 therefore requires material amendment, and consequential amendments are also required to other policies. The Plan is currently unsound when tested against all four of the soundness criteria in consequences of the flaws in Policy B5.

Q5 Change Requested

Policy B5 requires material amendments to remove the restriction on off-campusn student and teaching accommodation. The reasoned justification also requires amendment to make it clear that meeting the objectively assessed growth requirements is an imperative, is subordinate to neither environmental constraints nor other development needs, and the Plan will facilitate the continued growth of the Universities, if necessary through further release of Green Belt land. Consequential amendments may also be required to other policies of the Plan.

11 May 2016 Page 797 of 956

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: 7123 Comment Number: 3 Name: Organisation: CMBI Ltd Agent Name: Tom Rock Agent Organisation: ocke Associates 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy B5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The University of Bath is one of the key drivers of the local economy in terms of direct employment. The indirect impact is also very substantial indeed in terms of the service industries and businesses that it supports, including the attraction of knowledge-based businesses the enhancement of which is central to the economic strategy of the Core Strategy. Moreover, through its involvement in contract research for some of the most important companies in the UK, and internationally, the University contributes directly to developing the knowledge-based economy in the city. It is therefore absolutely imperative that the Plan makes sufficient provision for meeting the objectively assessed needs for both academic and student accommodation.

It is acknowledged in the Plan that the University's growth, and associated development requirements, are now likely to exceed previous expectations. However, it is equally apparent that the 'supply' of development opportunities to meet the increased 'demand' is reducing. There are a number of components to the contraction in supply, including:

- Introduction of the city-wide article 4 Direction restricting HMO growth, which will significantly impact upon the availability of student accommodation to meet the increased demand.
- Contraction in the available development area at the main Claverton campus through the introduction of a 'clear zone' in which development will be restricted, and which is effectively a cordon sanitaire reducing the extent of the development area excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for development under Policy GD.1/B11 of the Bath and North-East Somerset Local Plan.
- Introduction in the emerging policy framework of a raft of environmental policies with which on campus development must comply.
- Exclusion in Policy B5 of not only further purpose-built student accommodation, but now also teaching space, from both the Central Area and Enterprise Zone, and therefore from many of the key development sites in the city that could contribute to their delivery.

The emerging policy framework is surprising, and indeed of considerable concern, in terms of the apparent lack of priority given to accommodating the requirements of the University. The tenor of Policy B5, and the reasoned justification by which it is supported, is that accommodating the growth requirements of the University is subordinate to other development requirements and environmental protection, and will only be accommodated where it does not

11 Mav 2016 Page 798 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

interfere with other priorities. Given the importance of the University to the local economy, and its central role in delivering the economic strategy of the Plan, not least in terms of growth in the knowledge-based sector, that is considered render the Plan unsound since it would be contrary to each of the soundness criteria set out at paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Policy B5 therefore requires fundamental amendment since, as currently worded, it fails to Plan for meeting in full the objectively assessed needs of the Universities. Since those institutions are central to the economic strategy of the Plan, the Plan is unsound in consequence. It would also be contrary to national policy in the NPPF, a core planning principle of which is to "... proactively drive and support sustainable economic development" through making every effort to objectively "... identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth" (para. 17).

It is simply not an option, as implied in Policy B5, to put a brake on the further growth of one of the jewel's in the city's economic crowns, and that is of much wider national, and increasingly international, importance for its teaching, research and business capabilities and expertise. The fact that the policy framework indicates that could be a consequence, indicates that the importance of the University has not been properly weighed in the balance against environmental constraints and other development requirements.

Policy B5 therefore requires material amendment, and consequential amendments are also required to other policies (for example Policy SB1). The Plan is currently unsound when tested against all four of the soundness criteria in consequences of the flaws in Policy B5.

Q5 Change Requested

Policy B5 requires material amendments to remove the restriction on off-campus student and teaching accommodation. The reasoned justification also requires amendment to make it clear that meeting the objectively assessed growth requirements is an imperative, is subordinate to neither environmental constraints nor other development needs, and the Plan will facilitate the continued growth of the Universities, if necessary through further release of Green Belt land. Consequential amendments may also be required to other policies of the Plan.

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

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

Respondent Number: 322	Comment Number: 3			
Name: Rob Armstrong-Haworth	Org	ganisation: Bath Spa	University	
Agent Name:	Age	ent Organisation:		
Further Information available in t	he original comment?	No Attach	nments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the	e document is legally com	npliant? (Tick if indic	ated 'yes') 🗹	
Does the respondent consider the	document is sound?	No		
If the respondent considers the D	raft Placemaking Plan is (unsound, is it becaus	se it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸	Not Justified 🗸	Not Consisten 🗸	Not Effective ✓	
The control of the co	Della De	ette pe		
The representation relates to: Vol	ume 2 Bath , Po	olicy B5		

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SB20

CBRE is instructed, on behalf of Bath Spa University (hereafter referred to as 'BSU'), to submit representations to the Bath & North East Somerset ('B&NES') draft Placemaking Plan, which is currently open for consultation until 3rd February 2016.

11 Mav 2016 Page 799 of 956

BSU is a key stakeholder in Bath and the region, and welcome the opportunity to work proactively with B&NES going forward to establish a comprehensive approach to BSU's estate strategy and space requirements.

BSU have engaged with B&NES previously on general estate strategy and on a site-specific basis, and currently has a pending application for the change of use of the Herman Miller Building to D1 academic use, to allow the Bath School of Art and Design to relocate to this location (reference: 15/04810/FUL).

Background

Bath Spa University is a leading University in the South West, recognised for its teaching and research excellence. It offers a range of pre-degree, university and postgraduate degree programmes, focused primarily on arts and humanities subjects. In 2015, BSU celebrated 10 years since gaining full university status, with its history in the city dating back over 160 years.

The University currently has a core 1 of c. 6,300 students within Bath and its surrounding areas, across its five areas of study:

- Art and Design;
- Education;
- Humanities and Cultural Industries
- Music and Performing Arts;
- Society, Enterprise and Environment.

A Research and Graduate College operates across all disciplines.

Supporting this academic base are 770 full time equivalent employees (FTE) in teaching and supporting functions. For the 2015/16 academic year alone, employee numbers have increased by c.50 FTEs.

The University has strong links and partnerships with surrounding businesses, communities and schools. In addition to providing a highly skilled workforce, it is a source of entrepreneurialism and indirect benefits through its multiplier effects.

In late 2015, Oxford Economics was commissioned by BSU to undertake research into BSU's contribution to employment and economic benefits in the local area. This Report was submitted in support of the Herman Miller change of use application, and is submitted now as additional evidence for B&NES' consideration. This report demonstrates the wider economic impact that BSU have within the City and region. Key figures highlight that:

- In 2014/15, BSU had a total economic impact, comprised of direct, indirect and induced expenditure channels, of £51.8 million, supporting one in every 91 jobs in B&NES.
- In addition to this, BSU (including its students and visitors), when assessed support one in every 49 jobs in B&NES, supporting a GVA contribution of £94million to B&NES' economy, equivalent to 2% of the local economy.
- Long-term value is added by degree-educated workers thus giving them an increase in earning capacity/potential and overall contribution to the region's GDV.
- BSU is an importer of talent, retaining 17% of graduates who go on to find employment in B&NES.

BSU's significant contribution to the B&NES economy and employment market is clear. However, the draft Placemaking Plan fails to recognise the multiplier benefits of higher education and the University and offers no opportunity for BSU's continued success and managed growth in line with its robust projections.

We consider that the draft Plan goes so far as to offer protection and priority to other land uses, that it is prejudice against higher education and associated uses. The draft Plan should be reviewed so that due weight is offered to the economic contribution and benefits of higher education uses as to traditional employment (B class) uses.

In this context, BSU has identified a number of specific policy areas it would like to comment on, as well as clarifications

11 Mav 2016 Page 800 of 956

to make to relevant evidence base.

Student Projections

BSU has engaged with B&NES on a number of occasions to discuss their growth and associated estates strategy which has resulted from wider UK Government Policy changes on higher education and the higher education market. BSU welcomes that the draft Placemaking Plan's recognises the changing needs of the City's universities since the Core Strategy was adopted (2014).

B&NES has prepared a 'Historic and Future Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements in Bath' Report (December 2015) which forms part of the evidence base (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) informing the draft policies.

BSU has been approached to provide clarification of their student numbers and accommodation requirements in a particular format to enable B&NES to ensure their evidence base is robust and up to date. The information requested has been sent to B&NES previously, and will be updated and submitted in due course where necessary responding to recent questions received from Officers further to their review of the information provided.

B&NES' evidence base document was prepared ahead of receipt of this information from BSU and consequently contains a number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies as various assumptions have been made. In addition to the student numbers and accommodation requirements information requested, we therefore also enclose a schedule of comments and clarifications on the evidence base

document. BSU met with B&NES to discuss this information.

Whilst BSU has welcomed the engagement with B&NES Planning Policy Team, it is considered that this retrospective approach to policy making, whereby policy is drafted ahead of preparation of a robust and up to date evidence base is inconsistent with the NPPF 'positively prepared' test of soundness. As explained later in this representation, we consider that owing to the inaccuracies and inconsistencies within the current evidence base, the policy position which emerges from this evidence should also be reviewed.

B&NES' evidence base sets out a requirement for c. 1,500 to 2,100 (although the number has been quoted much higher, in excess of 3500, on occasion 2) additional bedspaces by 2020/21 3; BSU's own figures indicate this figure is actually 1,100 (excluding HMO assumptions). 4 This projected excess demand is significantly lower than B&NES' previous assumptions and therefore should be considered when assessing the policy approach and meeting BSU's need. It should also be noted that unlike other similar institutions BSU is able to demonstrate that a number of students do live at home, hence a reduction in dependency on designated student housing.

It should be noted that BSU as an institution operates within a different model to the University of Bath. A number of purpose-built student bedspaces have been delivered in recent years, on campus at Newton Park and also off campus through the use of Twerton Mill; in addition Green Park House will come on line in 2016. These developments enable BSU to meet student growth and demand, which has reduced pressure on HMOs. It is BSU's preferred strategy that growth is met through their own purpose-built development both on-campus and off-campus in the wider district, to ensure better quality and management of student accommodation, for the benefit of its students and the surrounding communities. Whilst it is acknowledged that HMOs constitute part of the student housing market, it would not be robust to rely solely on HMOs to meet BSU's projected need. Therefore, planning to meet student growth in a managed way through the development plan process is BSU's preferred approach.

The National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') sets out the tests against which Local Plans should be prepared and assessed.

NPPF 15 – 'Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development

11 Mav 2016 Page 801 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.'

NPPF 182 – 'The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

- Positively prepared—the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.'

It is against these categories that we have assessed policies in the draft Placemaking Plan, as this is what makes the document 'sound'.

POLICY ON BATH'S UNIVERSITIES

Draft Placemaking Plan (draft Plan Para 211 Onwards)

As abovementioned, the draft Placemaking Plan's recognition of the changing requirements of the City's universities following the adoption of the Core Strategy is welcomed. BSU's growth needs are set out in detail in the appended data on student numbers and should replace the current evidence base. BSU has engaged with B&NES on a number of occasions to discuss how the student number requirements translate into the University's Estates Strategy and their short, medium and long term requirements for carefully managed growth. This is given the context that future University growth at Newton Park is restrained under the existing policy framework and leasehold arrangements – meaning the University is looking for alternative sites to meet their needs. Despite this engagement, BSU has not been met with a willingness to discuss strategic options, clearly demonstrating B&NES' intention to not provide for growth of academic facilities or student accommodation.

This is reflected in the draft Placemaking Plan which does not take universities needs into consideration: 'there is no land within the city ('city' does not include on-campus land) to enable the aspirations of the Universities (even if these were curtailed somewhat) without significant negative effects on other priorities. 5'

With regard specifically to BSU's ambitions the draft Plan states that:

'No site specific deliverable solutions to enable further increases in housing supply specifically for BSU can be identified in the Development Plan at this time.' 6

Moreover, the proposed amendments to existing Core Strategy Policy B5 ('Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities') further restrict any BSU off-campus developments in the City (the amendments are highlighted in bold below):

- Proposals for off-campus student accommodation or teaching space will be refused within the central area and enterprise area where this would adversely affect the realisation of the vision of the spatial strategy in relation to for delivering housing, and economic development (in respect of office and retail space).

These draft Core Strategy amendments are considered to be internally contradictory - the first point on overall approach seeks to enable, as far as possible, the aims of the Universities to be met, within the balance of sustainability and the demands of development requirements in the city, however, the final point actively seeks to refuse development within the central and enterprise area for both student accommodation and academic space, where this would adversely affect

11 May 2016 Page 802 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

the realisation of delivering other land uses. Whilst the point on student accommodation is already within the Core Strategy, the specific reference to teaching space has been added, and therefore creates further restriction to University growth.

Furthermore the amended Core Strategy text states:

'Whilst a number of in-city accommodation blocks have been permitted... further supply must be controlled in specific parts of the city where necessary, otherwise the housing, affordable housing and economic strategies will not be deliverable. This also applies to teaching space.'7

Taken individually and together the proposed draft Placemaking Plan and amendments to the Core Strategy are contradictory to the 'positively prepared' test of NPPF Para 182 as it fails to find solutions for the identified need.

The proposed amendments to the Core Strategy, alongside the draft Placemaking Plan, essentially sets out that university development is the lowest priority land use in the City. This is unjustified and unsound. We do appreciate the pressure for development in the City Centre, but feel that the University's contribution to economic activities has not been recognised in the Placemaking Plan.

The policy makes no acknowledgement of the wider economic and community benefits of Bath's universities in terms of direct and indirect job creation, economic output, links with industry, graduate retention and other significant economic-generating activities. The economic contribution of BSU is highlighted at the beginning of this letter and quantified with the Oxford Economic Report (appended).

Furthermore, this approach is considered contradictory to the purpose and function NPPF Para 22 which seeks to prevent the long-term retention of land for economic uses where there is no reasonable prospect of the future use of the land for that purpose. The draft Placemaking Plan policy is considered to be more restrictive than and therefore inconsistent with the Para 22. Case law entrenches this position, in DB Schenker Rail (UK) v Leeds City Council [2013] EWHC 2865 (Admin), Her Honour Judge Belcher stated that:

'NPPF 22 read as a whole clearly covers both the need to prevent long term protection of sites where there is no reasonable prospect of the allocated use coming forwards and the need for applications for alternative uses to be assessed where there is no reasonable prospect of the allocated use coming forward.' [54]

The draft policy is not positive, rather seeks to add unwarranted protection to other uses as a preference to any type of university development.

The Development Plan period is 15 years therefore restricting BSU's growth requirements for the next five years but with the potential to have significantly longer implication on the positive growth and planning of the University. It does not allow sufficient flexibility for University development, yet safeguards land for the next 15 years without a flexible approach to allow release of this for changes in market conditions.

The proposal by B&NES that universities may rely on windfall or unallocated sites (to be assessed through the development management process as per amendments to Core Strategy Policy B5) is not a robust solution for a key growing sector; particularly as the draft Plan also states that 'the scope for windfall potential is limited.'

On that basis, the draft Plan also fails to accord within the 'justified' test of NPPF Para 182 in failing to consider reasonable alternatives to meet the universities' requirements.

Following the Bath City Forum, can I suggest that where possible the wider planning team monitor developments with the Green Paper for Higher Education, the changing nature of teacher education (and models of delivery) and immigration issues relating to international students. All three of these areas can easily change the way in which UK universities plan for the future.

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?

Reserve position should we be required to support BSU's position in the city.

11 May 2016 Page 804 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Para 254

Respondent Number: 6532 Comment Number: 1 Name: Richard Luetchford Organisation: 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective □				
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Para 254 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Volume 2 (Bath), paras. 254-271, including Policy SB19 (University of Bath), mention of Beech Avenue and/or the tennis courts at para.255 and Policy SB19 General Development Principle (o). Specifically, it defines the outdoor tennis courts behind Beech Avenue properties (part of the Cotswolds AONB but no longer within the Green belt) as an area "where university-related development is acceptable in principle" (para.255) and 'this should be guided by the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan where relevant'. It also states "The Tennis Courts on Norwood Avenue, if redeveloped, are only suitable for development of a height and use that respects and is compatible with the amenity of residential properties on Beech Avenue. That amenity does not include the maintenance of residents' views from Beech Avenue over the AONB as this is not a material planning consideration."				
These statements are not positively prepared, are not justified, and are not consistent with national policy. The last of these statements gives no reason why residents views' over the AONB status of this land should not be maintained, so this statement is simply not justified and in prepositioning the Plan to deny residents' views on a specific issue cannot be consistent with national policy. The statements are also not positively prepared. The Plan contains no evidence that prior consultation with the Cotswold AONB Board has taken place over the potential impact of university development on this land. This aspect of the Plan therefore fails to establish whether there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of university development here. Lack of consultation and due process and evidence of assessment whether EIA regulations apply may also mean these statements are also not legally compliant.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Statements within Plan referred to in Q4 above should be deleted				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				

11 May 2016 Page 805 of 956

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

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: SB19 (site map)

Respondent Number:	7237 Commer	nt Number:	2			
Name: Chris Beezley		0	rganisation: Be	eech Avenue I	Residents' Association	
Agent Name:		A	gent Organisati	ion:		
Further Information availa	able in the origina	I comment?	No	Attachments	sent with the comment	? Yes
Does the respondent cons	sider the docume	nt is legally co	mpliant? (Tick	if indicated 'y	es') 🗸	
Does the respondent cons	sider the docume	nt is sound?	No			
If the respondent conside	rs the Draft Place	making Plan is	s unsound, is it	because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	Not Just	ified 🗹	Not Consist	ten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relates	to: Volume 2	Bath , s	SB19 (site map))		
The Site Reference (if appli	cable) is:					

Q4 Soundness Comment

Policy SB19 is one of numerous occurrences (also paras.221, 236, 249, 257, 261, 263, 264, 265,271) where the Placemaking Plan proposes that the substantive solution to providing accommodation for future University of Bath students lies in building accommodation on land within the University of Bath campus that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007. This land continues to enjoy full AONB status.

The National Planning Policy Framework (paras.115 . 116) confirms that great weight and the highest protection should be afforded to the characteristics of AONBs, that planning permission for major development should normally be refused and that scope for developing elsewhere should be assessed.

The proposals set out in the PMP do none of these things and the PMP is therefore considered unsound, not complying with National policy and not being positively prepared.

Supplementary information is provided demonstrating that the predicted future numbers of students and their accommodation requirements are fundamentally flawed being out-of-date, and that a more credible future numbers scenario, reflecting latest university policies, could easily be accommodated without the need for ANY provision of student accommodation on sensitive areas of the campus removed from the Green Belt.

The PMP is therefore considered unsound on the basis that it is not justified, not proposing the most appropriate strategy considered against a reasonable alternative.

Q5 Change Requested

- 1.Reissue the PMP with up-to-date student numbers and accommodation requirements (as required by NPPF para.15 soundness test: Positively Prepared) and apply the analysis above to agreed forecasts.
- 2.Include in the PMP the clear requirement that, due to the uniqueness of part of the campus being protected by AONB and/or Green Belt designations, no further development will be considered in those designated areas, in line with NPPF para.115, until it has been demonstrated that there is no further capacity, including intensification and decked parking (Policy SB19 General Development Principle (h)) within the non-AONB campus (Compliance with National policy).
- 3.Remove all suggestions of utilising those areas of the campus removed from thGreen Belt (but remaining in the Cotswolds AONB) as being appropriate for future development of student accommodation, e.g. in paras. 221, 236, 249, 257, 261, 263, 264, 265, 271 & Policy SB19 since the above analysis proves this not to be necessary, considered against a reasonable alternative (NPPF soundness test: Justified).

11 Mav 2016 Page 806 of 956

4.Include in the PMP what other alternatives may exist for future university expansion across te District or beyond (e.g. Bristol & Bath Science Park, Emersons Green, Bristol). (Compliance with NPPF para.116).

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?

BARA stands ready to participate at the oral examination should the Inspector consider it necessary.

Respondent Number:	7237	Comment Number:	1			
Name: Chris Beezley Organisation: Beech Avenue Residents' Association						
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:						
Further Information ava	ilable in t	the original comment?	No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is legally o	compliant? (Ti	ick if indicated	d 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is sound?	No			
If the respondent consid	ders the D	Praft Placemaking Plan	is unsound, is	s it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared	✓	Not Justified 🗹	Not Con	sisten 🗸	Not Effective	
The representation relate	es to: Vo	lume 2 Bath ,	SB19 (site m	ap)		

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SB19

In preference to a solution involving significant expansion of the number of HMOs and/or accommodation blocks in the city, the Placemaking Plan (PMP) repeatedly proposes (paras.221, 236, 249, 257, 261, 263, 264, 265, 271 andolicy SB19) that future demand for University of Bath student accommodation be mainly satisfied by developing areas of the Claverton Down campus that were controversially removed from the Green Belt in 2007. These are the two purple hatched zones on page 125.

Notwithstanding the fact that at that time, the Inspector of the B&NES' Local Plan considered (para.257) that neither of these areas 'exhibit the classic qualities of the AONB' (due mainly to 'creep' resulting from the granting of previously-challenged planning permissions), the fact remains that both purple hatched zones remain within the Cotswolds AONB and therefore enjoy full AONB protection.

Policy SB19 claims the purple hatched zones, to be areas 'where university-related development is acceptable in principle' (p.127).

The starting point for considering the potential for land within an AONB to accommodate new development should be that in terms of the legal protection afforded to the AONB through Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000, any "major development" (as defined by the NPPF) is unlikely to meet the requirements of conserving and enhancing the AONB and therefore may be contrary to the original purpose of designation of this part of the AONB. Beech Avenue Residents' Association (BARA) considers student residential accommodation and/or academic space to constitute 'major development'. Further, the NPPF (para.115) confirms that 'great weight should be given to conserving the characteristics of AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

National policy thus gives the characteristics of AONBs a particularly enhanced status.

The NPPF (para.116) further states that consideration of planning applications for major developments within an AONB should include an assessment of scope for developing elsewhere outside the AONB or meeting the need in some other way. 'Other ways' in this context include intensifying the existing developed campus and/or providing accommodation elsewhere in the District, neither of which is considered in the PMP, thus rendering it unjustified.

11 Mav 2016 Page 807 of 956

BARA therefore considers that the proposed use of land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007 (the purple hatched areas on p.125) renders the PMP unsound, being unjustified and conflicting with National Policy.

Notwithstanding the above, Policy SB19 (p.127) acknowledges that any development in the purple hatched zones should be guided by the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan.

Objectives of the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan (see Note (1)) include:

- -provide havens of tranquillity of value to residents;
- -provide nature conservation initiatives; and
- -showcase the wildlife benefits provided by the area

In respect of the first bullet, BARA finds it difficult to understand how building student residences on the purple hatched areas could contribute to 'a haven of tranquillity', particularly for residents of adjacent Beech Avenue.

In respect of the 2nd and 3rd bullets, both purple hatched areas are known by local residents to be foraging areas for bats, acknowledged in the PMP at para.255:

-'notable ecological issues relate to the University's location close to the Bath and Bradford on Avon Bat SAC. Bushey Norwood (to the east) provides very important foraging for bats of many species, including those protected by the SAC designation, and bats use routes around the university's perimeter'.

The Cotswolds AONB Management Plan also cites under 'Main Threats facing the CAONB' concerns that tranquillity is under pressure from increasing noise, light and traffic, all of which would increase with university development of the type envisaged in the PMP.

BARA therefore considers that the proposed use of land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007 (the purple hatched areas on p.125) conflicts with the PMP's stated intention to be guided by the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan. The PMP is therefore considered unsound, not being Positively Prepared.

The University of Bath should be encouraged to find novel ways of intensifying the existing built (i.e. non-AONB) areas of the campus, for example by the use of decked car parking (in line with General Development Principle (h) of Policy SB19), by intensifying areas of older student accommodation (particularly near the northern campus boundary) and/or utilising areas of the self-styled 'Green Zone' (p.127) which enjoys no national designations, such as Green Belt or AONB. Note (1): http://www.cotswoldsaonb.org.uk/?page=ManagementPlan

Q5 Change Requested

Notwithstanding the arguments presented as to why Beech Avenue Residents' Association (BARA) considers development of the type proposed to be inappropriate within an AONB, if the University of Bath feels capable of addressing all the NPPF and CroW Act (2000) tests and can prove exceptional circumstances, there is no need for any specific zoning. Proposals can simply be addressed on an application-by-application basis. (Consistent with National Policy, Justified)

BARA therefore recommends deletion of the hatched Purple Zones in Policy SB19 as having development potential of the types proposed as they otherwise offer an unrealistic possibility of gaining planning permission in terms of AONB protection (let alone consideration of other factors including traffic, loss of playing fields, etc). (Consistent with National Policy, Positively Prepared, Justified).

Does the Respondent	wich to narticina	to at the Evamination	o (ticked if ves)?	
DOES THE DESPONDED	. WISH LU DAI LICIDA	ie al liie Examination	I LUCKEU II VESTI	

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

Beech Avenue Residents' Association stands ready to participate at the oral examination if the Inspector considers it necessary.

11 Mav 2016 Page 808 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Part: Policy SB19 Volume: 2, Bath Respondent Number: 262 Comment Number: Name: Justin Milward Organisation: Woodland Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB19 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment Increased 'floorspace' for university academic or research buildings or student accommodation. Ancient Tree (Ash) at ST7800964259. Adjacent - at less than 20 metres distance. Q5 Change Requested This ancient tree should be specifically protected in accordance with Policy N6 and national planning policy. Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination? Respondent Number: 304 Comment Number: 24 Name: Organisation: University of Bath Agent Name: Mark Rose Agent Organisation: Define Planning & Design Ltd Attachments sent with the comment? Further Information available in the original comment? No Yes Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') **V** 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 Consisten **✓** Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB19 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 809 of 956

The following is a summary of the objection and should be read in conjunction with the full objection (as attached ref.

Q4 Soundness Comment

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

UoB Rep to PMP Policy SB19 and Appendices 1 and 2):

The University of Bath (the University) is a major driver of social mobility, opportunity and economic growth and in the City and District. The Place Making Plan (PMP) should play a critical role in supporting its continued success and sustainable growth through the provision of a positive planning policy context that allows the expedient determination of future planning applications for key investments planned for the campus, and to realise potential off campus development opportunities to meet identified needs.

However, Policy SB19 does not provide that positive planning framework. The University objects to the policy, which is considered unsound on the basis that it:

-has not been positively prepared and does not seek to meet development and infrastructure requirements arising from the growth of the University;

-is not effective in that restricting the sustainable growth of the University will not allow the PMP's own strategic objectives to be realised; and

-is inconsistent with national policy in that it does not reflect the Government's Higher Education priorities and policies, and seeks to limit University related sustainable development.

Q5 Change Requested

Add

"The University of Bath: Claverton Campus & Sulis Club

The on-going operation and sustainable growth of the University of Bath in the city is supported. The further development of the Claverton Campus and the Sulis Club is proposed in order to enable the provision of replacement and additional teaching, research and related support space, student residences and associated infrastructure in the context of the Development Framework embedded in this policy.

The Development Framework establishes key development parameters and principles to guide the determination of planning applications. It seeks to optimise the development capacity of the campus within the context of the environmental constraints so that the University's minimum development requirement of an additional 57,000m2 of non residential floorspace can be substantially met.

As well as the specific matters set out below, the associated socio-economic benefits of the University's activities and associated development will be taken into account in the determination of future planning applications for the development of the campus."

Policy Zones

Purple Zones – Delete text after "is supported in principle".

Purple Zones (hatched) – Delete text after "is also accepted in principle". Add "subject to compliance with the following policy clauses" and add cross references.

Clear Zones- Add text after first sentence "unless it can be demonstrated that the specific development proposals would not unacceptably harm the overall GI function of the area".

General Development Principles

- a. Delete text after academic space. Add "and related support space, student residences and associated infrastructure."
- b. Delete text after first sentence.
- C. Revise to state: "Where development is likely to affect the significance of, it will be assessed to determine the degree to which is does so and great weight will be given to the asset's conservation. Any harm that would occur will be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal"
- d. Delete text after "mitigation measures".
- E. Delete clause.
- F. Delete text and replace with "The University will continue to implement its Masterplan proposals and Strategic

11 Mav 2016 Page 810 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Landscape and Ecological Management Plan for the enhancement of the Green Infrastructure within the campus. They will be updated periodically as part of a campus wide strategy. New development proposals should identify how Green Infrastructure assets within and around the development site have been addressed, any harm minimised / mitigated against, and where appropriate enhanced or localised green infrastructure linkages provided.

G. Delete text and replace with "The University will continue to implement its Travel Plan and car parking strategy. They will be monitored annually and updated periodically. The need for additional public transport, footway and cycleway infrastructure and car parking in association with the future development of the eastern sports pitches, tennis courts and Sulis Club will be assessed and provided as necessary as part of a campus wide strategy.

F. Delete clause.

i. Add "the loss of sports pitches can be compensated for through the provision of 3G pitches elsewhere in the campus, potentially on St Johns Field subject to NPPF policy.

Area Specific Development Principles

- I. Delete third sentence.
- N. Delete text after "residential amenity of properties to the south."
- p. Delete text and replace with: "The proposed development on the eastern playing fields should pay special regard to the potential impact on the wider AONB outside of the campus, the importance of maintaining GI linkages in this part of the campus, their potential need for ecological mitigation, notably in relation to the protection of bats, and the potential impact of lighting. An appropriate landscape scheme that addresses these matters will be provided with any development proposals."

Other Matters to be Addressed

q. Delete

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?

These are fundamental matters that underpin the soundness of the PMP and require detailed discussion at the examination with the University.

Respondent Number: 2723 Comment Number	·: 17		
Name: Matt Humberstone	Organisation:	University of Bath Students' Union	
Agent Name:	Agent Organisa	ation:	
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Tic	k if indicated 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	l? No		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared 🗸 Not Justified 🗸	Not Consi	isten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath	, Policy SB19		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	·		
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Some of the areas marked for development in the Univ	ersity of Bath ma	asterplan (2014 update) haven't been fully	

Q5 Change Requested

The sites allocated should be fully assessed both in terms of what could be developed (building height, size etc.) and the impact that the development would have on the student experience and the local community that also use these

assessed as to whether they would be suitable for development and would also take away important community facilities

11 Mav 2016 Page 811 of 956

facilities
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?
There is significant concern that some proposed developments on campus could have a detrimental impact on the student experience
Respondent Number: 2919 Comment Number: 6
Name: Dr David Martin Organisation:
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The University of Bath Masterplan document, updated in 2014, proposes that there is scope for 2,400 additional bedrooms to be built on campus. 700 of these have now been completed, and there is therefore, capacity for 1,700 further bedrooms. Along with other public discussions during the consultation period, it seems likely that all of the UoB's revised future student accommodation requirements can be met within a modestly intensified core campus, comprising the solid purple zone on the map on page 125. It is not justfied, therefore, to proposed that there is a need for building student accommodation on land removed from the Green Belt shown as hatched purple zones on page 125.
Q5 Change Requested
In view of the sensitivity of building on the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the plan should identify and analyse how intensifying the core campus for student accommodation can be achieved. This will then be consistent with National Policy by examining other viable options before any proposals to build on land that was removed from the Green Belt in 2007, and would make the Placemaking Plan sound. The analysis should take into account the UoB's revised future growth plans and the resulting need for student accommodation, because the UoB now expect to stabilise undergraduate numbers and increase postgraduate teaching.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 4679 Comment Number: 1
Name: Martyn Stutchbury Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 812 of 956

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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB19 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy SB19 Claverton Campus, and accompanying text, should make clear that the development areas will take account of the relationship of adjoining residential areas and any development proposals will respond to the relationship in terms of building height, location, orientation and use.
Q5 Change Requested
A landcape buffer area should be included in the Policy at this stage.
A development Brief should be considered as part of this process
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Despendent Numbers 4767 Comment Numbers 4
Respondent Number 4767 Comment Number 4
Respondent Number: 4767 Comment Number: 4 Name: Mark Funnell Organisation: National Trust
Name: Mark Funnell Organisation: National Trust
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Organisation:
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Organisation:
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Organisation:
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: National Trust 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')
Name: Mark Funnell 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
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: National Trust 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):
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: National Trust 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):
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: National Trust Agent Name: 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
Name: Mark Funnell Agent Name: Agent Organisation: National Trust Agent Name: 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 2 Bath , Policy SB19
Name: Mark Funnell 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB19 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

The National Trust owns 27 hectares of land at Bushey Norwood, Claverton Down. This land is part of the Trust's Bath Skyline landholding in the south eastern part of the city, and indeed forms part of the circular Skyline walk. It lies within both the Cotswolds AONB and the Green Belt, and is also important for nature conservation, including being an area for foraging bats. The Trust has a statutory duty under the National Trust Acts to promote the conservation of places of historic interest and natural beauty.

The draft Placemaking Plan policy SB19 – along with its accompanying text and maps – states that on AONB land north of The Avenue (and adjacent Bushey Norwood), and land east of Norwood Avenue, university related development would be acceptable in principle. It recommends an outline planning application north of The Avenue and requires that this shows how "any negative AONB and SAC will be moderated", and also that any visual impacts should be "moderated". It also refers to a landscape-led approach and that development should be guided "in part" by the AONB Management Plan.

11 Mav 2016 Page 813 of 956

It is questioned whether this approach – which could potentially lead to significant development including new student accommodation being proposed in the AONB next to Bushey Norwood – is an appropriate strategy that is consistent with the achievement of sustainable development and complies with the following:

- -the "great weight" that should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs (NPPF para 115);
- -for any major development... the relevant tests (NPPF para 116); and
- -the aim to conserve and enhance on biodiversity (NPPF para. 117 and 118)

Q5 Change Requested

More weight needs to be given to the status and policies associated with the AONB designation, and the draft policy and accompanying text altered accordingly. With the land north of The Avenue it could be stated that: "this land may have potential for some university related development subject to detailed assessments and compliance with national and local policies, in particular those relating to AONBs and the natural environment". It should not encourage an outline planning application which simply attempts to "moderate" the negative impacts, but should encourage the university to explore alternatives and consider various options before proposing any development that may harm the natural environment.

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 reiterate our concerns should we feel that more than a written submission is necessary.

Respondent Number: 6467 Comment Number:	2
Name: Simon Barnes O	rganisation:
Agent Name: Ag	gent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally consider the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	No
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , If The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Policy SB19

Q4 Soundness Comment

I was unable to view the diagram on page 125 in sufficient detail on my home computer to see precisely which parts of the undeveloped green areas at the northern edge of the campus were designated as clear zones. However, it would appear that the areas of green space between the developed part of the campus and its northern boundary with the golf course/Bathampton Camp monument are all clear zones. If not then they should be for the reasons which follow.

The green space on the northern boundary of the campus is vital both for wildlife such as bats of the SAC, and for people. Students and children from Westwood nursery use these areas for recreation all year round and it should be protected from any development. I submit that it should be designated as Local Green Space because it meets the criteria in the NPPF. Specifically, it lies in close proximity to the student and local communities of Woodland Grove, Copseland etc. It is demonstrably special as the objections to the recently refused planning application for a surface level car park (14/05793/FUL) show, it is an important foraging area for bats of the SAC, has been recognised by Historic England as important to the setting of the Bathampton Camp SAM (see their comments on the car park application) and borders the AONB and the Skyline walk. It is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. In short, it is eminently suitable for designation as Local Green Space.

11 Mav 2016 Page 814 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

Specific Development Principles on page 129 that the land is important Green Infrastructure and must remain undeveloped - the recent car park application shows that pressure to expand the University makes it vulnerable to development proposals.
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: 6532 Comment Number: 2 Name: Richard Luetchford Organisation: 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB19 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment Volume 2 (Bath), paras. 254-271, including Policy SB19 (University of Bath), mention of Beech Avenue and/or the tennis courts at para.255 and Policy SB19 General Development Principle (o). Specifically, it defines the outdoor tennis courts behind Beech Avenue properties (part of the Cotswolds AONB but no longer within the Green belt) as an area "where university-related development is acceptable in principle" (para.255) and 'this should be guided by the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan where relevant'. It also states
"The Tennis Courts on Norwood Avenue, if redeveloped, are only suitable for development of a height and use that respects and is compatible with the amenity of residential properties on Beech Avenue. That amenity does not include the maintenance of residents' views from Beech Avenue over the AONB as this is not a material planning consideration." These statements are not positively prepared, are not justified, and are not consistent with national policy. The last of these statements gives no reason why residents views' over the AONB status of this land should not be maintained, so this statement is simply not justified and in prepositioning the Plan to deny residents' views on a specific issue cannot be consistent with national policy. The statements are also not positively prepared. The Plan contains no evidence that prior consultation with the Cotswold AONB Board has taken place over the potential impact of university development on this land. This aspect of the Plan therefore fails to establish whether there are adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of university development here. Lack of consultation and due process and evidence of assessment whether EIA regulations apply may also mean these statements are also not legally compliant.
Q5 Change Requested
Statements within Plan referred to in Q4 above should be deleted Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

11 May 2016 Page 815 of 956

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

Respondent Number: 6580 Comment Number: 8 Name: Andrew Lord Organisation: Cotsy Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	wolds Conservation Board
Further Information available in the original comment? No Att	tachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if in Does the respondent consider the document is sound? No If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because the property of the proper	
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ☐ Not Consisten	,
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB19 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Policy SB19 University of Bath at Claverton Down Background: The Cotswolds Conservation Board notes that the Plan includes Yellow Zones nationally designated AONB, which have been identified as areas where pote is also the potential for development outside but within the setting of the AC Down.	entially new development could occur. There DNB at the University of Bath at Claverton
The ability of two of the yellow zones (St John's Field and Lime Kiln Field) to a harm to the AONB has previously been explained at Paragraph 257 of the Pla The Inspector examining BANES Local Plan (2007) observed that "none of the AONB, although the playing pitches St John's Field and Lime Kiln Field make a they have a more apparent undeveloped nature and greater affinity within the	acemaking Plan: e areas exhibit the classic qualities of the a greater contribution to the AONB since
The third site, the Sulis Club, is separate from the main university campus an Lime Kiln Field in that this site too has an undeveloped nature and greater af the AONB.	The state of the s
Therefore, the starting point for considering the potential for the Yellow Zon accommodate new development, should be that in terms of the legal protect 85 of the CRoW Act 2000, any "major development" (as defined by the NPP requirements of conserving and enhancing the AONB and therefore may be designation of this part of the AONB in 1990. Enhanced Status of AONB Designation:	tion afforded to the AONB through Section G) of these zones is unlikely to meet the
Under the relevant statutory provisions (notably Part IV of the Countryside a	nd Rights of Way Act 2000), the sole

Under the relevant statutory provisions (notably Part IV of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), the sole criterion for designation of an AONB is that the outstanding beauty of the area makes it desirable that particular protections should apply to it. Under sections 84(4) and 85(1) of the 2000 Act, a planning authority must take steps to accomplish the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of an AONB; and must have regard to that purpose in exercising any function in relation to, or affecting land in, an AONB.

Thus, amongst material considerations, national policy gives the conservation of landscape and scenic beauty in an AONB a particular enhanced status. It requires an application for planning permission for a major development within an AONB to be refused (Paragraph 116), unless (i) there are exceptional circumstances ("exceptional" in this context connoting rarity); and (ii) it is demonstrated that, despite giving great weight to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB, the development is in the public interest. As well as any detrimental effect of the development on

11 Mav 2016 Page 816 of 956

(iii) the landscape, this national policy requires the planning decision-maker to assess, and take into consideration, the need for the development and the scope for meeting the assessed need in some other way.

Alternative Options:

The NPPF advises in at least three locations that impacts on the environment of the AONB should be avoided. Paragraph 152 in reference to "Plan Making Local Plans" highlights the role of the environmental dimension of sustainable development. Accordingly that "Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be persued."

The second paragraph of relevance specifically in relation to "major development" in AONBs, Paragraph 116 of the NPPF, introduces three tests as stated above.

Accordingly at Paragraph 17 the NPPF advises ..."Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework." The NPPF confirms AONBs (Paragraph 115) as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

Q5 Change Requested

The Cotswolds Conservation Board therefore specifically requests changes to this element of the Plan in that the inclusion of the Hatched Purple and Yellow Zones as having potential for development at this time, offers a unrealistic possibility of gaining planning permission in terms of AONB protection (let alone consideration of the Green Belt designation and other environmental factors including traffic, loss of playing fields etc). It is noted that the "zoning" of these areas within a "framework" plan could be construed as not actually being an "allocation" as such within the Plan, however the Board considers that this approach to development runs the risk of undermining the nationally protected status of the Cotswolds AONB.

The suitable redevelopment solely of the existing previously developed Sulis Club site may have potential but not necessarily the surrounding open and undeveloped land.

By promoting land for development at the University of Bath at Claverton Down at this point in time, without actually knowing any details of what is proposed, the Council have not properly engaged with the exercise required of them by paragraphs 115-116 of the NPPF, which requires them to assess the need for the development, the scope for developing elsewhere outside their area or meeting the identified need in some other way, and the detrimental effect on the environment and landscape, whilst giving "great weight" to the scenic beauty factor. Simply referring to the NPPF as a future consideration fails to have due regard to the relevant planning policies and CRoW Act 2000 requirements in relation to AONBs and in particular has failed to give the conservancy of the AONB great weight and failed to consider the scope for alternative sites.

If the University is capable of addressing all the tests of the NPPF and can prove "exceptional circumstances", then there is no need for any specific zoning. This can simply be addressed on an application by application basis. The Cotswolds Conservation Board therefore recommends the deletion of the proposed zoning for future uses and development through Policy SB19. There is still clearly significant work to be undertaken in respect of the tests of the NPPF (and fulfilment of the CRoW Act 2000) as well as addressing all other environmental factors. No specific development proposals have been put forward on these sites, or alternative options considered, so the impact of development on the AONB cannot even start to be properly assessed. Development of anyone of a possible number of sites at the University in the AONB may also be subject to EIA regulations, but again this cannot be assessed given the lack of information at this point in time.

In conclusion, the zoning of areas for proposed development should be resisted at the University as no clear proposals have been put forward at this point in time. Sites can only be considered as being suitable, achievable and viable for development (particularly in or in the setting of the AONB) where a thorough assessment has been carried out of detailed proposals in the light of national planning policy.

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	on?

11 Mav 2016 Page 817 of 956

Respondent Number: 722	1 Comment Number:	3		
Name: Simon Gould	O	rganisation: Mitc	hell Eley Gould	
Agent Name: Tim Stanley	A	gent Organisation	: Colliers International	
Further Information available	in the original comment?	No At	tachments sent with the o	comment? Yes
Does the respondent considerable Does the respondent considerable If the respondent considers to Not Positively Prepared	r the document is sound?	No	cause it is (ticked where in	•
The representation relates to: The Site Reference (if applicab		Policy SB19		

Q4 Soundness Comment

It is acknowledged that Policy SB19: University of Bath Claverton has been allocated as a yellow zone, the Sulis Club has been identified as an opportunity to redevelop on previously developed land. The land at Combe Edge House is located approximately 370 metres to the North West of the Sulis Club. The land is in close proximity to the redevelopment opportunities that the council have identified, it is in our view that this provides an opportunity for land at Combe Down Edge can come forward to accommodate up to 25 dwellings.

Land at Combe Edge House needs to be removed from the Green Belt to meet the full objectively assessed need for housing. The land at Combe Edge House should be considered appropriate as an allocation. The need to release this site from green belt is driven by the requirement to plan better for the future. The future development pattern for the area is being strongly influenced by the West of England Partnership's Joint Strategic Plan and as such, the requirement to deliver a greater volume of residential development, in particular small scale residential development, is significant.

Q5 Change Requested

Land at Combe Edge House needs to be removed from the Green Belt to meet the full objectively assessed need for housing. The land at Combe Edge House should be considered appropriate as an allocation. The need to release this site from green belt is driven by the requirement to plan better for the future. The future development pattern for the area is being strongly influenced by the West of England Partnership's Joint Strategic Plan and as such, the requirement to deliver a greater volume of residential development, in particular small scale residential development, is significant.

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?

Yes, we would like to be present at the hearing sessions and to present our verbal representations. It is necessary as we would like to highlight the soundness issues presented above. We would also like to take the opportunity to make formal detailed representations regarding the disparities between the housing market information and economic development figures that are not currently aligned for Bath.

11 Mav 2016 Page 818 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Policy SB20

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number: 49 Name: Caroline Kay Organisation: Bath Preservation Trust 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB20 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
On site residential development should be specifically mentioned and potential identified.
Should include a paragraph on necessity for detailed historic environment assessment and evaluation as well as design constraints and/or mitigation. As per the NPPF this should be proportionate to the significance of the heritage asset/s affected. In this case the entire site is significant with the core historic structures and parkland being highly significant.
Q5 Change Requested
Insert more detail as to what possibilities exist onsite and at what capacity.
Add in usual historic environment assessment para including the design constraints phrase suggested above.
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 Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive submissions in relation to the original core strategy and appeared at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to have significant matters to raise on certain points of the placemaking plan
Respondent Number: 322 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Bath Spa University Agent Name: Organisation: Bath Spa University
Agent Name: CBRE Agent Organisation: Rachel Ferguson Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
Tarther information available in the original comment: NO Attachments sent with the comment: Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \ \Box$
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 □

11 May 2016 Page 819 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Policy SB20

The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SB20

Q4 Soundness Comment

The removal of the Major Existing Developed Sites status in accordance with the NPPF is accepted. However the statement that with regard to Newton Park, 'this is not all previously developed land' is unnecessary and should be deleted. The assessment of previously developed land should be determined solely by the development management process as it is a matter of judgement against the definition of 'previously developed land' in the NPPF.

The policy approach set out at SB20 is accepted, given the potential for some further development and flexibility with density at Newton Park, it is welcomed that there is some guidance on how this would be assessed. However, given the constraints of planning policy and land ownership terms (the Duchy of Cornwall who applies further restrictions), it will not be possible to meet the entirety of BSU's growth need at Newton Park and therefore, other solutions will need to be explored beyond this (as per the above comments under Bath's Universities).

The wider Green Belt

Historically, the University of Bath has had land in the Green Belt released to facilitate their on-campus expansion. Owing to a number of planning policy and (outside of Green Belt policy) land ownership constraints at Newton Park this option is not so readily available to BSU. Therefore we request a more flexible approach is take to development in the Green Belt elsewhere in B&NES for BSU expansion (i.e. Beyond Newton Park).

In accordance with the approach to Policy SB20 in identifying that BSU expansion requirements constitute 'very special circumstances' we propose that this guidance is extended to other parts of the Green Belt. Whilst the identification of 'very special circumstances' is under the remit of the development management process, we consider that the wider Green Belt approach should be amended or supplemented to include an acceptability that university development in the Green Belt constitutes very special circumstances given limitations of development elsewhere in B&NES proposed in the draft Placemaking Plan.

We therefore propose a new policy, to allow BSU to consider sites elsewhere in the Green Belt, through clarification of the approach to 'very special circumstances' as set out in the Newton Park policy, and the acknowledgement that BSU's role in B&NES is significant and worthy of being supported and justified through very special circumstances.

SUMMARY

The draft Placemaking Plan does not currently seek to meet BSU's needs for its future managed growth, and does not acknowledge the critical role BSU plays in the district, as an education provider and key economic and employment generator. The emerging policy position seeks to restrict University growth and expansion, and essentially designates University-related development as the lowest priority land use.

We consider the draft Policy in respect to Bath Universities and proposed amendments to the Core Strategy unsounds as they fail to meet the following NPPF requirements:

- Positively prepared the draft policy has been prepared ahead of the preparation of a robust and up to date evidence base. BSU encloses up to date information on student numbers and accommodation requirements. The emerging policy as drafted fails to offer a solution to meet this identified need. Instead it further restricts the expansion of teaching space (in addition to student accommodation) on sites outside of BSU's existing campuses;
- Justified this approach is not justified as it does not attempt to meet the identified need of BSU, and does not set out any specific reasons as to why this is considered to be an acceptable approach, in light of the 'positively prepared' requirement.
- Consistent with national policy a number of areas have been highlighted to demonstrate where specific policies are not compliant with policies as set out in the NPPF.

11 May 2016 Page 820 of 956

This does not represent positive planning, as per the requirements of the NPPF, and is therefore an unsound approach.

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?

Reserve position should we be required to support BSU's position in the city.

11 May 2016 Page 821 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 2, Bath Part: Table 2 infrastructure for Bath

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

Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number: 6 Name: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 2 Bath , Table 2 infrastructure for Bath The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment
Infrastructure and Investment - There is only a small part of this section that we are able to comment on at this stage of consultation, namely parts of Table 2:Summary of Key Infrastructure in Bath, although it is difficult to distinguish which is greyed out as part of the formatting and which is highlighted text that can be commented on. Highways England supports the delivery of all the key infrastructure identified in the table, the majority of which will contribute towards sustainable development promoting walking, cycling and the use of public transport and therefore reducing impacts on the SRN. Of key interest to us is IDP Ref BI.1 Transport Proposals for Bath - Other essential transport links and improvements. Under this any improvements to the SRN to mitigate any severe impact from development in Bath should be identified. Circular 02/2013 Paragraph 18 is relevant to note here as mentioned previously in the letter. Infrastructure required to deliver development should be identified at this stage.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$

11 May 2016 Page 822 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Keynsham general

Respondent Number: 3316 Comment Number:	1
Name:	Organisation: Keynsham Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to Molume 2. Kounsham	Vouncham ganaral
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Keynsham general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Concerns have been received from some residents of Keunderstand.	ynsham that that the plan is difficult to read and hard to
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	tion (ticked if ves)?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	ate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 5169 Comment Number:	1
Name: David Laming	Organisation: River Regeneration Trust
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	P 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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham	, Keynsham general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
1) Reference should be made and consideration given to Council and carried out by The River Regeneration Trust	the Broadmead Peninsula Scoping Study commissioned by the
COMPANIANA CANTALA DAL DVI TIE NIVEL NEVELICIALIDII ITUSL	OH BEHAN OF BALLEN E SUITE SEL COUNCIL.

11 May 2016 Page 823 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

2) Reference should be made and consideration given to the WaterSpace Study currently being undertaken by the Strategic River Group on behalf of Bath N E Somerset Council.

Q5 Change Requested

See Q4.

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 importance of emphasising the positive impact the River Avon Corridor has upon the future sustainability of the integrated societal aspirations of the NPPF cannot be overstated enough. In particular relating to flood, drought, alternative affordable homes and the role river corridors will play in waste treatment and energy production.
Respondent Number: 6346 Comment Number: 1
Respondent Number: 6346 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Mactaggart and Mickel
Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
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 3 Keynsham , Keynsham general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The combining of the Core Strategy with the Placemaking Plan makes it a comprehensive Local Plan, all of it which is now subject to consultation and potential amendment. This is reflected in the fact that the Council has made amendments to parts of the Core Strategy components of the Plan. It is inconsistent, and unreasonable, for the Council to restrict comments only to those parts of the Core Strategy that it has chosen to amend. The entire Plan is therefore now subject to consultation and amendment, include the incorporated Core Strategy.
Q5 Change Requested
No change required, other than to remove the Explanatory Note and to accept any representations to the incorporated Core Strategy as having been duly made.
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: 6576 Comment Number: 1
Name: Elizabeth Barling Organisation: Keynsham Community Energy
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 Mav 2016 Page 824 of 956

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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Keynsham general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
No comments.
Q5 Change Requested
No comments.
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: 6798 Comment Number: 1
Name: John Britton Organisation:
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') $\ \Box$
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 3 Keynsham , Keynsham general
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
If this is not the correct address for consultation could you please forward this email and let me know the correct one.
I believe the expansion of Keynsham is too large for the size of our "market town". The town is and will further be strangled by the proposed housing explosion on the arterial roads into Keynsham.
The current expansion beyond the Federated Estate feeds onto Charlton Road by an undersized roundabout. The proposed development further out of town will cause more chaos on the road.
The explosion on the Bath Road towards Saltford will be another disaster. Houses one side and Business park on the other. How will all this extra traffic get out onto the congested A4. How will people cross the road. What will happen to
the environment with all that queuing traffic? You can't just trust to luck or put up traffic lights.
If you are intent on this housing explosion we need proper road access. You can't just say that people must use public transport and hide the problems you will create.

11 May 2016 Page 825 of 956

If it's not possible to stop this building and profiteering, the houses must be low level and not exceed 2 storey.

How are the senior schools going to cope with the influx? They must provide extra classrooms and playing fields. AND they must provide parking and drop off parking on-site to stop the cancerous growth of parking in the residential streets around the schools. The parking problem is not solved by just putting parking restriction on the roads outside the schools.				
Our lovely Market Town will be destroyed and turned into a heaving sprawling mass.				
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?				
Respondent Number: 6871 Comment Number: 1 Name: N J Norris Organisation: 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 Consisten ☑ Not Effective ☑				
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Keynsham general The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment Please note my comments on The Draft Placemaking Plan. Core Volume 2 Koynsham				
Please note my comments on The Draft Placemaking Plan - Core Volume 3 Keynsham				

The Document Layout

The report looks like a rushed first draft with text crossed and manual alterations – this would be fine for internal BANES use but is very unprofessional and confusing for public viewing and decision making.

I would judge this document not to be a plan but rather an executive summary with scant detail of what is actually proposed. I feel that it's as an attempt to state that consultation has taken place whilst allowing BANES carte blanche permission to undertake whatever 'developments' they wish rather than to take into account the views of Keynsham residents. It contains many worrying statements without specifics and much appears to have already been approved such as the removal of land from green belt.

The embedded maps and documents in the report are extremely difficult to view making them almost impossible to comment upon. These need to be available separately. The report also contains an awful lot of spin such as referring to the new Civic Centre as a 'multiple award winning redevelopment' when it has overwhelmingly been labelled a monstrosity by local residents. This sort of statement will not win over residents but will merely antagonise them.

Lack of Detail

There are many fine words but few specifics – the public needs to see the fine detail. This current document is an opportunity to enhance BANES's reputation and it has been missed – BANES already has a reputation for covertly introducing changes without adequate consultation and this document will not change this opinion.

11 May 2016 Page 826 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Keynsham's Image

I disagree with the statement that 'At present the overall image of the town is poor' (that is if I ignore the monstrous new civic centre) and would like to know the basis for this assumption. Many I have spoken to have been envious of those that are able to afford a house in Keynsham. Most aspire to living here but state that they cannot afford to. Keynsham has always been able to strike the right balance between a market town rural community and economically vibrancy making it an attractive place to live.

Keynsham is described as 'coasting' since the 1970s, implying that Keynsham has received minimal attention in terms of development this is true however so has Saltford, Chew Magna, the list is long. I don't feel that minimal redevelopment is necessarily a bad thing; however it is the new housing developments within Keynsham that have changed the 'ball game'. It's sad that only after totally changing the face of Keynsham in spite of resident's opposition have BANES now decided to address the town's changed needs.

The challenge is to cope with the hundreds of extra houses built over the past 12 months (and inevitably in the future) whilst retaining the character of Keynsham.

The bad image of Keynsham if it indeed exists is often of BANES own making such as the bad image of the new civic centre, the fiasco of the opening of the town clock, the lack of consultation for a new leisure centre – I could list more.

Jobs

It is stated that 1,600 new jobs will be created between 2011 and 2029. I can only assume that this primarily refers to those offered by the new Civic Centre and the Prison/Holding facility. If this is the case its worth remembering that these are not new jobs as positions are mainly filled by those staff that commute from Bath and outlying areas, these are certainly not new jobs for Keynsham residents. The only new jobs provided will be the few for lower graded staff such office cleaning as most staff will have simply changed their commute to Keynsham. When more senior jobs are advertised (I would question if BANES are undertaking much recruiting following savings that need to be made) these are unlikely to be filled by Keynsham residents unless they happen to have the skills required. What this report fails to mention is the number of local jobs lost as a result of the new housing developments such as approx. 50 working at businesses previously occupying the K2 site. Where will the extra 20,200m2 of office space be housed by 2029 – is this to cater for the movement of still more BANES staff into Keynsham?

If businesses are to be sited in Keynsham they need to be ones that will actually offer employment to local people not merely the relocation of existing head office's as this will create few extra local jobs as most staff will simply commute into Keynsham.

The statement about residents 'forced to out commute for many jobs' – I disagree with this as most people will already have a job when they move to Keynsham, their jobs are such that they would never be employed in Keynsham. Has a survey been conducted to establish how many of those employed in Keynsham actually live in Keynsham?

Green Belt & Developers

The report states its aim is to 'Maintain the Green Belt surrounding Keynsham, allowing releases of Green Belt' – this is a huge contradiction you can't have both you either maintain Green belt or release it. This appears to be just an excuse to justify further building on Green Belt land.

I have seen no consolations of what appears to be the building of further houses as part of the KE4 development – when did these occur?

We need to be much firmer on new developers – forcing a much better deal from them that provides the infrastructure in support of housing. Remember that they want to build so BANES is in a strong bargaining position and should be introducing contract penalties in the event that developers fail to abide by contracts backed up by strong contracts and strong legal representation in the event of disagreement. Too often have BANES entered into weak contracts and supplied poor legal support when attempting support their decisions, Keynsham is becoming a convenient dumping ground for compulsory government initiatives. When will BANES look at other site within its boundaries?

It's interesting that the development of the Wellsway side of Keynsham for housing has been largely ignored. Positive Points

There are some excellent suggestions in the report however it's impossible to judge whether they meet requirements of Keynsham residents as there is so little detail these include:

-'better use of the existing blue infrastructure' – this should be the plans primary objective. The easy option is to carve

11 Mav 2016 Page 827 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

up new areas when we should be aspiring to make better use of existing areas that have been allowed to depreciate.

- To ensure that 'the town to continue to function as an independent market town'
- -Retain and extend the Broadmead/Ashmead/Pixash Industrial Estate as an area for business activity
- Encourage enhancement of Queen Road and Chandag Road as local centres I would like to see these plans as these areas have been sadly neglected in the past
- Improvements to public transport
- Recognition that 'The trees and green spaces are important.... Strengthening the landscape setting'

Leisure Centre

I'm disappointed that given the recent high profile champagne to maintain leisure centre sports hall facilities that there is no mention of this in the report. The Riverside is mentioned 'Evaluation has identified this site as the preferred location for a replacement leisure centre'. Yet there is no mention although a sports hall has already been promised by the leader of BANES.

Other Matters

Who says that there is 'A lack of restaurants, cafes and bars'? There are plenty and some are well used others are poorly managed and suffer as a result.

Traffic chaos – lots of very vague ideas but no specifics that would allow us to comment on. These may be contained within maps but as these are unreadable it's impossible to comment

Finally

Let us not lose sight of the fact that this plan should be aimed at improving Keynsham for the residents of Keynsham not simply a box ticking exercise for BANES to allow them to comply with government quotas.

I would like the reassurance that once a more detailed masterplan has been published that further public consultation will take place that will allow amendments to be made as currently I do have a concern that signup to this draft will mean sign up to the masterplan.

At lease proposals are now being widely pre announced which is a major step forward however It will be interesting to see what areas of the detailed plan change once 'consultation' has taken place.

I do not consider the current plan to be sound for the following reasons:

- It is not effective in terms of deliverability as there is currently insufficient details in the document to demonstrate that the proposed replacement Leisure Centre facility would be sufficient to meet the needs of the community and the current users of the existing facility.
- There is insufficient clarity of embedded documents or detail in many areas of the document to judge if the proposal is justified effective or deliverable
- The plan is not justified as it demonstrates no evidence of new employment opportunities
- I do not feel that the current plan does not clearly demonstrate the need for further development on Keynsham's green belt areas only the need for compliance with government quotas. Such development will put too much pressure on Keynsham's current infrastructure with no clear demonstration of the provision of facilities in support of such a significant increase in population (such as schools, Doctors, Dentists, sports facilities, roads.....). As such it demonstrates an adverse impact on Keynsham.
- -The plan is not justified as it contains too little factual and statistical evidence (proportionate evidence) in support of many of the -- Its not been positively prepared as I see no factual or statistical evidence of benefits to Keynsham Thank you for the opportunity to make a contribution to this document.

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?

I can if required to clarify my statements

11 May 2016 Page 828 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Comment Number: 7

Plan Order Reference

3, Keynsham Part: Policy KE1 Volume:

93

Respondent Number:

Name: Sean Walsh	Organisation: Highways Agency		
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:		
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant?	? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \square	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	?		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound	nd, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not C	Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham	, Policy KE1	 E1	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Access and Movement - We welcome the focus on transeconomy and well-being of Keynsham, and the acknowl Whilst this is not part of the SRN, and is for the Local High sustainable transport strategies put forward to assist in sub region are being investigated by the West of England	ledgement og ghway Authog the matter.	of congestion issues both in the town and on the nority to comment on specifically, we welcome the . We note that wider transport improvements in	A4. ne the
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	•	, .	
Respondent Number: 114 Comment Number	: 1		
Name: Ben Knight		ion: Society of Merchant Venturers	
Agent Name:	Agent Orga		
Further Information available in the original comment		Attachments sent with the comment?	Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	? No		
, , 2			
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy KE1	<u>:</u> 1	
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Policy KE1 (b) does not identify sufficient sites to ensure	e the delivery	ry of the housing strategy in Keynsham (i.e. a	
l1 Mav 2016		Page 829	of 956

minimum of 2150 new homes) over the plan period or to boost significantly the supply of housing†(in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF).

The allocated sites in the Local Plan (i.e. K2) and those in the Core Strategy (i.e. KE2, KE3a, KE4) provide for approximately 1,701 dwellings. Indeed, it is noted (from paragraphs 37 - 42) that at this stage only 1,251 dwellings currently have planning permission - with only around 123 new homes delivered. Further, the delivery of windfall sites from 2011 does notmake up the significant shortfall.

As such, the LPA cannot rely upon the existing allocations/permissions or windfall sites to boost significantly the supply of housing in Keynsham and without identifying further sites it is considered that the Plan is unsound.

Q5 Change Requested

Policy KE1 (b) should identify additional key sites to boost significantly the supply of housing in Keynsham.

It is considered that simply allocating the safeguarded land to the east of Keynsham (for approximately 200 dwellings) is insufficient to boost significantly the supply of housing at Keynsham. To this end, we consider that our clients land should now also be considered for allocation in the Placemaking Plan. Indeed, in the Land at Uplands Development Concept Options Report (Arup, 2013) it notes, at page 16, that developing the East Keynsham site in tandem with the land to the south of Keynsham at Uplands Farm would be a good opportunity to create a more comprehensive and sustainable solution.

We (nee Smiths Gore) submitted representations to the Options Placemaking Plan in January 2015 setting out the suitability of the site for development. This included a Indicative Concept Plan for potential development of land at Uplands comprising some 250 dwellings together with a neighbourhood centre providing local services and facilities for the development and which could serve a wider, area improving sustainability locally. We have attached these representations for reference.

In summary, it is considered that the Council has wrongly rejected our clients land as a potential development site to deliver housing for Keynsham. Indeed, development of the land to the south of Keynsham at Uplands Farm is a deliverable option (either on its own or in tandem with East Keynsham) for the following reasons:

- -Keynsham is capable of accommodating significant growth given the range of services it currently offers, being a market town and service centre for the surrounding area. Keynsham also occupies a strategically important location between Bristol and Bath, and is therefore a sustainable location for development.
- -Residential development in this location would be in keeping with the surrounding area. The site would adjoin the existing built up area and is considered an appropriate extension to Keynsham. In addition, the land is well contained and development on this site would have a limited impact on the wider landscape.
- -Whilst the site and surrounding area lies within the Green Belt, it does not meet the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Indeed, in the Council Green Belt Review Stage 1 (April 2013) it comments that the Green Belt directly to the south of Keynsham is not of importance for preventing the merger of Bristol and Keynsham" therefore the rolling back of the Green Belt in this area is acceptable.
- -Whilst the site is in close proximity to the town centre there is an opportunity to improve walking linkages to the town centre via new pedestrian footways along Wellsway with potential for a link to Hardington Drive. In addition, the town centre is only 15-20 minutes by bicycle.
- -The site has access to local employment opportunities within Keynsham at the industrial estate to the north and by public transport provision to the town centre.
- -Easy access to bus services along the B3116 Wellsway, including the No 178 service which could serve further development to the south at Uplands. In addition, the train station is only approximately 1.5 miles from the site with

11 May 2016 Page 830 of 956

train services to Bath and Bristol (and beyond) for access to employment etc.

- -The scale of dwellings proposed is capable of delivering housing in line with local objectives, such as need for affordable housing, and improvements to infrastructure and services.
- -There is scope at the Uplands site to include local services and facilities as part of a development proposal. These could serve a wider area supporting the sustainability and access to services and facilities for the southern residential estates of Keynsham.
- -The allocation of development at Uplands in tandem with East Keynsham could also offer the opportunity for a primary school site from a sustainability perspective if a new primary school is required then a site to the south of Keynsham would be preferable in terms of spreading accessibility, rather than concentrating primary education to the north of Keynsham where Chandag Primary and Infant schools already exist close to the East of Keynsham allocation.
- -The site is in Flood Zone 1. Further, there are no other environmental or physical constraints to the site which cannot be mitigated for (i.e. The gas pipeline).
- -Further opportunity to deliver new areas of green infrastructure, such as public open space.
- -The site is within the sole control of the SMV which will facilitate its timely development. In addition, the Land at Uplands Development Concept Options Report (Arup, 2013) confirms that a viable housing scheme could be delivered on the site.

The above demonstrates that the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development. Moreover there are no significant constraints which will prevent development on the 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 suitability of the Plan (as currently set out) to boost significantly the supply of housing at Keynsham will require exposition at the Examination Hearings.

11 May 2016 Page 831 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Diagram 1 Keynsham Spatial Strategy

Respondent Number: 4335 Comment Number: 1	
Name: Neil Fountain Organisation:	
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes	S
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Diagram 1 Keynsham Spatial Strategy	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Diagram 1 - doesn't show Queen Charlton as a Conservation Area	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 832 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Diagram 7 Local Green Space Designations

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

Respondent Number: 6346 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Mactaggart and Mickel
Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates
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 3 Keynsham , Diagram 7 Local Green Space Designations The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
It is unclear from Diagram 7 whether the Local Green Space designation includes land within the strategic allocation at East Keynsham. Clarification has been sought, but not provided. There is no justification for designating part of the East Keynsham strategic allocation as Local Green Space, and to do so could result in the plan being ineffective in terms of delivering the objectively assessed housing need and the specific requirements for the strategic allocation. The open space requirements for the East Keynsham development will be considered through the Masterplan that is required pursuant to Policy KE3a and that will be subject to consultation with the local community. There is no requirement to protect any part of the site as Local Green Space in the strategic policy, and it was understood that the Placemaking Principles were not intended to be re-visited through the current plan.
Q5 Change Requested
Delete the Local Green Space designation shown on Diagram 7 within the East Keynsham Strategic Allocation (Policy KE3a as shown on Diagram 8).
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? ✓

11 May 2016 Page 833 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 49 Volume: 3, Keynsham Respondent Number: 6820 Comment Number: Name: Clive Honeychurch Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten 🗸 Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Para 49 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment It is anticipated that there will be a total of 2150 new homes built in Keynsham. No allowance seems to be made for any of the new housing sites on the fringes of the town. Few people from these are going to walk the distance into town. Apart from a few cyclists, and with a bus service which will be at best every half hour, most people will probably drive. There seems to be no provision for the extra traffic generated and no mention of additional parking provisions in the town. Paragraph 49 mentions "an improvement at the Wellsway, Bath Hill and Bath Road junction to increase its capacity". I hope that this does not mean traffic lights. The main constriction is westbound from the mini roundabout which causes congestion during peak periods. The installation of traffic lights will not change this. It will only cause annoyance to motorists who are forced to wait unnecessarily, whilst emitting greenhouse gases, especially during the 22 hours of the day when there is no problem whatsoever. There is however the possibility of some road widening to allow a longer two lane approach to the mini roundabout from Wellsway, waiting restrictions to allow a longer two lane approach from Bath Road, and yellow boxes to prevent clogging of the inner lanes of the mini roundabout for right hand turns from and into Wellsway. Q5 Change Requested Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

11 Mav 2016 Page 834 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Para 50

Respondent Number: 239 Comment Number: 2 Name: Roger Busby Organisation: Keynsham Civic Society Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	0
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □	
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Para 50 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Para.50: Query 'south' bound. should it be west bound? Under "Other Transport Measures" mention should be made to the problem of traffic, including HGVs and coaches reversing into side roads and private accesses in order to return in the direction of the High Street. Not only is this a danger to pedestrians, but it adds to the high level of pollutants in the area. The solution is to remove the bollards in the road behind 'Simply Carpets' and make this short section one-way int the Labbott.	
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? To explain to the Inspector the current problem of reversing vehicles on Temple Street.	
Respondent Number: 6820 Comment Number: 4 Name: Clive Honeychurch Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	0
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 3 Keynsham , Para 50 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	

11 Mav 2016 Page 835 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment

Paragraph 50 just looks at possibilities. To prevent High Street becoming a rat run at peak periods consideration should be given to making it one way towards Bath during the morning rush hour and one way towards Bristol during the evening rush hour, and two way at all other times.

Improvements to the Hicks Gate roundabout should be transferred from paragraph 50 to 49 making it definite. There should be road widening on the approaches to the roundabout from (a) A4174 and (b) Bath side of the Keynsham bypass. This should be to provide dedicated and longer lanes from Bath side onto A4174 and also from A4174 towards Bath.

Paragraph 50 should include the possibility of widening the railway bridge over Avon Mill Lane to give 2 way, road traffic. Alternatively give priority to traffic from Keynsham road, as sometimes the tailback of traffic heading in the other direction blocks the tunnel. Also the road on the Bath Hill side of the tunnel should be widened to give a better view through the tunnel.

through the tunnel.	
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?

11 May 2016 Page 836 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Diagram 13 Potential Transport Infrastructure Improvements

Respondent Number: 4335 Comment Number: 2
Name: Neil Fountain Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Diagram 13 Potential Transport Infrastructure Improvements The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Diagram13 - doesn't but should highlight the need to effect improvements to the road infrastructure to take account of the impact of new housing developments along Charlton Road and at Whitchurch, i.e. Redlynch Lane, Sleep Lane / A37, level of traffic through Queen Charlton
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 837 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Diagram 16 Keynsham Character Areas

Respondent Number: 4335 Comment Number: 3	
Name: Neil Fountain Organisation:	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Diagram 16 Keynsham Character Areas	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Diagram16 - Queen Charlton hasn't been included as a 'character area', is this an omission?	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 838 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Policy KE2a

Respondent Number: 7146 Comment Number: 2	
Name: Organisation: St Monica Trust	
Agent Name: John Sneddon Agent Organisation: Tetlow King Planning	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Policy KE2a	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Policies K1, KE2 and KE2A	
My client has an interest in the Somerdale site.	
The figure contained in that policy on the level of B1 office accommodation has no adequate justification or basis. It is not contained in the Core Strategy. It appears to be there purely based on a planning application that has been approved in the past. This is not an evidence base for an allocation policy. Other uses can provide employment outside the B1 use. The figure of 11,000 m2 of B1a does not tie up with policy KE1 seeking B1 space of 13,000m2 in 2011 to about 20,200m2 in 2029. The Riverside is planning 2,500 m2 of B1a.	
In our view it is disingenuous to apply a figure for B1 when that is not in the Core Strategy. The policy should say "around" 11,000 m2 not say "at least". It is too prescriptive.	
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?	

11 May 2016 Page 839 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Para 88

Respondent Number: 274 Comment Number: 10 Name: Gary Parsons Organisation: Sport England 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Para 88 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Keynsham Leisure Centre	
Support the redevelopment of the Leisure Centre. However, the redevelopment of the site and re-provision will need to be addressed in the emerging Strategy for Built (sports) Facilities and will need to address displaced user requirements.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Completion/Adoption of the Built (sports) Facilities Strategy is required.	
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?

11 May 2016 Page 840 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 3, Keynsham Part: Table 1 Keynsham Infrastructure

Respondent Number: 194 Comment Number: 3 Name: John Webb Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Table 1 Keynsham Infrastructure The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
At Ref. K1.1 Flood protection measures necessary for the Somerdale site are identified. This may be of interest to the River Avon User Group.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$ Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 4335 Comment Number: 4
Name: Neil Fountain Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The manufaction relation to Maluma 2. Manufacture Table 4. Manufacture Information
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Table 1 Keynsham Infrastructure The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

11 May 2016 Page 841 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 6820 Comment Number: 3	
Name: Clive Honeychurch Organisation:	
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓	
The representation relates to: Volume 3 Keynsham , Table 1 Keynsham Infrastructure	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
In Table 1 at the end of the document it mentions improvements to Keynsham Train Station, but doesn't give any details. If people are going to commute into Bristol or Bath by rail, there needs to be a major provision for car parking specifically for this purpose.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 842 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Somer Valley General

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

Respondent Number: 1449 Comment Number: 1	
Name: Nicola Duke Organisation: Radstock Town Council	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Somer Valley General	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The Chairman and members of Radstock Town Council considered the current consultation on the draft Placemaking Plan at a meeting of Council held on Monday 18th January 2016.	
I am directed to inform you of the outcome of that debate and to formally report the Council's response to the consultation. I copy for you below the relevant extract from the draft minutes:	
Members received a report from the Placemaking Working Group relating to the current B&NES consultation on the	
Placemaking Plan. It was proposed by Cllr Shearn, seconded by Cllr C Dando and resolved that:	
1.The Town Council supports the Draft Placemaking Plan as having been prepared in accordance with legal	
requirements, recognising that it is, therefore, legally compliant.	
2.The Placemaking Working Group will proceed to open a dialogue with local organisations to ascertain their aspirations for the town. The outcome of these discussions will be reported to the Away Day planned for March 2016 and be used	
to prepare a land use plan with the support of B&NES. (Policy number 2015/133) (No financial implication).	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$	

11 May 2016 Page 843 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Para 13

Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number: 8	
Name: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency	
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Para 13 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Bristol, Bath and Somer Valley Enterprise Zone - Highways England generally supports the principle of this new strategic employment location for the area, noting that it is in response to major factory closures that have impacted on the area. The location of this may go some way to reducing the levels of out commuting and potentially impacts on the SRN.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	

11 May 2016 Page 844 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Somer Valley Vision

Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd
Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Ye
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 Consisten ✔ Not Effective ✔
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Somer Valley Vision
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
2.0 RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC POLICIES
Vision and Spatial Strategy
2.1 The salient part of the Vision within the Somer Valley Chapter reads:
'The southern part of the district will become more self-reliant, facilitated by economic led revitalisationalongside energy
generation, building onitsindustrial expertise and improving skill levels. Transport connections to other centres, as well a connections between settlements within the Somer Valley area will continue to be improved'.
2.2 Paragraph 18 goes on to say: 'new housing in the Somer Valley will therefore be restrained in the interest of sustainability but some additional
housing is likely to come forward on brownfield sites. The Housing Development Boundary has been reviewed in the
Placemaking Plan to facilitate this'.
2.3 We welcome the reference to brownfield redevelopment opportunities, which would include the two sites we
identify on the northern edge of Radstock, and request that the development boundary is further amended to include these.
2.4 However, the vision as currently worded clearly shows that the council wishes to restrict new residential
development until self-containment improves and new economic development is delivered in the towns within this area
We are concerned that this would conflict with the overall vision set out for BANES, the emerging West of England JSP
and national planning policy.
2.5 Whilst we do not disagree with the general objective of improving the self-containment of settlements it must be
balanced against the acute need for housing in BANES as a whole and considered within the context of the need to
'boost significantly the supply of housing', a key requirement of the NPPF, set out in paragraph 47.
2.6 Paragraph 001 of National Planning Practice Guidance states that:

11 May 2016 Page 845 of 956

'national planning policy sets clear expectations as to how a Local Plan must be developed in order to be justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared to deliver sustainable development that meets local

needs and national priorities' (Reference ID: 12-001-20140306)

2.7 Restricting housing growth, particularly in Bath where issues of housing affordability are particularly acute, would not be consistent with National Planning Policy and nor does this suggest that the plan has been positively prepared.
2.8 In addition to this, preparation of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan is currently underway and issues and options for strategic growth have recently been consulted upon. Consideration should therefore also be given to the potential increased need for housing in the Greater Bristol Area. This is currently identified at 85,000 homes over the next 20 years; 30,000 more than what is already planned for between each of the unitary authorities.
2.9 Within the West of England JSP Issues and Options Document, paragraph 5.12 clearly states that, in relation to BANES: 'urban extension options at Bath, where evidence shows development would have an adverse impact on heritage and landscape assets (specifically the World Heritage Site and the Cotswold AONB) have been excluded as possible strategic locations.'
2.10 Therefore given the constraints identified that surround Bath including the Green Belt, World Heritage Site and Cotswolds AONB, if no additional extensions are proposed in these areas, growth will be directed towards the existing urban area of Bath which has very limited opportunities to accommodate growth and then settlements such as Midsomer Norton and Radstock as the primary towns. Consequently a more permissive policy approach needs to be set out in response to this to allow sustainably located brownfield sites, adjacent to the Housing Development Boundary, to come forward as necessary.
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?

11 May 2016 Page 846 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Diagram 2 Somer Valley Strategy Map

Respondent Number: 4786 Comment Number: 1 Name: Cllr Barry Macrae Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 2 Somer Valley Strategy Map The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment There is a FUNDAMENTAL error on both Diagram 2 and Diagram 3 in that these plans are indicating A) that The Old Mills (new, greenfield) site lies within Midsomer Norton. It does not. It lies within Paulton. Paulton is (clearly!) NOT part of the (inexplicably newly linked!) Midsomer Norton & Westfield community. Vol. 4 of the documentation actually links Paulton & Peasedown (itself also an inexplicable & incongruous link!) B) the associated plans are indicating that (ONLY) this Old Mills site is to be newly designated as "The" Somer Valley Enterprize Zone".
This is totally incorrect and exceedingly misleading, as it does NOT represent the recent attainment (by Banes Council) thatthe entire "Somer Valley" (which comprises a number of varied adjacent parishes & rural communities) will be adopted - alongside the central area of Bristol - as a/the strategically important location in which major effort is to be given to redressing the present dearth of local employment (including recent major local job-losses on (eg) the brownfield Welton Bag site, in MSN(N). Both aspects require formal recognition and immediate adjustment, in order to then be in line with the Cabinet & Policy determination of thevery specific Economic Regeneration priorities for the North East Somerset part of the Banes District.
Q5 Change Requested A simple redrawing of the plan, (eg removal of the purple-star & revised Title) together with apprpriate rewording of the relevant explanatory paragraphs would entirely satisfy my present deep concerns. Such concerns have also been expressed to both the MSN Town Council and to the current Chair of the Somer Valley Partnershipboth have supported my request.
I am entirely confident that the drafting Officers - and the Banes submission Team - will readily acknowledge this present very clear inconsistency, which might even be explained by the (very!) recent timing in which the Somer Valley Enterprize Zone status has actually been achieved.
I fully expect the Cabinet Members for both Planning and Regeneration -together with the relevant Corporate Director - to support my submission.

11 May 2016 Page 847 of 956

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?

I will wish to seek CATEGORIC affirmation that the amendments to the current Strategic Plan's aspirations for my Ward, as sought above, WILL now be formally incorporated into the final submission to the Examination process

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 11 Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □	
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 2 Somer Valley Strategy Map The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Diagram 2; Somer Valley Strategy Map - The quality of the base maps used is lacking and should be replaced with a map that can be used by decision makers. This Diagram and indeed later diagrams in this Volume cover an area wider than the Somer Valley i.e. include settlements classed as being in the Rural Area (Volume 5) There is a lack of clarity as to the purpose and scope of this Diagram. The areas defined as Landscape Setting appear to have been set in a fairy arbitrary fashion when viewed without the benefit of the evidence base. For example; around High Littleton some of the existing built area would appear to be included within the area of Landscape Setting whilst other places open landscape which would appear to contribute to the Landscape Setting has been omitted.	
Some settlements do not benefit from any designated Landscape Setting. For example the Saxon settlement of Hallatrow, which would seem to indicate a haphazard, un-evidenced approach to identifying this proposed classificatio We object to Landscape setting being drawn tight the boundaries of a number of settlements 'white washing' over land identified in previous SHLAA's as being substantially suitable for development. In particular we object to;	
Land on the West of Paulton being included. It makes little contribution to the setting of the existing settlement, development would have low impact on landscape and it offers a sustainable and unobtrusive direction for the settlement to expand.	
Land on the South side of High Littleton opposite Rosewell Country Home being included. This land has been subject to planning application which was withdrawn at appeal by the applicants on the basis that it was premature. This land is of the ridge line in keeping with the way in which the existing settlement has developed over time and contributes little to the setting of the settlement. Development here has already been evidenced to have development would have low impact on landscape.	n
Land South of Cluton to the South of Maynards Terrace. The designation here would appear to include an existing planning approval and in any event contributes little to the setting of the existing settlement.	

11 May 2016 Page 848 of 956

Land at Midsomer Norton to the South of Thicket Mead Farm. This land contributes little to the setting of the existing settlement and its development would have a low impact on landscape.

This list is not exhaustive and as stated above does not appear to be based on any sound evidence or be made in a positive way.

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?

Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.

11 May 2016 Page 849 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Diagram 3 Midsomer Norton & Westfield

Respondent Number: 4786 Comment Number: 2 Name: Cllr Barry Macrae Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 3 Midsomer Norton & Westfield The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
There is a FUNDAMENTAL error on both Diagram 2 and Diagram 3 in that these plans are indicating A) that The Old Mills (new, greenfield) site lies within Midsomer Norton. It does not. It lies within Paulton. Paulton is (clearly!) NOT part of the (inexplicably newly linked!) Midsomer Norton & Westfield community. Vol. 4 of the documentation actually links Paulton & Peasedown (itself also an inexplicable & incongruous link!) B) the associated plans are indicating that (ONLY) this Old Mills site is to be newly designated as "The" Somer Valley Enterprize Zone". This is totally incorrect and exceedingly misleading, as it does NOT represent the recent attainment (by Banes Council) thatthe entire "Somer Valley" (which comprises a number of varied adjacent parishes & rural communities) will be adopted - alongside the central area of Bristol - as a/the strategically important location in which major effort is to be given to redressing the present dearth of local employment (including recent major local job-losses on (eg) the brownfield Welton Bag site, in MSN(N). Both aspects require formal recognition and immediate adjustment, in order to then be in line with the Cabinet & Policy determination of thevery specific Economic Regeneration priorities for the North East Somerset part of the Banes District.
Q5 Change Requested
A simple redrawing of the plan, (eg removal of the purple-star & revised Title) together with apprpriate rewording of the relevant explanatory paragraphs would entirely satisfy my present deep concerns. Such concerns have also been expressed to both the MSN Town Council and to the current Chair of the Somer Valley Partnershipboth have supported my request.
I am entirely confident that the drafting Officers - and the Banes submission Team - will readily acknowledge this present very clear inconsistency, which might even be explained by the (very!) recent timing in which the Somer Valley Enterprize Zone status has actually been achieved. I fully expect the Cabinet Members for both Planning and Regeneration -together with the relevant Corporate Director - to support my submission.

11 May 2016 Page 850 of 956

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?

I will wish to seek CATEGORIC affirmation that the amendments to the current Strategic Plan's aspirations for my Ward, as sought above, WILL now be formally incorporated into the final submission to the Examination process.

11 May 2016 Page 851 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Policy SV1

Respondent Number: 9 Name: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Our comments relating to Somer Valley remain broadly the same as during the previous consultation. In terms of soundness we would consider the locations and scale of development not to have enough impact on the SRN for dighways England to have any major concerns, assuming the relevant supporting evidence in line with policy requirements is supplied when applications for planning permission come forward. As per our previous comments relating to development sites in Somer Valley, we note that a significant proportion of the rousing requirement is either built or committed development. The remainder of the development requirements are either brownfield sites that are within or adjacent to the town centres of Midsomer Norton and Radstock, and within Westfield. The Agency generally supports the location of these developments and regards them as being as sustainable as possible given the circumstances. The impacts on the A36 to the east or the M5 to the west are considered to be imited at this stage, particularly given the efforts to become more self-reliant, facilitated by economic led revitalisation alongside local energy production and improved transport connections. Notwithstanding this any planning applications for development will need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base to understand the specific impacts of development, and to identify any mitigation as required.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 234 Comment Number: 2 Name: Michael Fenton Organisation: Taylor WBath Preservation Trustimpey UK Ltd Agent Name: Simon Fitton Agent Organisation: RPS Planning & Development Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 852 of 956

Does the respondent consider the	e document is legally con	npliant? (Tick if indicated	'yes') 🗌	
Does the respondent consider the	e document is sound?	No		
If the respondent considers the D	raft Placemaking Plan is	unsound, is it because it i	s (ticked where indi	cated):
Not Positively Prepared 🗸	Not Justified 🗸	Not Consisten ✓	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Vol	ume 4 Somer Valley , Po	olicy SV1		
he Site Reference (if applicable) is:				

Q4 Soundness Comment

Context

At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision taking. For plan-making this means that:

"Local authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area" and 'Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change' (NPPF, Paragraph 14)

Paragraph 15 of the NPPF further sets out that:

"Policies in Local Plans should follow the approach of the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay. All plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally."

For the Placemaking Plan to be found sound it must meet the four tests of soundness as outlined in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In this regard, it must be demonstrated that the Plan is:

- Positively prepared the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed
 development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is
 reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- •Consistent with national policy the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

On consideration of the BANES Placemaking Plan, we consider that there are fundamental elements of the Plan that demonstrate insufficient flexibility to be able to respond to changing circumstances. As a result, it is our view that the Plan has not been prepared positively, is not justified or effective, and is not consistent with national policy. We discuss this in greater under the following specific policy headings:

Part 1: District Wide Strategy and Policies Policy DW1: District-wide Spatial Strategy. Page 32

The District Wide Spatial Strategy has been brought forward from the adopted Core Strategy with no subsequent changes in the policy text. Specifically we note with concern that Policy DW1 remains silent on the emerging West of England (WoE) Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) including work being undertaken in respect of a new OAN for the WoE. Our concerns in respect of the indicated JSP Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) have been submitted to the JSP Issues and Options (I&O) consultation. Of note, is the exclusion of BANES from the WoE JSP and the significant shortfall in the proposed housing requirement, which we consider should increase by approximately 70% to at least 153,440 homes. Whilst these comments are made separately, they do nonetheless directly relate to the draft Placemaking Plan and how BANES intends to deal with the significant rising housing need including through the subsequent impending review of the Core Strategy/ Placemaking Plan. Policy DW1 should therefore be amended to reflect the role of BANES within the WoE JSP.

11 Mav 2016 Page 853 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Despite the lack of changes within Policy DW1, the Spatial Strategy does, however, now include additional supporting text in respect of Housing Development on non-allocated sites at Bath, Keynsham and Somer Valley. In this regard, paragraph 62 states:

"In respect of the Somer Valley, Core Strategy Policy SV1(4) relates to the housing proposals in Midsomer Norton...Policy SV1 confirms that housing development will be acceptable in principle within the HDB and that residential development on sites outside the HDB will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan (see the Somer Valley place-based section)."

We consider that the soundness of the Plan is significantly compromised by its lack of flexibility to respond and adapt to change, and this includes the inward looking and restrictive policies in respect of future housing growth in the Somer Valley. The Housing Development Boundaries and policy wording as proposed in Policy SV1 would, in our view, unacceptably and unsustainably restrict growth across the plan period. In the context of BANES and its role in the WoE we consider that such a restriction on growth would lead to a Plan that has not been positively prepared and would not be effective. We discuss this in greater detail in our response to Policy SV1 below.

Q5 Change Requested

We consider that the Placemaking Plan provides an opportunity for the Council to respond positively and proactively to the delivery of housing in the district. Further consideration to the inclusion of sites such as our client's land at Chilcompton Road, Midsomer Norton, which would represent an entirely logical extension to the town, would provide an opportunity for the Plan to adapt to change, which would be consistent with paragraph 14 of the NPPF, and would reflect the important role of BANES and the market town of Midsomer Norton in the greater West of England area. The need to remain flexible to future change is especially pertinent given the Council's history in terms of housing delivery as confirmed by its status as a 20 percent authority.

Summary

For the Placemaking Plan to be found sound it must meet the four tests of soundness as set out within paragraph 182 of the NPPF. For the reasons outlined above, we consider that the Plan has not been positively prepared, is not justified, is not effective and is not consistent with national policy and therefore fails the tests of soundness under paragraph 182.

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Placemaking Plan and would welcome the opportunity to engage further at all future stages. In the meantime, if you require any further information or have any queries regarding the content of this representation please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

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 also request that we are given the opportunity to appear and speak at any forthcoming Examination Hearings.

Respondent Number: 234	Comment Number: 5		
Name: Michael Fenton	Organisation:	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	
Agent Name: Simon Fitton Agent Organisation: RPS Planning & Development			
Further Information available in the	e 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 Justified ✓ Not Cons		

11 Mav 2016 Page 854 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1

The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

Strategic Issues: Para.10

The strategic issues contained under paragraph 10, Part 4 (Somer Valley), remain unchanged from the adopted Core Strategy. We consider, however, that the strategic issues of the Somer Valley should be revisited and updated to reflect the status of the area, and in particular Midsomer Norton, as a location for significant economic growth and investment. It should further be recognised that significant investment in the area, including through the Somer Valley Enterprise Zone, must also be supported by adequate housing supply and this should be reflected within the strategic issues.

Whilst we recognise the Council's concern in respect of out-commuting and an apparent imbalance of housing over jobs in Midsomer Norton, we do not consider that sufficient recognition has been given to the economic benefits of housing or the significant projected investment in Midsomer Norton. For example, whilst paragraph 13 has been added to the Plan outlining the role of the Bristol, Bath, and Somer Valley Enterprise Zone, this significant strength has not been reflected within the strategic issues. Additionally, the significant strength of additional housing, and the direct correlation between housing and the economy must not be ignored. For example, according to the Home Builder Federation's Housing Calculator, a further 250 homes could support the employment of approximately 1,075 people.

Further, whilst the 'mixed quality of Midsomer Norton town centre' has been identified as a challenge, the Plan does not in turn recognise that investment in the town, including in terms of new homes, would offer a significant strength to the vitalisation of the town centre.

Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

In respect of the Somer Valley Spatial Strategy we note that amendments have been made to the wording of Policy SV1, strategy 4: 'Housing', as below:

"Enable around 2,470 new homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John within the housing development boundary. Residential development on sites outside the Housing Development Boundary will be acceptable only if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan by amending the housing development boundary as necessary and to reflect existing commitments."

We consider that the review of the Housing Development Boundaries (HDB) and the amendments to the spatial strategy within the Plan have not been undertaken in a positive or proactive manner. In our view, the soundness of the Plan is significantly compromised by its lack of flexibility to respond and adapt to change, and this includes the inward looking and restrictive policies in respect of future housing growth. This is discussed in greater detail below.

Although the Housing Development Boundary has been amended in order to accommodate existing housing commitments in Midsomer Norton, it makes no additional provision to allocate or safeguard land for further residential development in the Plan period. Given the status of Midsomer Norton as the principal market town for the Somer Valley, we consider the complete lack of flexibility in housing to be a fundamental flaw of the Plan undermining its soundness.

According to the BANES Housing Trajectory 2011 to 2029 (dated April 2015) the Somer Valley is anticipated to deliver exactly 2,470 dwellings in the Plan period, which includes five year and longer term windfall allowances. The figure that is forecasted is therefore exactly on target with the 'around' about figure required in the Somer Valley by the Core Strategy. There is not, however, any scope within the revised HDB or the wording of Policy SV1 to react to any shortfall that may occur on any one of the existing commitments, or indeed any future short or medium term housing need. As the principal market town in the Somer Valley we consider that the policy wording should allow sufficient flexibility within the town to positively react to change. As presented, the Plan does not provide such flexibility and instead unacceptably and negatively restricts development outside of the drawn housing development boundary. This is not in

11 May 2016 Page 855 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

the essence of the NPPF or the Government's objective to significantly boost housing supply. Whilst the Plan provides an opportunity for housing to come forward as part of the Midsomer Norton Neighbourhood Plan, this does not provide adequate reassurance that future growth will be supported including within the short term. Indeed it would appear that the Midsomer Norton Neighbourhood Plan has already been significantly delayed beyond its projected timescale with no recent update available to date.

In addition to the above, we note that in the Somer Valley, housing delivery is expected to drop significantly from the next five year period (between 2015 and 2020), to the end of the Plan period in 2029. In the five year period between 2015/20 annual housing delivery in the Somer Valley is forecasted to be in the range of 171 to 354 dwellings, which includes an annual delivery rate of between 49 and 75 affordable homes. By comparison, in the five year period between 2020/21 and 2024/25, annual housing delivery is forecasted to drop substantially to between 69 dwellings and 19 dwellings per annum. Of significance, we note that the affordable housing delivery rate is forecasted to be 0 from 2021 to 2029.

The significant drop in housing delivery across the Plan period is completely unsustainable and does not reflect the status of the Somer Valley, and in particular Midsomer Valley, as a location for increased economic growth and enterprise. In order to continue as a thriving and sustainable community, the Plan must provide sufficient flexibility to provide future growth, not only in terms of economic development but also in terms of housing supply. It must be recognised that there is a close relationship between promoting economic growth alongside supporting housing supply. To ignore this principle would undermine the purpose of the Placemaking Plan, which is intended to:

"help to deliver better places by facilitating the delivery of high quality, sustainable and well located development supported by the timely provision of necessary infrastructure." (para. 9) (RPS emphasis).

Furthermore, and as already highlighted, BANES has an active and significant role to play in terms of meeting the housing requirement of the WoE and this is being translated through the WoE JSP. Whilst we consider the proposed JSP housing requirement to be unsound as presented, we do nonetheless support the recognition of Midsomer Norton as a location for town expansion. This has not, however, been reflected within the Placemaking Plan with Policy SV1 placing undue restrictions on the ability of the town to expand. Given the fundamental importance of the JSP to the future of the four WoE authorities, including BANES, we consider that the absence of proper consideration of the JSP within the Placemaking Plan fundamentally and critically undermines its soundness.

We consider that the Placemaking Plan provides an opportunity for the Council to respond positively and proactively to the delivery of housing in the district. Further consideration to the inclusion of sites such as our client's land at Chilcompton Road, Midsomer Norton, which would represent an entirely logical extension to the town, would provide an opportunity for the Plan to adapt to change, which would be consistent with paragraph 14 of the NPPF, and would reflect the important role of BANES and the market town of Midsomer Norton in the greater West of England area. The need to remain flexible to future change is especially pertinent given the Council's history in terms of housing delivery as confirmed by its status as a 20% authority.

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?

We would also request that we are given the opportunity to appear and speak at any forthcoming Examination Hearings.

Respondent Number: 244 Comment Number: 2

Name: Susan E Green Organisation: Home Builders Federation

Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 Mav 2016 Page 856 of 956

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \qed
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 Consisten 🗹 Not Effective 🗹
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Therefore additional housing sites will be required so Placemaking Plan policies should be flexible in order to facilitate future development. In this context the Housing Development Boundaries proposed on the basis of the Core Strategy housing requirement rather than meeting longer term housing needs will become out of date very quickly after adoption of the Placemaking Plan. Indeed the restriction of development to sites within Housing Development Boundaries in Policy SV1 will overly constrain future development.
When allocating sites the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets.
Bullet Point (3) of Policy DW1 states the Councils intention of "prioritising brownfield to limit need for greenfield sites". If it is the Council's intention to prioritise brownfield before green-field then this approach would be contrary to national policy. It is suggested that the wording of this Bullet Point is changed to encourage the re-use of previously developed land. The core planning principle set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF is to "encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)" such encouragement is not setting out a principle of prioritising brownfield before green-field land. Similarly paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that "Local Planning Authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land" again there is no reference to prioritising the use of brownfield land. The Council's intention should not lapse back to previous national policies which are now inconsistent with current national policy. In paragraph 17 of his determination of the Planning Appeal at Burgess Farm in Worsley Manchester (APP/U4230/A/11/215743) dated July 2012 (4 months after the introduction of the NPPF) the Secretary of State confirmed that "national planning policy in the Framework encourages the use of previously developed land but does not promote a sequential approach to land use. It stresses the importance of achieving sustainable development to meet identified needs".
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?
Respondent Number: 2564 Comment Number: 4 Name: Simon Steele-Perkins Organisation: Strategic Land Partnerships Agent Name: Joanna Lee Agent Organisation: Peter Brett Associates LLP Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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):

11 May 2016 Page 857 of 956

Not Consisten **✓**

Not Effective **✓**

Not Justified **✓**

Not Positively Prepared 🔽

The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley , Policy SV1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

We note that the housing development boundary for Midsomer Norton has been amended to take account of the permissions that have been granted for housing. We support this amendment which properly reflects how the settlement is going to grow, but consider that the revisions do not go far enough. The plan should recognise the development potential of the site at Silver Street and as such the settlement boundary should reflect this allocation. The Council clearly believes that this site is suitable for development and we agree that the area around Silver Street is highly sustainable and suitable for development.

As part of the comprehensive development of this area the development boundaries should be extended as shown on the attached plan at Appendix 4, as previously submitted, to include land to the east and west of Silver Street and relate properly with the Barratt site that is currently being developed to the west of Fosseway.

Conclusion

The Placemaking Plan is predicated on an out of date housing figure which means the context of the plan is flawed and the provision identified does not meet the full objectively assessed needs that exist. In order to more properly plan for the needs of the area, and to provide appropriate flexibility additional development should be identified. This includes making allocations in policy H1 and also adopting a more flexible approach to the safeguarded school site in policy LCR3 to recognise that an alternative preferred site exists and that if this more suitable school site is developed to meet the needs, the site at Silver Street should continue to come forward to meet the needs of Midsomer Norton. This would ensure the plan is deliverable, justified and flexible and is sound in accordance with the NPPF.

The sites at Silver Street represent highly sustainable, suitable, available and achievable locations for a mix of development which must be planned comprehensively to ensure that development to meet the needs of the town is provided. Consequently it is recommended that the policy is amended to recognise that if the school does not come forward, the land should be developed for other uses.

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?

We wish to attend the examination to present these arguments and ensure that the Inspector is aware of the current up to date position in relation to the school particularly in relation to the preferred site in Mendip and to provide detailed evidence in relation to delivery issues.

Respondent Number: 3094 Comment Numb	per: 5			
Name:	Organisation:	Purnell Prope	rty Partnership	
Agent Name: Neil Rowley Agent Organisation: Savills				
Further Information available in the original comm	ent? No	Attachmen	ts sent with the comment?	Yes
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 Con	sisten 🗌	Not Effective	

11 Mav 2016 Page 858 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Proposals Map – Housing Development Boundary
For similar reasons, we consider that the "Housing Development Boundary" should be amended to reflect the extent of the development permitted on the site by the outline permission.
We consider that the Plan is not 'positively prepared' and not 'justified' as it excludes land that has already been granted planning permission from falling within the Housing Development Boundary.
It should therefore be amended in line with the blue line on the plan on the following page:
Q5 Change Requested
The "Housing Development Boundary" should be amended to reflect the extent of the development permitted on the site by the outline permission.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6410 Comment Number: 11 Name: Organisation: Linden Homes Strategic Land Agent Name: Pegasus Group Agent Organisation: Sarah Hamilton-Foyn 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 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Placemaking Plan introduces 'Core Development Management Policies' which are complemented by a range of district-wide policies. Paragraph 86-88 states that together these will help to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy and will be used to assess and determine planning applications.
The following responses identify those policies which serve to constrain development and are contrary to the tests of soundness. Not only should these be revised to be consistent with the NPPF, a more positive approach should also be adopted to ensure sufficient flexibility to meet the longer-term housing needs once these are known.
Through the Joint Spatial Plan, Bath and North East Somerset may be required to accommodate some of the needs of the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area in addition to the housing requirement of the Core Strategy and any additional needs which have yet to be identified by a reassessment of the needs in Bath and North East Somerset to 2036.

11 May 2016 Page 859 of 956

requirement of the Core Strategy; but these requirements will become out-of-date very shortly either through the Joint

However, the Placemaking Plan has reviewed the Housing Development Boundaries on the basis of the housing

Spatial Plan or through the partial or full review of the Core Strategy. Therefore, the Housing Development Boundaries proposed will become out-of-date shortly after adoption in 2018. Policy SV1 Somer Valley restricts development to sites within the Housing Development Boundaries. This will clearly not be an effective or positive policy and will serve to constrain housing development contrary to the NPPF. The Policy should be revised to allow development beyond the Housing Development Boundaries where this responds to the needs identified in updated Strategic Housing Market Assessments and where the development is commensurate with the settlement.

On the basis of the overly optimistic delivery assumptions and the negative interpretation of the short-term housing requirements (excluding any needs in the Wider Bristol HMA), the Placemaking Plan identifies that there is no requirement to release greenfield sites within the Somer Valley in paragraph 145. However, once a more realistic analysis is undertaken and the longer-term needs are known it is inevitable that greenfield sites will be required to complement the development of previously developed sites. A mix of both greenfield and previously developed sites ensures that delivery can be forthcoming in a timely manner, without the delays associated with complex land ownerships, contamination, demolition etc. whilst also making efficient use of land.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate	
Respondent Number: 6414 Comment Number: 1	16
Name: O	organisation: Radstock Land LP
Agent Name:	gent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment?	No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally concerns the respondent consider the document is sound? If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, If The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	s unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective
Q4 Soundness Comment	
The Placemaking Plan sets out a series of Development Ma	anagement Policies and we consider these below.
detail for development as well as site allocations. In this co	, , , , ,

Secondly, the only mechanism available to deliver development in addition to that allocated / committed is via a

accepted as being a minimum, contrary to the explicit reference contained within the CS Inspector's Report.

11 May 2016 Page 860 of 956

New text introduced via the Placemaking Plan to SV1 (4) confirms that housing development will be located within the Development Boundary and any development outside the designated boundary only acceptable if permitted in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. We have two principle concerns with this approach. The first being that the quantitative provisions of SV1 are premised on the application of the CS requirement as a cap on development in excess of that

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Neighbourhood Plan. There is no guarantee that a Neighbourhood Plan will be prepared or that such a plan would look to identify additional sites. Therefore SV1, in the context of its quantitative provisions, effectively imposes a moratorium on additional development. This fails in two respects, firstly it amounts to a blanket restriction on development which is contrary to national policy and guidance, and secondly, it provides no flexibility or policy scope to enable the Somer Valley to make an appropriate contribution to meeting newly identified needs arising from the JSP both in terms of the Wider Bristol HMA and any updated B&NES SHMA assessment. Critically, it also precludes the release of appropriate and sustainable sites in circumstances where a five year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. Meaning that it is only through the application of Paragraph 49 and 14 of the NPPF that such development opportunities will be considered, i.e. where the relevant policies for the supply of housing, including Development Boundaries, are considered to be out of date.

Q5 Change Requested

Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6415 Comment Number: 18 Name: Organisation: Strongvox Homes Agent Name: Daniel Weaver Agent Organisation: Pegasus Group 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The Placemaking Plan sets out a series of Development Management Policies and we insider these below. The Placemaking Plan is intended to complement the strategic framework as set out in the adopted CS, providing policy detail for development as well as site allocations. In this context the proposals contained within the Placemaking Plan represent the delivery mechanism for the CS Vision and Strategic Objectives. The spatial strategy is established through CS Policy DW1, the Placemaking Plan does not propose any amendments to this policy. Paragraph 62 provides the strategic overview for housing proposals in the Somer Valley with reference to CS Policy SV1(4). New text introduced via the Placemaking Plan to SV1 (4) confirms that housing development will be located within the
Development Boundary and any development outside the designated boundary only acceptable if permitted in an

Valley to make an appropriate contribution to meeting newly identified needs arising from the JSP both in terms of the

11 May 2016

Page 861 of 956

adopted Neighbourhood Plan. We have two principle concerns with this approach. The first being that the quantitative provisions of SV1 are premised on the application of the CS requirement as a cap on development in excess of that

accepted as being a minimum, contrary to the explicit reference contained within the CS Inspector's Report.

Secondly, the only mechanism available to deliver development in addition to that allocated / committed is via a Neighbourhood Plan. There is no guarantee that a Neighbourhood Plan will be prepared or that such a plan would look to identify additional sites. Therefore SV1, in the context of its quantitative provisions, effectively imposes a moratorium on additional development. This fails in two respects, firstly it amounts to a blanket restriction on development which is contrary to national policy and guidance, and secondly, it provides no flexibility or policy scope to enable the Somer

Wider Bristol HMA and any updated B&NES SHMA assessment. Critically, it also precludes the release of appropriate and sustainable sites in circumstances where a five year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. Meaning that it is only through the application of Paragraph 49 and 14 of the NPPF that such development opportunities will be considered, i.e. where the relevant policies for the supply of housing, including Development Boundaries, are considered to be out of date.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6434 Comment Number: 2
Name: David Webb Management Ltd
Agent Name: Kay Mann Agent Organisation: Phoenix Land Solutions Ltd
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 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Background Representations
1. This document has been prepared on behalf of David Webb Management Ltd the client in response to BANES's Pre Submission Placemaking Plan.
2. The representation focuses on the strategy to deliver housing within the Somer Valley namely in Radstock. The context of the representation is in respect of a site located just outside the Radstock Housing Development Boundary.
3. Details of the site and proposals are contained in Planning Reference 15/00855/OUT. This application was withdrawn in May 2015 in order to resolve outstanding matters. It remains my client's position that matters can be resolved to provide for acceptable development.
Appendix 1 to this document makes reference to previous Local Plan Inqury's where the site was considered. It highlights the need to consider this brownfield site independently from a larger site (as identified in the SHLAA).
Representations Policy SV1 4) and Paragraph 62 of Part 1 of the Plan
5. The Spatial Strategy seeks new development to be located in the most sustainable locations and the priority is to steer growth primarily to brownfield land.
6. The spatial strategy for Somer Valley is outlined in Policy SV1(4) and Paragraph 62 of the Somer Valley section of the Plan (Part 4). Here housing development is considered acceptable in principle if it is within the HDB or identified in an

11 Mav 2016 Page 862 of 956

adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

- 7. This approach is not considered to be effective as it curbs any flexibility to deliver sustainable sites that are brownfield in nature just outside the HDB. Furthermore, the national position to prioritise development on brownfield land in sustainable locations is not reflected within SV1 (4) and at paragraph 62 of Part 1.
- 8. The Tyning Hill site is previously developed land on the edge of the existing HDB close to Radstock Town Centre. It is situated on the edge of rural landscape but does not display the physical characteristics of the agricultural landscape on the adjacent hillside or the same degree of openness. Moreover foundations and footings of previous dwellings together with associated hardstanding access are visible on the site and have not blended into the landscape. The old estate road is clearly show on a number of plans within the Placemaking Plan.
- 9. Development will form an extension of the existing HDB at Tyning Hill, and can be seen in the context of a settlement which extends up the valley hillsides. Given it is adjacent to the Radstock settlement and a 10 minute walk from Radstock Town Centre it would form a natural extension to the Town offering the opportunity to improve the settlement edge, while including new key landscape elements, which will enhance the site. It will also enable improved connectivity between the new school to the north and the existing residential development at Lower Whiteland's. It will link up existing recreational walks that enable users to enjoy Radstock mining heritage and will re-connect Lower Whitelands development and residents with the wider community that was lost since the disintegration of the adjacent Mining dwellings.
- 10. Extending the existing adjacent HDB tightly round the Site and/or widening the policy as suggested below would help facilitate a brownfield site in a sustainable location with various public benefits as including enhanced biodiversity, 30% affordable housing and community café to be brought forward in a positive way fostering the delivery of sustainable mixed use development.

Q5 Change Requested

Housing Development Boundary

We seek an extension of the Housing Development Boundary (HDB) around the Site at Tyning Hill, Radstock (see attached site plan with site outlined in red) and/or a change policy /paragraphs as outlined below.

Changes to Policy SV1(4)

Enable around 2,470 new homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John within the housing development boundary. Residential development on sites outside the Housing Development Boundary will be acceptable if

adjoining the Housing Development Boundary and brownfield in nature or if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. This will include affordable housing, providing more choices of housing to meet the needs of the local communities. (Policies RA1 and RA2 are applicable to the other settlements in Somer Valley.)

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 proposed changes relate to a specific site rather than a general change that may be could be suggested by other people making representations. For this reason participation is considered necessary.

11 May 2016 Page 863 of 956

Respondent Number: 6456 Comment Number: 2 Name: Organisation: Biggin Family Agent Name: Tom Rocke Agent Organisation: Rocke Associates Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment The following comments were made on behalf of the current representor in response to the Placemaking Plan Options Consultation: My clients are the owners of 46 Radstock Road, a sizeable Victorian residential property that has a frontage onto the Radstock Road. To the rear the dwelling has an extensive curtilage, and beyond that is a paddock that extends to the River Somer in the valley bottom. The site is identified on the enclosed plan. The site represents an ideal opportunity for housing development in close proximity to Midsomer Norton Town Centre. There is sufficient space to the west of the existing dwelling to create a new access road through to the land at the rear, retaining the existing dwelling on the road frontage. Adequate visibility can be created by setting back the boundary. The land falls towards the River Somer, and the site could be developed for residential purposes with minimum environmental impact. The site is within easy walking distance of Midsomer Norton town centre and local employment in the vicinity of Radstock Road and the town centre.
Q5 Change Requested Include as an amendment to the polocies maps at appendix 2, annex 1 the inclusion in the housing development boundary for the Somer Valley of the land outlined in red on the plan at Annex 1 to these representations.
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: 6497 Comment Number: 1 Name: Margaret Edwards Organisation: 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 Sustified Not Consisten Not Effective

11 May 2016 Page 864 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley , Policy SV1	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	

Q4 Soundness Comment

Paulton has had substantial building (The Printworks etc etc etc various plots of land recently popped up with loads of houses and the road infrastructure is not able to cope at present the main road can not be made wider due to historic houses! and the other roads around can not cope with the traffic or be made wider due to houses! There are also farms and farm vehicles going up and down narrow roads and coaches lorries! There is lack of parking on local roads, it is very difficult to park anywhere and Traffic is bad here and Midsomer Norton from 3pm peaking at 4pm due to schools. The main road out to the wells road has a bollard on it which is dangerous because people think they can get through! the same time as you and so to avoid a head on you damage your car hitting bollard and slows down already slow traffic! Needs sorting if commercial premises are being planned for OLD MILLs!There should be defined openspaces and green spaces and especially starategic nature areas especially by the side of Brookside ad Valley View where that dangerously steep and flood area land was never built on and obviously should never be! We need some green area in Paulton!We need green ways there are lots of endangered species here! Boxbury Hill Paulton should not be built on! No jobs, Lack of public transport to Bristol and Bath, Not enough schools or child care facilities already, Transport chaos already! No parking spaces, Print works new development has inadequate lighting and Why only houses other facilities were suppost to be built there for the community!!!!!! Midsomer Norton is the same and Radstock Traffic is awful at a stand still! and there is no was of changing it! you cannot make roads bigger unfortunately!

Q5 Change Requested

classification.

Do not build any more houses in Paulton, get rid of bollards, farm vehicles a problem and parking a problem, Do not build on Boxbury Hill, make land between Brookside and Valley View a strategic nature area due to wonderful nature there and due to floods and land slide is not suitable for building on, it is a natural valley! With a view point etc has always been special area. Pilton also has rare wildlife!nr Keynsham!

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

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

Respondent Number: 7074 Comment Number: 1 Name: Paul and Rachel Condry, Steph and Judy Urch Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?	Yes
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 Consisten Not Effective	
Not rositively repared Not sustined Not consistent Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
From the documentation we are uncertain whether a piece of land has been included within the new Plan for	

11 Mav 2016 Page 865 of 956

development - Land on edge of Staddlestones, Midsomer Norton, BA3 2PP, adjacent to properties 1, 5, 6 & 7 Staddlestones. Grid reference: ST6263253193. If this piece of land has now been included we object to the new

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

1 Ecology

This field forms part of the River Somer corridor. Midsomer Norton Town Council is working hard to ensure that the Somer 'corridor' is retained and protected. If it becomes an 'infill' site it would interrupt a natural green corridor for wildlife along the River Somer.

2 Flood risk and assessment

The field location is shown on plans as a "low risk" flood area. It does not state "zero risk" and so logically it should be assumed there still remains a risk of flooding to some degree. This field has flooded on occasions since we moved into our properties 30 years ago, primarily as a result of intense rainfall on the level of the field. However we have also observed many times that the level of the stream to the West side of the field has risen substantially and one could not rule out the possibility that at some point in the future it could still spill over into the field.

On the issue of the Flood Plan, plans clearly show that immediately adjacent to this field there is a category Flood Zone 3 area upstream from the development. It doesn't take much imagination to conclude that this higher level risk area would pose a threat to any adjoining land, albeit at a lower level, unless of course the proposed development area is currently higher than the area in Zone 3, which it is not.

Also using most simple logic, when the Staddlestones estate was built a low flood escape bridge was clearly installed in the field to act as a channel for any flood waters coming from upstream to be cleared to the downstream Zone 2 and 3 flood areas to the North of the field. The raising of ground levels to form flood banks were also made to protect all the properties adjoining the field boundary – ie numbers 1, 5, 6 and 7. If housing is built and this channel infilled it could significantly increase the risk of flooding.

When challenged on the current categorisation of the field it seems that the Environment Agency still need to do some modelling (flood risk) to be absolutely sure.

Environment Agency (Extract)

The area showing as Flood Zone 1 next to the River Somer is an area of land where our national generalised flood mapping (J-Flow modelling) ends and a detailed model produced in 2008 begins. As a result the flood outline for this location may not be entirely representative. We are aware of this inconsistency and are undertaking further modelling work in this location in 2016, when we hope to address this."

"As this location is on a boundary between two flood models, we would also be looking for further modelling work to be undertaken (until our new model is available) to clarify the flood zoning before discussing any impacts to flood risk and operational maintenance"

They could not explain why proper modelling of this area in the field had not been carried out, or at least they appeared to have no record of that specific modelling. Before any inclusion / development could be allowed to proceed surely that work would need to be carried out, as there seems to be no current and categorical science that clearly establishes the level of risk to this field.

We therefore have concerns over flood drainage.

3 Agricultural Land

We understand that this piece of land has been described as a redundant parcel of land – this is not true. Until very recently the land was in productive use with the grazing of livestock and harvesting of grass. Although the land is not currently being used for these purposes there is considerable local interest in the purchase or leasing of this land for agricultural, equestrian or horticulture use. There would be no problems in the future with someone wanting to continue to use this land for agricultural purposes.

4 Need for Additional Housing

It can be questioned whether there is a need for further housing in our area. It is our understanding following discussion with the planning officer that there is sufficient land already allocated to meet Midsomer Norton's housing requirements for the next 5 years or so. Is there a need therefore to change the classification of this greenfield site.

We therefore object to this piece of land being reclassified for housing in the Placemaking Plan Options document.

	_		
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?			

11 Mav 2016 Page 866 of 956

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

	Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number: 1	
	Name: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd	
	Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd	
	Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes	
-		-
	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 Consisten Not Effective	
		_
	The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1	
	The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	

O4 Soundness Comment

- 1.1 On behalf of Bidwell Metals Ltd Grass Roots Planning have been instructed to prepare and submit written representations to the Bath and North East Somerset (BANES) Draft Placemaking Plan Consultation. Bidwell Metals currently own a metal recycling facility on the northern edge of Radstock and this is a successful long-standing local business located within Bath.
- 1.2 This statement sets out our position on the emerging Placemaking Plan and the issues and options for consideration, and promotes two Bidwell Metals sites as future allocation sites for housing. Whilst we consider that the preparation of the Placemaking Plan is a positive step, we have significant concerns on the policies set out in the Somer Valley Chapter in particular which aim to restrict the supply of housing growth and will not allow the flexibility to react to changing circumstances.
- 1.3 The Placemaking Plan should aim to complement the adopted Core Strategy by providing a set of detailed planning policies and site allocations. This will help shape what development takes place and where up to the year 2029.
- 1.4 Alongside this statement we have submitted the online consultation form and a redline boundary plan for the Bidwell Metals site at Chapel Road, Clandown, situated to the north of Radstock, and a secondary site to the east of Radstock adjacent to Bath Old Road, with proposed masterplans for each site contributing up to 70 dwellings (45 for Chapel Road, 25 at Bath Old Road). Further technical work will be undertaken to inform any mitigation measures that need to be considered with regards to highways, ecology, landscape, archaeology etc. but it is largely thought that there are no significant constraints to the site and homes can be delivered within the next five years subject to planning permission being granted.

Policy SV1: Somer Valley Spatial Strategy

2.11 The Somer Valley Chapter of the Placemaking Plan currently identifies one of their critical issues as an imbalance between housing and jobs. This is asserted by the fact that many employment locations have closed. Paragraph 13, page 5, states that:

'theSomer Valley element of the Bristol, Bath and Somer Valley Enterprise Zone will prioritise the establishment of a new strategic employment location for the area and provide incentives to bring forward existing sites... the area [which] is suffering from increasing out-commuting as local job growth is not keeping pace with residential expansion'.

2.12 Whilst planning for the enterprise zone is a positive step, the plan also proposes to restrict housing growth to ensure the number of jobs increases to ascertain a better balance between these elements. We consider this assertion

11 Mav 2016 Page 867 of 956

to be flawed for a number of reasons that we will go on to describe.

2.13 Firstly, it should be noted here that at no point does national planning policy contained in the NPPF prescribe that future residents commuting to work would represent an adverse impact that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the significant benefits of providing much needed housing in the Somer Valley. The relevant parts of the NPPF that relate to transport include the following:

'Paragraph 17: Authorities should: actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable;

Paragraph 30: Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development, where reasonable to do so, facilitatingthe use of sustainable modes of transport;

Paragraph 34: Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised; and

Paragraph 37: Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encourage to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.'

- 2.14 These policies clearly show that the travel implications of commuting to work by car are just one consideration relating to sustainable transport. The proximity of sites to shopping, leisure, educations and other services should be balance against the availability of employment. At the current time the council seem to be focusing purely on this former issue and not balance the latter issues against it.
- 2.15 The Somer Valley, and in particular Midsomer Norton and Radstock are sustainably located and within close proximity to Bath. A direct route is the A367 which runs into the centre of Bath and takes approximately 20 minutes by car, without traffic. In addition to the use of the private motor car, there are several routes of public transport available including buses within Clandown which run into Bath City Centre, including on Saturdays.
- 2.16 Radstock and Midsomer Norton also have a large level of everyday facilities and services which minimises the need to travel and maximises the use of sustainable transport modes, as set out in paragraph 34 of the NPPF. This includes supermarkets, Radstock College, Radstock Museum, The Academy of Trinity, Post Office, local stores, churches, employment locations, sports clubs, banks, hairdressers, pubs, and restaurants.
- 2.17 Under part 4e) of the adopted Bath Core Strategy, it is clear that the Local Planning Authority have planned transport improvements to support the connectivity of Midsomer Norton/Radstock with both Bristol and Bath. IDP Ref MNRI.2, on page 117 of the Core Strategy, identifies a key infrastructure item as the Greater Bristol Bus Network Major Scheme A37, which therefore will improve linkages for these settlements to the Greater Bristol Area.
- 2.18 Accordingly policies within the NPPF actually suggest that new development should be focused on existing urban areas where public transport links can be provided and strengthened and shops and services already exist or can be accommodated to cater for the needs of residents. This would minimise the distance of trips which is the core desire of NPPF transport policy.
- 2.19 In addition to other major constraints, such as the Green Belt, AONB, and World Heritage Site, it is therefore logical to promote housing growth within Midsomer Norton and Radstock instead of restricting it, as planned transport works will ensure residents are able to use sustainable methods of transport to go to work which ensures a balance of homes and jobs in the area.
- 2.20 Part 4 of policy SV1 relates to housing growth and makes it a key objective to 'enable around 2,470new homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John within the housing development boundary. Residential development on sites outside the Housing Development Boundary will be acceptable only if

11 May 2016 Page 868 of 956

identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan'.

- 2.21 These homes are part of the committed strategy presented in the Bath Core Strategy. However, it is clear that within each separate section of the Somer Valley chapter that there has not been a specific proportion of housing allocated to settlements across the Valley. This is a fundamental flaw within the Placemaking Plan if development is expected to be delivered through neighbourhood plans where there is no direction of growth.
- 2.22 Consequently it is inappropriate to suggest that development will come through via Neighbourhood Plans when no apportionment to various parishes, and hence neighbourhood plans, is identified. Although policy SV1 identifies an overall housing figure for the area this is not informative enough to distinguish what level of housing growth will be required in each neighbourhood and this should have been identified to avoid a lack of supply in the future.
- 2.23 It is therefore not clear as to whether the Somer Valley will meet its intended housing requirements and this could result in BANES being found to have a lack of five year housing land supply if homes are not delivered in this area which are needed.
- 2.24 In relation to Radstock, the Town Council have no immediate plans to undertake a Neighbourhood Plan. This will result in no development, even brownfield sites, being considered at all outside of the Housing Development Boundary.
- 2.25 This reduces the plan's ability to react and adapt to rapid change, a key requirement of the NPPF. If at a later date BANES are found to have a lack of five year housing land supply, policies within the Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan will be found out-of-date and this may lead to unsustainable patterns of development forming, which may include the prioritisation of Greenfield sites over brownfield land which are quicker and easier to deliver.
- 2.26 Given national government's presumption in favour of sustainable development with particular prioritisation of brownfield sites, a change in policy wording is needed here to ensure that a permissive approach to brownfield sites that are sustainably located adjacent to the Housing Development Boundary will be considered for development, ensuring choice and competition in the market.
- 2.27 This will result in a plan that is positively prepared and will aim to significantly boost the supply of housing, both key requirements of national planning policy.

Q5 Change Requested

3.0 CHANGES TO SPECIFIC POLICIES

- 3.1 As set out we consider that the policies set out within the Somer Valley chapter of the Placemaking Plan are unsound in their current form. This is because these policies restrict housing growth in an area where housing affordability is an acute issue, which is in direct conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which sets a need to 'boost significantly the supply of housing'.
- 3.2 Furthermore, it does not appear that any form of apportionment is set out between the existing settlements in the Somer Valley, a fundamental flaw if the plan intends to rely on neighbourhood plans to come forward and deliver housing. As a minimum the Placemaking Plan cannot restrict housing growth and also needs to designate specific numbers to the different settlements within the Somer Valley.
- 3.3 We are therefore proposing several changes to the policies as they exist in their current format.
- 3.4 Under part 4 of Policy SV1, a permissive approach needs to be set out in relation to land adjacent to the Housing Development Boundaries, with particular regard to brownfield land and should instead read: 'Enablea minimum of2,470 new homes to be built at Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Westfield, Paulton and Peasedown St John. This growth should be prioritised in the mainurban areas, in particular Midsomer Norton and Radstock. In order to ensure choice and flexibility within the market, brownfield land adjacent to the housing development boundary in sustainable locations should be considered for development'.

11 Mav 2016 Page 869 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

bonedate of Bury Made comments received (in Fian Gracif
3.5 Reference to a reliance on neighbourhood plans to deliver housing should be removed unless a specific allocation of housing numbers is determined in the Placemaking Plan for each settlement.
3.6 Policies SSV14 – SSV20 need to broadly identify the number of homes envisaged on each site to better indicate the level of dwellings to be allocated and delivered in the Somer Valley over the remainder of the plan period.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Despendent Numbers 7120 Comment Numbers 12
Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 12 Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes
Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
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 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy SV1
2 Facultural Bernalduran est
3.Economic Development There appears to be little, if any, tangible evidence that 900 additional jobs can be attracted to the Somer Valley and
presently no schemes to encourage larger employers to move into the area.
4.Housing There are many settlements within the Somer Valley that do not have a Neighbourhood Plan and the Placemaking Plan is a higher tier plan which should be guiding the Neighbourhood plan process. The plan also needs to be positively made. We recommend the proposed wording to 4 should omit the word 'only' and read:- on sites outside the Housing Development Boundary will be acceptable only if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
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?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.
Respondent Number: 7231 Comment Number: 1
Name: John Mason Organisation:
Agent Name: John Hooke Agent Organisation:

11 May 2016 Page 870 of 956

No

Further Information available in the original comment?

Attachments sent with the comment?

Yes

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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SV1 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
As indicated previously the land is located on the eastern side of Kilmersdon Road adjacent to 3 Kilmersdon Road. The land is open and falls from its western edge, adjacent to the highway in an easterly direction towards a watercourse located at the lowest part of the site. The northern boundary is formed by a stone wall and separates the land from the adjacent two storey dwelling. In the north eastern corner is a property known as Brookside, which is accessed from Meadow View. These properties form part of a group of properties along with Meadow View.
It is the view of Mr Mason the opportunity exists to adjust the Housing Development Boundary by moving the line to the south and aligning with the proposed development residential development to the east of the watercourse.
A realignment moving the boundary to the south as indicated would be of sufficient size to enable the development of a single dwelling. The development of this plot size would enable the provision of landscaping to soften the view of the settlement when approaching from the south. Furthermore, the land is of sufficient size to retain maintain the integrity of the open land alongside the watercourse. The existing access can satisfactorily service both the proposed building plot and the remainder of the site which is proposed to be retained as open land and utilised as at present.
The site falls from to the east away from Kilmersdon Road and a dwelling can be built into the land without appearing any more intrusive than the existing dwellings, and with the measures indicated above would mitigate the appearance of the proposed dwelling.
Furthermore, the land is located within approximately 400m of the RadstockTown Centre and within close proximity to other facilities. The St Nicholas Junior School is approximately 200m distant. Thereby is considered to be a sustainable location which would not rely on the motor car.
In conclusion, there is an opportunity to provide an adjusted Housing Development Boundary which would reflect the changing pattern of development in this locality. Provide a site for a single dwelling which would provide the opportunity to soften the approach to the settlement without appearing prominent and provide a sustainably located dwelling for a local person.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 871 of 956

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

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Para 28

	_
Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 1	
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council	
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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\) Not Consisten \(\square\) Not Effective \(\square\)	
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Para 28	_
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	_
The draft PM Plan could be sound with minor changes proposed in the attached document.	
[entered as separate representations]	_
Q5 Change Requested	
"Town Centres" not "Town Centre"	
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?	
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town	

11 May 2016 Page 872 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Para 29

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number	
Name: Clive Stilwell	Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Pla	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Para 29
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Westfield is NOT a town.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Please reword to say "The Towns of Midsomer Norton,	Radstock and the Parish of Westfield have grown up."
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked if yes)? 🗹
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the Examination?
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a m	andatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 873 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Diagram 5 Strategic Green Infrastructure Network

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 13 Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 5 Strategic Green Infrastructure Network The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Green Infrastructure, Open Space & Landscaping.
The quality of the base maps used for Diagrams 5 to 10 inclusive are lacking and should be replaced with base maps that can be used by decision makers.
There would appear to be a 'broad brushed' approach to all these diagrams with out any evidence base to support the extent to which swathes of land have been included in individual designations.
We recommend that all the Diagrams are marked as being for "indicative purposes only".
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?
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.

11 May 2016 Page 874 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Diagram 6 Key Components of the Ecological Network

	_
Respondent Number: 6434 Comment Number: 4 Name: David Webb Organisation: David Webb Management Ltd Agent Name: Kay Mann Agent Organisation: Phoenix Land Solutions Ltd Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment?	
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 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 6 Key Components of the Ecological Network The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	_
3. Diagram 6 and 7 refer to the UK Priority Habitat. The resolution of both plans make it difficult to identify the area nvolved. Clarity is also required between the two plans.	
5. Diagram 6 indicates areas which are considered to be UK Priority Habitat. My clients site is identified as such Ithough this was not the case at Options Consultation Stage of the Placemaking Plan.	
.6. It has yet to be established how the site has been described as a UK Priority Habitat. Information on how this positio vas established is yet to be received. Our position from the survey conducted by Tyler Grange in 2015 does not come to he same conclusion. For this reason an in principle objection is raised until this matter is further explored.	
7. My client's Ecologist is currently seeking to obtain the evidence base that has informed the basis of describing the ite as a UK Priority Habitat site. The approach remains to adopt the most sensitive and effective response in respect of inhancement of the wider site (totalling an additional 6 hectares which is in my clients ownership) and compensate for my loss to achieve an overall net gain in ecological terms.	
8. A note prepared by Tyler Grange LLP in respect of the UK Priority Habitat is included as Appendix 2 to this document	
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box	
Vhy does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?	
Respondent Number: 6434 Comment Number: 5	
Name: David Webb Management Ltd	
Agent Name: Kay Mann Agent Organisation: Phoenix Land Solutions Ltd	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No)

11 Mav 2016 Page 875 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') $\ \Box$
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 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 6 Key Components of the Ecological Network The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
13. Diagram 6 and 7 refer to the UK Priority Habitat. The resolution of both plans make it difficult to identify the area involved. Clarity is also required between the two plans.
14. Diagram 7 contains a Key notation but no indication on the plan. This plan also contains a notation in the form of a star without reference in the accompanying Key.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 876 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Diagram 9 Green Setting

Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 14	
·	
Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes	
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the commer	t? 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 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 9 Green Setting The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Diagram 9; Green Setting (landscape setting) It is unclear whether this Diagram is to compliment Diagram 2 or to be read separately. There are clear difference between the areas identified in Diagram 2 as Landscape Setting and the areas identified in Diagram 9 as Green There needs to be clear definitions for both these terms and clarity as to their purpose.	
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?	
Could you please also note that we would like a place at the Draft Placemaking Plan Examination.	

11 May 2016 Page 877 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Diagram 12 Midsomer Norton Town Centre Functional Areas

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 9
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Diagram 12 Midsomer Norton Town Centre Functional Areas
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The diagram is out of date - The Moody Goose has now reverted to the original name of 'The Old Priory'.
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?
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 878 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Policy SSV4

Respondent Number: 6437 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: MNRE
Agent Name: N G Whitehead Agent Organisation: WPB Development Planning
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 4 Somer Valley , Policy SSV4
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
This submission is made on behalf of MNRE in respect of their land interest at Station Road, Midsomer Norton (FWMS Site SSV 4, Vol 4 Somer Valley). It summarises their previously stated responses to the draft document and supporting text presented within the Placemaking Plan (BaNES Council 2015) on the former 'Welton Manufacturing Site' to accord with the required timeframe for submissions.
In doing so it confirms the planning principles and assumptions which should underpin this site's consideration within th wider BaNES Evidence Base (SHLAA/JSA) and how these principles have been central to the refinement of emerging planning application proposals for the site.
MNRE representatives have worked closely with BaNES Council representatives (Economic Development/Planning Policy/Major Projects) over the last six years to ensure that future redevelopment opportunities on the site are fully considered.
The site was formally identified in the adopted BaNES Local Plan as a mixed-use site (GDS.1/NR14 See Appendix 3)). Pre application discussions with a prospective developer of the site also took place in mid 2012.
Formal representations were made at the launch stage of the Placemaking Plan document (Terrace Hill Midsomer, September 2013) and the Options Stage (MNRE January 2015) .
MNRE are freehold owners of the whole of the site identified in Appendix 1. The adjoining Stones Cross Public House and Social Club are in separate ownerships (See Appendix 1). Dialogue over the comprehensive redevelopment of the entirety of the local area are ongoing via the Council's development team process (See Section 3/Scope of Evidence). Discussions have concluded on the need to potentially extend the defined site boundary and this has resulted in the recommendation to change the site to that shown in Appendix 2.
The allocation site ('the site') has a total area of approximately 6.0 hectares and is located within the central built up area of Midsomer Norton adjacent to existing residential areas (See Site Location).
It comprises of an irregularly shaped vacant area of brownfield land extending within the Town Centre Shopping Area of Midsomer Norton.

11 May 2016 Page 879 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Housing and community buildings bound the area on all sides (See Appendix 1). Existing public transport services to adjacent centres including Bath and Radstock extend along North/Radstock Road and Station Road/High Street.

A public footpath extends along the northern boundary of the site (Thicket Mead to Radstock Cycleway) with footpath links extending from this to the south.

The Midsomer Norton & Welton Conservation Area extends along the eastern boundary of the site to include a small section of the entrance area but there are no listed buildings within or adjacent to the allocated site.

There are a number of semi-mature and mature trees within the north west corner of the site and a culverted section of Wellow Brook extends beneath part of the site.

The Welton Bibby & Baron Paper manufacturing operation relocated from the site in 2010. All purpose-built industrial buildings on the site are now vacant having passed their design life. Buildings range from 2 to 3 storeys in height. With the application of a caveat over the former Brewery Building (See Section 5) it is envisaged that all buildings and structures across the site would be demolished prior to redevelopment.

The site is situated within walking distance from a range of local facilities including shops, schools, a major supermarket and a range of community facilities within the town (incl. Midsomer Norton Social Club, West Clewes Recreation Ground). Potential connection would be achievable to surrounding services and facilities by existing linkages.

The accessibility of the site to local facilities and services within Midsomer Norton is dealt with within a PERS audit of the local footpath/footway network. Councils own assessment of its suitability is self evident from the Midsomer Norton and Westfield Site Assessments (See Appendix 4 Appendix 1d Somer Valley BANES Strategic Land Assessment 2013)

There are existing public transport bus routes running along the frontage of the appeal site (Appendix 23 - Bus Services 19/20/Station Road/North Road). In Midsomer Norton there is no railway station, the closest station is at Frome, which is approximately 16 km from the site.

In conclusion the site relates well to existing settlement pattern of Midsomer Norton and is a highly sustainable location that offers key opportunities to achieving redevelopment objectives.

3.0SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

This representation has arisen from the publication of the Placemaking Plan by B&NES Council covering the administrative area of Somer Valley (Vol. 4 The section on 'Former Welton Manufacturing Site' states:-

Context

56. The Former Welton Bibby & Baron (Welton Bag) factory located to the north east of the town centre and provides a substantial redevelopment opportunity. The site is positioned on the steep north facing valley side, sloping down from the ridge at North Road to the Wellow Brook base. There is a drop of approximately 10m from the valley ridge down to Wellow Brook, and similar level change on the south facing slope on the other side of the brook against the former railway line.

57. The factory buildings and ancillary uses occupy the majority of the 5.3ha site. The core complex straddles the valley base, culverting the Wellow Brook, and fronting out to Station Road. The position of the factory interrupts the valley setting and creates a significant barrier to a potential west-east strategic green infrastructure route following the Wellow Brook. An existing shared public footpath with bridleway and cycleway rights (ST Route T9/NR Greenway/Public Footpath CL24/21) extends along the northern boundary of the site.

58 There are no buildings at the ridge where the site fronts to North Road and consequently the site remains fairly hidden from this prominent position and the top of the High Street. Aside from a collection of historic buildings within

11 May 2016 Page 880 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

the adjoining Conservation Area including the site's former brewery use, the majority of the buildings on site are of limited built quality. The 1850s brewery buildings survive largely untouched and with most of their external architectural features intact. These present a considerable asset to incorporate into future development of the site.

- 59. The priority will be to deliver an appropriate mix of employment floorspace and housing, and to improve connections through to the High Street. The Stone's Cross roundabout is the key point of arrival to the High Street but fails to capitalise on the range of attractive Victorian buildings there to announce the beginning of the High Street successfully. The steep, single sided pavement route along Station Road combined with heavy traffic creates an unattractive pedestrian environment and difficulties integrating the site.
- 60. The retail study (July 2015) considers this site as a potential large retail development site. It is not concluded that the site is sequentially inferior to the South Road car park site in delivering new retail floorspace, due to it being an 'edge of centre' location. The issue of suitable pedestrian links between the High Street and this site also make it difficult for retail uses to function as an integral part of the town centre.
- 61 An important focus is the frontage to North Road, where an area of hard standing is divided from the valley top by a high wall. This area presents the only real opportunity to establish a more direct and attractive connection between the site and the High Street via the Stone's Cross gateway. It is also important to consider options for improving existing road and pedestrian routes as well as highway safety along Station Road.
- 62 Incorporation of a high quality green infrastructure link along the Wellow Brook through the site will also be a key priority, linking with the attractive Welton Green community space.
- 63. The site lies within the surface coal resource plan area by the coal authority. Placemaking Plan policy M1 clarifies How applications and non-mineral development within minerals safeguarding areas Will be considered. A small part of the site is within the coal authority defined development high risk area therefore the submission of a coal mining risk assessment would be necessary to support development proposal.

Vision

64.

Regeneration scheme to deliver an appropriate mix of employmentand housing, And to improve connections through to the High Street. Incorporation of a high quality green infrastructure link along the Wellow Brook through the site will also be a key priority linking with the attractive Welton Green community space.

This submission is made on the basis that there are no other known references made to the site within the Placemaking Plan other than in the Local Green Space Designations section. Given that the site is referred to by different name in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2013.

Appendix 1 Title Plan/Landownership

Whilst the explanantory text to Policy SSV4 (Para 59) refers to failure of the Stone's Cross Roundabout to act as a successful entry statement to the High Street this area is not currently part of the defined site (SSV 4).

Appendix 2 Inset 19A MN Town Centre

4.0 FUTURE PROPOSED USES

The site has an extended history in terms of its planning promotion as a major mixed use development site. However existing material relating to the Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2013 of Site MSN 9 Appendix 1di Report of Findings is historic and requires updating as part of this current Placemaking Plan review. The assumptions made in terms of site capacities, vehicle accessing and general highways lack proper supporting work.

11 Mav 2016 Page 881 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

At this juncture MNRE wish to continue to preserve the option to facilitate a phased redevelopment of the site over the coming decade. This would include :-

- •Mixed use development comprising of up to 210 residential units incl. 70 Elderly care,
- •3,250 sq.m of business development.
- associated private and public carparking for town centre;
- associated public realm and landscaping.

Dialogue regarding this site commenced with B&NES representatives when the local planning authority began their Local Plan Review in 2004. The availability of the site was first reported in writing as part of the call for sites.

Given the site credentials in planning terms discussions focused upon a mix of potential uses. Employment uses are envisaged within the A & B Landuse categories.

A number of national multiples have shown interest in taking part of the site for a joint food retail store combined with other A & B Class Uses.

5.0 FORMER WELTON BAG FACTORY SSV4

Given that the draft Placemaking Plan seeks to allocate and facilitate the delivery of housing, employment and other uses on this brownfield site (SSV 4) to meet the development needs identified in the adopted core strategy, its general approach is welcomed.

Council views on the 'reasonable alternatives' or 'options' for this site are also broadly accepted. However given that expressed options could form the basis of development management policies (the Draft Plan) used in the determination of planning applications for the site, suggested amendments and clarifications are sought over specific assumptions underlying the commentary on the site. MNRE reserve the opportunity to comment on subsequent iterations of the Site Assessment.

In regard to the revised site definition and extension of the proposed area to include Stones Cross the total area would be approximately 6 hectares. The justification for this recommendation relates to the Council's commentary over required linkage of the area to the High Street and the establishment of an improved gateway to Town Centre (see below).

In terms of specific text the following points are made: -

Context

56. The Former Welton Bibby & Baron (Welton Bag) factory located to the north east of the town centre and provides a substantial redevelopment opportunity. The site is positioned on the steep north facing valley side, sloping down from the ridge at North Road to the Wellow Brook base. There is a drop of approximately 10m from the valley ridge down to Wellow Brook, and similar level change on the south facing slope on the other side of the brook against the former railway line.

It is unclear how this brief description of the topography of the site assists in terms of purposes of the Placemaking Plan document. The site is also positioned on the south facing valley side (See next para). The local topography does not present a key constraint to site redevelopment. This is evidenced by existing areas, which extend within the immediate vicinity of the site. The site is also fully screened from large areas of Midsomer Norton.

11 May 2016 Page 882 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

57. The factory buildings and ancillary uses occupy the majority of the 5.3ha site. The core complex straddles the valley base, culverting the Wellow Brook, and fronting out to Station Road. The position of the factory interrupts the valley setting and creates a significant barrier to a potential west-east strategic green infrastructure route following the Wellow Brook. An existing shared public footpath with bridleway and cycleway rights (ST Route T9/NR Greenway/Public Footpath CL24/21) extends along the northern boundary of the site.

Existing factory buildings are not focused on the valley floor but rather extend up the southern portion of the site as described in Para 56. A significant part of the valley base remains undeveloped.

The future treatment of the public realm in the vicinity of Stone's Cross Roundabout and the site's connection through to the High Street will be a key 'design influencing factor' in taking forward detailed proposals for site redevelopment. This area also provides a key opportunity for potential highway and pedestrian improvements along Station Road. Existing Para 61 of the existing text states that it is also important to consider options for improving existing road and pedestrian routes as well as highway safety along Station Road.

In this regard it will be imperative that design and access statement and corresponding supporting design material explain the design principles and concepts that have been applied to the proposed development. Given the potential scale of residential development (Up to 210 units) and the proximities within the town centre direct pedestrian connection will be vital.

Best practice dictates that any urban design exercise take into account the other existing buildings (SCPH/MN Social Club) in the immediate vicinity of the Stones Cross Roundabout. This point is repeatedly made in the commentary text referring to this site within the Placemaking Plan. Based upon this and related highway reasoning a recommendation is made that the area be extended to encompass these two additional buildings and their curtilages.

The lack of appropriate dialogue with related landowners has been offered as a reason for their non-inclusion. Relevant contact details are therefore provided with this representation.

58 There are no buildings at the ridge where the site fronts to North Road and consequently the site remains fairly hidden from this prominent position and the top of the High Street. Aside from a collection of historic buildings within the adjoining Conservation Area including the site's former brewery use, the majority of the buildings on site are of limited built quality. The 1850s brewery buildings survive largely untouched and with most of their external architectural features intact. These present a considerable asset to incorporate into future development of the site.

This statement is incorrect as there are No.2 key historic buildings at the ridge in this location (SCPH/MN Social Club) . Same point as above.

The existing text should be amended to reflect that buildings of the former 1850s brewery complex which survive are not listed but most of their external features are intact. These present a heritage asset to potentially incorporate into future development of the site.

59. The priority will be to deliver an appropriate mix of employment floorspace and housing, and to improve connections through to the High Street. The Stone's Cross roundabout is the key point of arrival to the High Street but fails to capitalise on the range of attractive Victorian buildings there to announce the beginning of the High Street successfully. The steep, single sided pavement route along Station Road combined with heavy traffic creates an unattractive pedestrian environment and difficulties integrating the site.

Same point/s as above.

60. The Retail Study (July 2015) considers this site as a potential large retail development site. It is not concluded that the site is sequentially inferior to the South Road car park site in delivering new retail floorspace, due to it being an 'edge

11 May 2016 Page 883 of 956

of centre' location. The issue of suitable pedestrian links between the High Street and this site also make it difficult for retail uses to function as an integral part of the town centre.

Reference should be made to Inset 19A and the boundaries of MN Town Centre

61 An important focus is the frontage to North Road, where an area of hard standing is divided from the valley top by a high wall. This area presents the only real opportunity to establish a more direct and attractive connection between the site and the High Street via the Stone's Cross gateway. It is also important to consider options for improving existing road and pedestrian routes as well as highway safety along Station Road.

Same point/s as above.

62 Incorporation of a high quality green infrastructure link along the Wellow Brook through the site will also be a key priority, linking with the attractive Welton Green community space.

Text should refer to local green space not community space to accord with Figure 18 & Para 79

63. The site lies within the surface coal resource plan area by the coal authority. Placemaking Plan policy M1 clarifies how applications and non-mineral development within minerals safeguarding areas will be considered. A small part of the site is within the coal authority defined development high risk area therefore the submission of a coal mining risk assessment would be necessary to support development proposal.

Application supporting material on the extent of related areas should be reviewed and updated accordingly.

Vision 64.

Regeneration scheme to deliver an appropriate mix of employmentand housing, And to improve connections through to the High Street. Incorporation of a high quality green infrastructure link along the Wellow Brook through the site will also be a key priority linking with the attractive Welton Green community space.

Same point/s as above.

In regard to the specific wording of draft policy SSV4 text wording in numbered points 1 & 3 should be reworded as text requirements are superfluous as it is a partial restatement of national planning policy.

Finally numbered point 3 in draft Policy SSV4 should also be reworded to reflect the 'potential' retention and reuse of the former Brewery buildings which survive. This would install greater flexibility whilst the appropriate assessment of heritage issues is ongoing. The current wording suggesting that the buildings in question must be retained or reused runs counter to National Heritage policy. The Midsomer Norton conservation area appraisal identifies the former brewery building as a key historic feature and sets out the need to ' restore, repair and bring the former brewery into full use'. This was an enhancement objective and does not reflect current national planning policy (B&NES Council 2004:8).

6.0 MIDSOMER NORTON/SOMER VALLEY

MNRE acknowledge the published initial findings of the Stage 1 B&NES Retail Study in respect of Midsomer Norton and Radstock. They acknowledge the comments over predicted retail expenditure, the health check of the centres and estimates of retail need. We are also aware of ongoing assessment work being undertaken in respect of the town centre assessment. In these circumstances MNRE reserve the opportunity to comment on subsequent iterations of the town centre assessment.

11 May 2016 Page 884 of 956

At this stage MNRE acknowledge that Midsomer Norton town centre currently serves the daily shopping needs of Norton-Radstock residents and those villages in the southern part of Bath & North East Somerset and northern Mendip District. While the town has a good range of convenience shopping facilities, both within the town centre and out-of-centre at Thicket Mead (which lies within the Parish of Paulton) B&NES Retail Strategy 2014 confirms that the town is losing market share (Page 54) to adjoining centres including Bath. The town centre also continues to provide for a range of day to day comparison goods shopping and residents tend to travel to Bath to meet their other shopping needs.

MNRE note that despite providing a range of shops there is still scope for improving the town centre. There are few medium or large units available that would be suitable for national multiples. Proposals should help to enhance the centre by making better use of public spaces and improving linkages between different parts of the retail frontage.

The availability of a good range of convenience and comparison shops will make an important contribution to people's quality of life in Midsomer Norton. Shopping provision is primarily focused in the town centre of Midsomer Norton although some out of centre sites exist.

Existing B&NES Council background documentation stress the importance of maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of the centre in conjunction with that at Radstock, to meet the various shopping needs of residents and visitors in the most sustainable way.

In this regard MNRE highlight the important contribution that a vibrant public realm makes to the success of the centre.

Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?	П

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

11 May 2016 Page 885 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 80

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

Volume:

4, Somer Valley

Respondent Number: 303 Comment Number: Name: Organisation: Mendip District Council Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Para 80 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The Council note the safeguarding of land for education use at Silver Street. BANES will be aware that there have also been discussions with the school, landowners and the Education Funding Agency (EFA) on an alternative site in Mendip promoted in association with a significant housing development. This alternative site has been promoted through the Council's Issues and Options process and appears to be supported as a preferred option by the EFA. Further evidence to support the case for this site is understood to be in preparation. In principle a site within the BANES boundary would make many of the planning aspects of delivering a school more straightforward as it aligns with the LEA and planning area area. It is also aware of the opposition of BANES and Midsomer Norton Town Council to extend development into Mendip. Q5 Change Requested Recognising the priority to deliver addition school places to the town, the Council will positively engage with BANES at the earliest opportunity to ensure this site and the land promoted in Mendip are fully assessed to ensure the most sustainable and deliverable solution. Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?

11 Mav 2016 Page 886 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Para 82

Respondent Number: 1338 Comment Number: 14
Name: Clive Stilwell Organisation: Midsomer Norton Town Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley , Para 82 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Amend Hayes Park to read Wellow Brook Walk.
Q5 Change Requested
See Q4.
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?
As an interested Town Council within BANES and as a mandatory consultee on Planning Applications in the town

11 May 2016 Page 887 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Para 92

Respondent Number: 6563 Comment Number: 2 Name: Rosemary Tiley Organisation: 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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐		
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Para 92		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
It is unfair to specify the 1960s shops (which are of their time) alone, when some current house building is equally out of character. (Please note that I do not include the development on the Waterloo Road side of the river, which has been tastefully done and blends very well with the miners cottages adjacent to it).		
Q5 Change Requested		
I think that the wording in para 92 should be amended to read '1960s shops and recent development adjacent to the		
Victoria Hall contrast sharply'		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if ves)?		

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

11 May 2016 Page 888 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Policy SV3

order to meet this need.

Respondent Number: 7115 Comment Number	; 3		
lame: Organisation: Bidwell Metals Ltd			
Agent Name: Matthew Kendrick	Agent Organisation: Grass Roots Planning Ltd		
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes		
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 Pla	nn is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):		
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓		
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley	, Policy SV3		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			
Q4 Soundness Comment			
and consequently it will be difficult to plan for development of identified figure for growth in each settlement within 2.29 Furthermore, this policy relates primarily to Radstodevelopment outside of this main urban area. 2.30 Therefore the plan does not provide a robust fram	ment has been designated towards Midsomer Norton/Radstock ment and deliver this through neighbourhood plans, when there is n the Somer Valley.		
·	ownfield sites for redevelopment in Radstock. Aside from the ck Infant School, no figures within the other sites have been even		
Placemaking Plan will aim to deliver the 2,470 dwellings Planning Policy to significantly boost the supply of hous being unable to demonstrate a five year housing land so	urban areas within the Somer Valley it is not clear how the s as a key objective of both the Bath Core Strategy and National sing. Without the delivery of these homes it may result in BANES upply and consequently this may lead to unsustainable patterns on Greenfield sites that may be located in more sensitive areas Site.		

states the need to: 'recognise that residential development can play an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres

11 May 2016

Page 889 of 956

Placemaking Plan process and this should be undertaken now. This would accord with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which

2.33 Consequently a significant amount of land, including brownfield sites adjacent to the Housing Development

Boundary of Radstock and Midsomer Norton, particularly brownfield sites, should be assessed as part of the

Boundary in sustainable locations such as Midsomer Norton/Radstock, should be considered for further development in

2.34 In order to achieve this we consider that a review of all of the available sites adjoining the Housing Development

and set out policies to encourage residential development on appropriate sites'.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Despendent feel it is necessary to participate at the Evamination?
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 890 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

|--|

Respondent Number: 6563 Comment Number: 3 Name: Rosemary Tiley Organisation: 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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Radstock Vision The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The vision statement states' town centre with extended and enhance retail to serve as a focal point for local communities'. A) High streets are struggling with the increase in on-line shopping which is still growing B) Local rural communities do not have access to public transport and therefore require parking adjacent to shops C) Those towns with flourishing high streets (e.g. Frome and Wells) have well preserved, quaint shopping areas which have existed for decades (and parking). B) New precincts are relatively devoid of shoppers other than those in large cities. C) There are already four or five shop units available which have received little or no interest. C) Retail jobs are notoriously poorly paid, often part-time and should not be the aspiration for employment in Radstock. B) Midsomer Norton struggles and it would make more sense to concentrate efforts in attracting more diverse shops there, rather the existing charity and coffee shops.
think the word 'extended' should be removed from the text and the term 'enhanced' planned for by provision of adequate and easily available parking (bearing in mind that the population is aging and no mention of that fact appears anywhere in the place-making plan?). Also more should be made of attracting businesses and preserving and helping those already here e.g. the Post Office sorting office.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7228 Comment Number: 1 Name: Colin Currie Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 891 of 956

Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley , Radstock Vision				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Concern is expressed at the omission of the current Radstock to Frome railway re-instatement project from any discussion on sustainable transport contained in the plan. Given there there are no changes to the existing road infrastructure possible, sustainable transport solutions of bus,cycle, and walking are completely unrealistic. The Railway is the only viable sustainable alternative to relieve the road congestion the proposed 80,000 extra homes in the Somer Valley will cause. Especially if the houses are only affordable by commuters from Bath and Bristol. On the completion of the line to Frome, it is intended to connect to to the mainline to Westbury, thus giving the Somer Valley an independent link to London and all other mainline stations.				
Currently the North Somerset Railway are in advanced discussion with R.P.L to purchase the line and expect to complete in the near future. The contribution to the regeneration of the SomerValley of the Railway cannot be overestimated, as it will be a major contributer to investment, tourism, jobs, and traffic congestion relief. If this is not included in the Placemaking Plan, it becomes a very flawed document.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				

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

11 May 2016 Page 892 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Policy SSV20

Respondent Number: 4532 Comment Number: 2 Name: Kevin Bird Organisation: The Silverwood Partnership
Agent Name: Laura Wilkinson Agent Organisation: D2 Planning Ltd
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 4 Somer Valley, Policy SSV20
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
This site is the former St Nicholas Infant School, which lies to the south of Radstock town centre and is adjacent to the public car park. The site consists of 19th Century buildings and is located within the Conservation Area. The site has been subject to previous planning applications for redevelopment which involved the demolition of the buildings on the site. These have been refused by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority considers that the 19th Century buildings are capable of conversion to residential. However, it is known that the redevelopment of the site using the existing buildings would render any development unviable. There are also bats roosting within the building and redevelopment would need to provide appropriate ecological mitigation. In view of the above, the site is not deliverable and will not be developed.
Q5 Change Requested
To remove the allocation because of issues in regards to viability of converting the existing 19th Century buildings. To replace the allocation with Land North of Kilmersdon Road, Manor Farm, Haydon.
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?
Because the issues are complex and need to be debated as part of the oral examination.
Respondent Number: 7130 Comment Number: 15
Name: Simon Jenkins Organisation: Edward Ware Homes
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 893 of 956

Does the respondent consider the	document is legally co	ompliant? (Tick if indicated	d 'yes')
Does the respondent consider the	document is sound?	No	
If the respondent considers the Di	raft Placemaking Plan i	s unsound, is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓	Not Justified	Not Consisten 🗸	Not Effective
The representation relates to: Vol	ume 4 Somer Valley,	Policy SSV20	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is	:		
Q4 Soundness Comment			
Policy SSV20 Former St Nicholas Infa	ant School		
existing buildings, which have been Redevelopment of the site using the There are also Bats roosting in the Lin our view this site is not deliverable.	e existing buildings has puildings, redevelopme		testing and found unviable. uire appropriate ecological mitigation.
A key element of any Infrastructure to development is the lack of capacithere should be a detailed review of to deliver sufficient capacity (to meaneds) within acceptable travel dist	ity and or the distances of all schools within the et the needs of both ho	s children have to travel to Somer Valley and and ad ousing identified in the pla	equate plans should be put in place
Q5 Change Requested			
Does the Respondent wish to partic	ipate at the Examination	on (ticked if yes)?	
Why does the Respondent feel it is	necessary to participat	e at the Examination?	
Could you please also note that we	would like a place at th	ne Draft Placemaking Plan	Examination.

11 May 2016 Page 894 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Policy SSV11

Respondent Number: 7030 Comment Number: 1
Name: David Jones Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SSV11
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
I am in favour of the development at St Peter's factory, however I feel that long term consideration should be taken to providing an additional access route (possibly from Cobblers (via ST181629) way running South of the village and joining up in Radstock.) Again going forward this would allow additional housing to be built following this route to the North and the potential for linking to the Westfield industrial estate by the slag heap to the road. This would provide an additional access route for the other housing estates down through the valley and relieve the pressure on the A361.
Q5 Change Requested
Long term consideration should be taken to providing an additional access route (possibly from Cobblers (via ST181629) way running South of the village and joining up in Radstock.)
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 895 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Policy SSV9

Respondent Number: 6395 Comment Number: 1
Name: Mr J Amos Organisation: Clifton Developments
Agent Name: Chris Dadds Agent Organisation: Peter Brett Associates
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Policy SSV9
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
As the promoter of the land south of Langley's Lane, we support the allocation of the land in the emerging PlaceMaking Plan and confirm that the site is being actively promoted for development. It should be noted that the land can be accessed from both Langley's Lane as well as via the existing employment estate.
Q5 Change Requested
Therefore, for completeness this should be reflected in the "Additional Development Requirements and Design Principles or the Southern Area". The text should say; 12. "Access from existing Old Mills Industrial Estate and/or Langley's Lane".
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
ssues relating to the delivery of land may be an important consideration in an examination. We therefore reserve our client's right to be heard at an examination.

11 May 2016 Page 896 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 4, Somer Valley Part: Para 156

Respondent Number: 1415 Comment Number: 2
Name: Organisation: Peasedown St John Parish Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 4 Somer Valley, Para 156
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
We request the wording of the Local Green Spaces in Peasedown St John to be more accurate:
'Land between Pippin Close and Russet Way' should be changed to 'Land on Orchard Way between Frenchfield Road and Russet Way'
'Beacon Hall Play Area' should be changed to 'Beacon Field Public Open Space'
Supporting evidence for these sites to be designated as 'Local Green Space' has been emailed to BANES Planning Officer Julie O'Rourke.
Q5 Change Requested
See Q4.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Evamination (ticked if ves)?

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

11 May 2016 Page 897 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 13

Respondent Number: 93 Comment Number:	10			
Name: Sean Walsh	: Sean Walsh Organisation: Highways Agency			
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 of	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 \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Consisten Not Effective			
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas	, Para 13			
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
As per previous consultations, Highways England is less c				
·	hose identified in the urban areas. Due to the smaller scale of			
•	the SRN the Agency does not have any major concerns at this			
	uring application determination supported by a Transport			
Statement/Transport Assessment with assessments of ke	ey junctions will identify specific impacts and allow any			
necessary mitigation to be identified as required.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$				

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

11 May 2016 Page 898 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 47

Respondent Number: 7109 Comment Number	: 1		
Name: Mr and Mrs Bays and Ms Gallop	Organisation:		
Agent Name: A Shepley	Agent Organisa	ition: WYG	
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Attachments sent with the	comment? Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	/ compliant? (Tic	k if indicated 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	l? No		
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where i	ndicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consi	sten Not Effective	V
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas	, Para 47		
To the second se	,		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:			

Q4 Soundness Comment

Placemaking Plan - overall housing requirement

Whilst the Placemaking Plan takes its lead from the spatial strategy adopted within the Bath & NE Somerset Core Strategy, it is considered that the overall strategy for the District needs to be reconsidered and updated now in the light of fresh evidence prepared in connection with the emerging West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). If such a strategy is not undertaken, the Placemaking Plan must be considered unsound as it has not been positively prepared and would be neither justified or effective.

With this in mind, the Council should particularly reconsider its strategy for development in the Rural Areas, specifically with regard to the Policy RA1 settlements (including Temple Cloud). This is stated for the following reasons:

A significant portion of the Bath & NE Somerset District on its western side (including Temple Cloud) has been defined as falling within the Wider Bristol functional housing market area (HMA), as defined within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), prepared by ONS in July 2015. The SHMA has advised that the "best fit" area for the Wider Bristol HMA should be the districts of Bristol, South Gloucestershire and North Somerset; however, this approach has been questioned by a significant number of key stakeholders during the consultation on the JSP Issues & Options (which closed on 29th January 2016), the key point being that the entirety of Bath & NE Somerset should have been assessed as part of the SHMA and without doing so the full Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) requirement cannot be properly assessed.

This notwithstanding, the emerging JSP has advised that 85,000 new homes need to be delivered within the Wider Bristol HMA by 2036. Again, this figure has been questioned by many of those responding to the emerging JSP and there is a strong possibility that the overall housing requirement contained within the JSP will increase. Even if the 85,000 figure is maintained, there will be a need to maintain duty to cooperate discussions between all West of England Authorities over future requirements in the HMA. This will be particularly important if it is found that there is unmet need in the West of England due to Greenbelt or other policy constraints.

Rural Areas – Temple Cloud

Given the above, it is considered that Bath & NE Somerset cannot ignore the likely requirement for additional development within its boundary, to help meet potential unmet needs within the Wider Bristol HMA. Of particular importance will be a need to consider areas of the District that lie within the Wider Bristol functional HMA, and concentrate development in sustainable locations that are relatively unconstrained by landscape and other designations (e.g. Green Belt, AoNB). The settlement of Temple Cloud would represent a suitable location for additional development, when judged against this requirement.

11 Mav 2016 Page 899 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

It is recognised that Temple Cloud will expand in the near future, when the land south of Temple Inn Lane is developed with a scheme of 70 dwellings. This scheme was allowed on Appeal in August 2015 and it is pertinent to note that, during the Inquiry, the Council accepted that the expected allocation of around 50 dwellings should not be interpreted as a cap or maximum limit/ceiling to development in the settlement. It therefore stands to reason that, where suitable, deliverable and available sites are identified, these should also be considered for allocation in the Placemaking Plan and if necessary phased for delivery at a later stage within the Plan period.

Land north of Temple Inn Lane

Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that an additional area of land to the north of Temple Inn Lane (see attached location plan) should be allocated for development.

The site has an area of 3.74ha is located to the northwest of Temple Inn Lane running northwest and adjoining the main A37 on its western boundary. The site is presently undeveloped and its lawful use is assumed to be agricultural. The site is split into two fields, with mature hedgerows running along the majority of the site boundaries, with an established boundary of hedgerows/trees running between the site and the A37 on its western side. A public right of way runs along the northeast boundary, with open fields beyond. The site is relatively flat.

The main A37 lies to the west, providing access into Bristol to the north, and down to Wells and Shepton Mallet to the south. The A37 is also a public transport route, providing a regular service to Bristol. A sheltered bus stop lies on the road through Temple Cloud, which is within easy walking distance of the appeal site. A petrol filling station also lies on the A37 through Temple Cloud, which contains a convenience shop. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is not covered by any specific landscape or heritage designations.

It is pertinent to note that the southern parcel of land was put forward as a potential allocation in the previous iteration of the Placemaking Plan (Options Consultation), published in November 2014. Therefore, the Council clearly considers that this area of land is suitable for development. The northern parcel is also considered to be suitable for development as it relates well to the existing settlement and would not have any detrimental impact on the surrounding landscape.

Allocation of this land also provides an opportunity to look at the wider highway network within Temple Cloud, with a potential option being to route existing/proposed residential traffic through this site to exit onto the A37 further north, thus reducing the use of the existing Temple Inn Lane/A37 access, which is seen as a hazard locally. We would be happy to discuss this further with the Council if this is seen as a potential solution.

Land West of the A37

The owners of the above site also have control over as parcel of land to the west of the A37, as indicated on the attached site location plan. The land has a site area of 1.1ha and is currently in use for grazing. The landowners are currently in the process of undertaking technical assessments of the site in terms of access, drainage etc, but the land is considered to be suitable for a number of uses, including residential and/or community facilities.

Q5 Change Requested

Allocation of land at Temple Cloud (as indicated on the attached site plan) for residential development.

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 discuss potential inclusion of key allocation(s) for Temple Cloud.

11 May 2016 Page 900 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 66 Volume: 5, Rural Areas Respondent Number: 262 Comment Number: Name: Justin Milward Organisation: Woodland Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 66 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment "The Clutton Neighbourhood DP will be used to set out more detailed priorities for development at a local level, consistent with the more strategic vision for the wider area set in the adopted Core Strategy. The Neighbourhood DP will be focusing on the following policy areas: Housing and Development; Business; Open green spaces and leisure; Footpaths. The Clutton Neighbourhood Plan is expected to 'be made' by the B&NES in 2015." Impacts on Woodland Trust site legal boundary at Greyfield Wood at ST6331258590. Within the general area. However there are no details for proposed development sites (see previous cell). Q5 Change Requested The Woodland Trust's Greyfield Wood site should be specifically protected under Policy NE6. 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?

11 Mav 2016 Page 901 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Policy SR17

Respondent Number: 6511 Comment Number Name: Chris Head	: 1 Organisation:
	•
Agent Name: Further Information available in the original comment	Agent Organisation: ? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	v compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') ✓
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? Yes, with minor changes
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	in is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas	, Policy SR17
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
Para 74 and adjoining map - SR17 Development site no	t shown on map
Q5 Change Requested	
Show site on map	
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to partici	pate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7069 Comment Number	: 1
Name: Dr and Mrs Edwards	Organisation:
Agent Name: Elgan Jones	Agent Organisation: Savills
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	?
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	in is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	Not Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Policy SR17
Q4 Soundness Comment	
We strongly support the allocation of the Former Orcha	ard, Compton Martin, for residential development under Policy

11 May 2016 Page 902 of 956

To support the allocation we make the following points:

i) Deliverability

We have recently concluded a marketing campaign on behalf of our clients to identify a developer for the site. We received numerous offers on various basis and are currently progressing negotiations with a preferred party. We undertook a professional marketing campaign targeting regional developers experienced in developing similar schemes and who are adequately funded. The campaign identified strong interest in developing at Compton Martin generally and specifically to deliver a high quality scheme on this site reflecting the character of the area and the policies outlined at SR17 of the Draft Placemaking Plan. It is the intention of both landowner and developer to progress proposals as soon as possible in order to beg in construction following the conclusion of the planning application process.

ii) Sustainability

The site is directly located on the main A368 providing easy vehicular access to Bath to the east and the M5 to the west. Compton Martin provides amenities in the shape of Pub, Church, Post Office, Village Hall and Open Space. The nearest shop is approximately 500 m from the site at West Harptree. The draft allocation is in line with B&NES Council aspiration, set out within the Core Strategy (adopted 10th July 2014) Policy RA2 Development in Village outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA 1, to enable the delivery of 1, 120 dwellings from within the Rural Areas. Furthermore the Core Strategy seeks to allow small scale development within the more sustainable villages.

Contributions through the B&NES Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (approved 171h February 2015) relevant to the scale of development will assist the funding of identified projects in the wider B&NES area. Further site specific planning obligations may be negotiated with the developer through a planning application process to potentially mitigate any adverse impacts of the development.

The site forms a sustainable development by uniting the two distinct sections of the village namely the Mendip Villas to the West and historical centre of the village to the east. This development follows the construction of the footpath in early 2000's to provide a pedestrian link between the two sections.

An assessment of the Environment Agency's online flood maps identifies the site is not located within a flood zone and therefore considered appropriate for development.

iii) Local Support

Compton Martin Parish Council considered potential sites for residential development within the village as part of the background evidence for the Placemaking Plan - Options Document (November 2014). The Parish evaluated that this site should be considered within the Placemaking Plan and now, within the Draft Placemaking Plan, it represents the only development opportunity within Compton Martin area. The Parish Council will become fully involved in any future planning application, to determine detailed development plans, in addition to the continuing evolution of the Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan.

We believe that the principle of residential development on this site is sound and in line with the aspiration of B&NES Council's Core Strategy (Adopted July 2014) of allowing small scale development within the more sustainable villages. The marketing campaign, that has recently been completed, produced strong interest from local developers seeking to deliver new housing in the area. Consequently the allocation within the Draft Placemaking Plan is supported by deliverable commercial interest in developing the site. Whilst further negotiations are progressing to finalise the terms of the disposal, the aspiration is to begin construction of the

dwellings soon following the granting of an implementable planning consent.

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?

In general support of the policy.

11 Mav 2016 Page 903 of 956

11 May 2016 Page 904 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 82

Respondent Number: 6511 Comment Number: 3
Name: Chris Head Organisation:
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 82
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The introductory paragraphs to East and West Harptree 82 and 172 respectively contain different derivations for the
name Harptree; 82 - It is stated that the name Harptree is from "hartreg", an old English word for a 'grey hollow'
Q5 Change Requested
Change both to;
One suggested explanation for the name Harptree is from "hartreg", an Old English word for a grey hollow. Another from the Domesday Book is Harpetreu meaning 'The military road by the wood' from the Old English herepoep and treow.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 905 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 87

Respondent Number: 6469 Comment Number: 1 Name: Christine Billinghurst Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	lo
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 Consisten Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 87 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SR6	
Q4 Soundness Comment	
In paragraph 87, page 25, the text refers to 5-8 dwellings on site SR6, and gives the reason why this has been reduced from 10. However on page 29, paragraph 1, the site is still said to be suitable for about 10 dwellings, which contradicts paragraph 87.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Change paragraph 1 of SR6 on page 29 to 5-8 dwellings so that the requirement for this site is clear and not ambiguous.	_
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?	

11 May 2016 Page 906 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume:	5, Rural Areas	Part: Policy SR5	

Respondent Number: 7073 Comment Number: 1
Name: Malcolm Pearce Organisation:
Agent Name: Andy Shepley Agent Organisation: WYG Planning and Design
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Mr Pearce supports the proposed allocation on the site (Site ref: SR5); as a brownfield site within easy walking distance of East Harptree's key facilities, it is clearly a suitable and sustainable option for residential development. Mr Pearce is currently in the process of assessing various options for residential redevelopment of the site, with a view to submitting a planning application later this year. As the local planning authority will be aware, the site has been the subject of previous planning applications for residential development. In each instance, the principle of residential development for this site was accepted by the case officer. In addition, the Council's highway department raised no objection to residential development on this site. It is considered that the Draft Placemaking Plan strategy for housing provision within the Policy RA2 village of East Harptree can be considered sound, subject to minor changes.
Q5 Change Requested
These changes relate to the detailed criteria contained within Policy SR5, as follows: -Criteria 2 and 3 – these criteria are repetitive and should be combined as a single criterion. -Criterion 5 – whilst the supporting text to the policy (paragraph 96) refers to possibly emulating /reinterpreting a farmhouse or farm buildings grouping, such an approach should not be insisted upon as other potential site layouts could also be acceptable. Therefore, the words "and reference should be made to reinterpreting a farmhouse/farm buildings grouping" should be removed from this criterion. -Criterion 9 – removal of the words "during operational hours". As a residential development is the most appropriate use here, there will be no specific "operational hours". However, if the reference to "operational hours" refers to the lighting itself, this should be made clear within the policy criterion. -Criterion 12 – at this stage, it is not clear whether the site will be appropriate for the provision of SUDs. Therefore, the criterion should include the words "If possible" at the beginning.
Subject to these detailed changes, the policy is considered to be sound.

11 May 2016 Page 907 of 956

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

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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

The landowner would like the opportunity to participate in any discussion on the Policy SR5 site. He may be able to answer any technical questions that the Inspector may have about the site, and which would aid positive discussions on its suitability for development.

Respondent Number: 270 Comment Number: 1 Name: Simon Tofts Organisation: Blue Cedar Homes Agent Name: Des Dunlop Agent Organisation: D2 Planning Ltd 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 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR5 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SR5
Q4 Soundness Comment The site lies outside the Housing Development Boundary and is adjacent to the East Harptree Conservation Area. The site was originally identified for 10 dwellings but is now identified for between 5-8 dwellings. The supporting text at paragraph 86 states that the capacity of the site has been reduced to between 5-8 dwellings but the text at paragraph 90 still states that the site can accommodate 10 dwellings. This inconsistency should be corrected. It is apparent that the site is situated in a sensitive location and contains buildings which would be used by protective species e.g. bats, birds etc. In addition the site is prominent and potentially development would breach the sky line resulting in an intrusive form of development. Whilst the quantum of development has been reduced, there is no indication that the site is available or deliverable. The site lies remote from local facilities and services when compared to more centrally located sites such as that at Church Lane. It is again unclear how in assessing the suitability of sites that this site was allocated in favour of land at Church Lane. That site lies within the settlement limits and in close proximity to existing facilities. It is therefore recommended that Proposal SR5 be deleted.
Q5 Change Requested
Delete Proposal SR5 as a residential allocation and replace it with land at Church Lane 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? Because the issues are complex and need to be the subject of debate as part of the oral examination.
Respondent Number: 4808 Comment Number: 2 Name: Mr and Mrs Currell Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation:

11 May 2016 Page 908 of 956

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 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SR5
Q4 Soundness Comment
The other site (Site SR5) has a history of planning refusals, the most recent of which was a planning application for 12 no.
houses (including 4 no. affordable houses) which was refused planning permission on 10 July 2014 (ref: 14/00883/OUT).
The application was refused on the grounds that the development would result in an inappropriate suburban development of excessive density which would unacceptably harm the setting of the Conservation Area and AONB whilst
failing to reinforce local distinctiveness. The Parish Council objected to the planning application on the grounds of
increased traffic; lack of car parking; poor access and an unsustainable location. Further, when commenting from the
planning toolkit (December 2013), the Parish Council identified significant constraints (both on and off-site) which would
need to be addressed in order for the site to be suitable for residential end use (see Placemaking Plan Stage 2: Site Assessment Report included as Background Evidence to Placemaking Plan Options Document). It is not considered that
these constraints have been properly addressed in the draft plan.
It is considered that the inclusion in the draft plan of site SR5, which does not have the support of the Parish Council and
has a history of planning refusals, does not meet the test of soundness as set out in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework in that it is:
-Not justified – there are alternatives which have been promoted and have the support of the Parish Council.
-Not effective – given its recent planning history and the lack of local support, there are questions about the
deliverability of this site
Q5 Change Requested
Delete Site SR5.
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 examine alternative sites.
Respondent Number: 6511 Comment Number: 5
Name: Chris Head Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Turtier information available in the original comment. Two Accaemients sent with the comments.
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR5
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SR5
,

11 May 2016 Page 909 of 956

Q4 Soundness Comment
No reference is made to the revisions to the Housing Development Boundary to incorporate site SR5 Pinkers Farm and the on-line map showing the Draft HDB also revert to the 2007 version
Q5 Change Requested
The correct and revised HDB is shown on the on-line map and within the Appendix - Volume 6
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

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

11 May 2016 Page 910 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 97

Respondent Number: 270 Comment Number: 2 Name: Simon Tofts Organisation: Blue Cedar Homes Agent Name: Des Dunlop Agent Organisation: D2 Planning Ltd 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 5 Rural Areas , Para 97 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SR6	
Q4 Soundness Comment Objections are lodged to the allocation of site SR6 for residential development. The original Placemaking Plan identification the site for circa 10 dwellings but this has been refined to between 5-8 dwellings due to ecological concerns (see paragraph 87). There is an inconsistency in the plan regarding the quantum of development that can be accommodated on the site (i.e. see paragraphs 87 and the Development Requirement & Design Principles for the site). The site represents a sensitive location due to ecological concerns that has also been prone to flooding in recent year.	ted
and no mention has been made of this concern. There are concerns that given the constraints on the site that the development may not be deliverable or that the site is unavailable. In view of the above it is requested that the allocation be deleted and that more suitable land at Church Lane be allocated.	
Q5 Change Requested	
Delete Water Street allocation and include land at Church Lane.	
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?	

11 May 2016 Page 911 of 956

The issues are complex and need to be the subject of debate as part of the oral Examination.

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 110

to the whole area and the community.

Respondent Number: 7136 Comment Name: Patrick Bridges Agent Name:	Organisa	ion: ganisation:		
Further Information available in the original of	_	_	ents sent with the com	nment? Yes
Does the respondent consider the document	- , ,	? (Tick if indicate	ed 'yes') \square	
Does the respondent consider the document				
If the respondent considers the Draft Placem				cated):
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justifi	ed 🗌 Not	Consisten	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rur	al Areas ,Para 11)		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: LGR18				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
I live at Churchley Cottage, 79 Church Lane, Far support of Farmborough Parish Council's noming the Local Authority's Placemaking Plan. Born in the cottage where I now reside and have knowledge of the land, its history and usage. The land was used as cottage gardens falling worth and immediately adjacent to All Saints' Cottage of Hunstrete Estate F.W. Leyborne Stone-built Cottages with Large Gardens" they	ving lived in Farmbook ithin the curtilage of Churchyard (See att Popham, and desc were sold.	esignated as a Lo brough for the m f three ancient of ached photo). In ribed in the sale	ajority of my life I have cottages which occupie July 1911, on the instr catalogue as "Three Su	ne purpose of e an extensive ed an area to the ructions of the ubstantially
substantial gardens between No 1 Church Lane				_
Mr Shore, who was a keen self-sufficient garde as the land in question until the early 2000s. The apple tree and a couple of domestic fowl runs of productive use of the land gradually tailed off to farnborough taken in 1958.	ne gardens accommon the land adjacer	odated fruit tree t to Church Lane	es, soft-fruit bushes wit Due to Mr Shore's ill-	th at least one -health
The grassy area now supports a variety of wild the centre of the village the openness of which loss would be extremely harmful.			•	-
So many cottage gardens have been lost to dev	velopment and if th	is site is not pres	erved it would cause s	significant harm

considered that new development should be sited so as to conserve the character of the village and 56% thought that it

11 May 2016

Page 912 of 956

In a recent survey carried out for a yet to be published Community Plan for Farmborough 57% of villagers considered undesignated open spaces including fields and gardens to be very important and 32% thought they were important. 88%

would be inappropriate for new housing to be built on gardens.
Church Lane is narrow and used regularly by pedestrians including young children going to and from the local school as well as visiting the play area in The Glebe (Molliers). It also gives access to what is now a very busy church and is much favoured by dog walkers.
Please take all the above factors into consideration when considering the Parish Council's nomination.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? $\ \Box$
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 913 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 140

Volume:

5, Rural Areas

Respondent Number: 262 Comment Number: Name: Justin Milward Organisation: Woodland Trust Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 140 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment "The Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood DP will be used to set out more detailed priorities for development at a local level, consistent with the more strategic vision for the wider area set in the adopted Core Strategy. The Neighbourhood DP will be focusing on the following policy areas: Housing and development; Business and employment; Transport and communications; Community and Recreation. The Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood Plan is expected to 'be made' by the BANES in 2015." There are ancient trees (oaks) between Dowling's Wood and Folly Wood at ST6074060296. Within the general area. However there are no details for proposed development sites. Q5 Change Requested These ancient trees should be specifically protected under Policy NE6 and national planning policy. 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?

11 Mav 2016 Page 914 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 147

Respondent Number: 7133 Comment Number: 2 Name: Mrs E Russell Organisation: Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning
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 5 Rural Areas , Para 147
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Volume 5 – Rural Areas - Timsbury
Paragraph 147 correctly identifies Timsbury as a Policy RA1 village that needs to allocate site(s) for around 50 dwellings over the Plan period. However, the two sites that are proposed to be allocated – SR14 Wheelers Manufacturing Block Works and SR15 Land to East of St Mary's School – between them 'could' accommodate 'approximately' 45 dwellings (see paragraphs 152 and 159). Moreover, for the reasons outlined below, there is by no means any certainty as to their availability and deliverability for housing, and indeed there is no evident rationale as to the suitability of SR15 for residential development.
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?
We wish to advise that at this stage we would like to participate at the oral stage of the Examination to enable us to explain to the Inspector the land south of Loves Hill site and its scheme and sustainability credentials in more detail.

11 May 2016 Page 915 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 148

Respondent Number: 7117 Comment Number	r: 1				
Name: A C Smith	Organisation:				
Agent Name: Mel Clinton	Agent Organisation: Nash Partnership				
Further Information available in the original commen	t? No	Attachments sent with the	e comment?	Yes	
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant? (Ti	ck if indicated 'yes')			
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	l? Yes, with m	ninor changes			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is	it because it is (ticked where	indicated):		
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not Cons	sisten 🗸 Not Effective	; ✓		
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas	, Para 148				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA					

Q4 Soundness Comment

- 1. Introduction
- 1.1 Nash Partnership is instructed by Mr A C Smith, owner of land to the north of Loves Hill, Timsbury, to make representations in respect of the Placemaking Plan: Pre-Submission Draft, December 2015.
- 1.2 These representations relate to the Policies Map and to paragraph 148 of the Pre-Submission Draft: Part 5 in respect of proposed site allocations and the Housing Development Boundary at Timsbury.
- 1.3 Representations have previously been submitted in respect of proposed site allocations and the Housing Development Boundary at Timsbury and a number of other policy proposals, on behalf of Linden Homes, in response to the publication of the Placemaking Options Document, November 2014.
- 2. Housing Need and Supply
- 2.1 The Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy, via Policy DW1, intends to deliver around 13,000 new homes over the period 2011 to 2029, to meet the full assessment of housing need. The supporting text to this policy makes it clear that the figure of 13,000 is not a cap on housing delivery over the period.
- 2.2 Housing land supply information is set out in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment: Findings Report, December 2015 (HELAA). The Housing Delivery Trajectory is included as Appendix 2 to the HELAA and the sites included within this show a projected total delivery of 12,860 dwellings the identified supply housing land. This is in line with the Core Strategy requirement for delivery of around 13,000 dwellings but the identified supply of housing land is very tight in relation to this need and delayed or non-delivery on a number of sites would put at risk the level of delivery required in order to meet the identified need.
- 2.3 The Draft Placemaking Plan, at para. 56, notes that completions over the period 2011 -13 were already below the required annual average of 750+ and that for the remainder of the Plan period would need to rise to an annual average delivery of 850. This represents an increase in the annualised average of over 500 p.a. compared to historic delivery over the period 2001 -11.
- 2.4 The housing delivery requirement is therefore extremely challenging, particularly when viewed against the background of past performance. An adequate supply of deliverable housing sites is consequently essential. In order to

11 Mav 2016 Page 916 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

mitigate the risk of some sites failing to deliver or being significantly delayed, the identified supply should exceed the Core Strategy requirement of around 13,000 dwellings by a significant margin.

- 3. Housing Delivery in the Rural Areas
- 3.1 The Core Strategy, in support of Policy DW1, sets out a spatial distribution of housing at Table 1b. This proposes 1,120 new homes in the Rural Areas, with 250 of these being identified as additional to existing commitments. These are to be provided via Policy RA1 at villages that meet specified sustainability criteria, with around 50 dwellings at each of these locations and around 10-15 dwellings, under Policy RA2, at villages that do not meet these criteria but are outside the Green Belt.
- 3.2 The Draft Placemaking Plan proposes to amend the criteria for villages that qualify for development under Policy RA1, so that a primary school is an absolute requirement, together with at least two of the following; post office, community meeting place and convenience shop.
- 3.3 Of the sixteen villages that fall under Policies RA1 and RA2 (excluding Whitchurch, which is subject of a separate allocation), only six are proposed for site allocations in the Draft Placemaking Plan. These allocations, if delivered as proposed, would provide a total of 162 dwellings.
- 4. Housing Delivery in Timsbury
- 4.1 The Placemaking Plan Options Document identified three potential sites for allocation in Timsbury:
- SR13 Land North of Loves Hill: about 25 dwellings
- SR14 Former Wheelers Block Works: about 25 dwellings
- SR15 Land East of St Marys School: 1 0-15 dwellings
- 4.2 At para. 1.417 the Options Document stated that the Parish Council had identified SR 13 and SR 14 as the preferred sites and that B&NES had also included SR 15 along with SR14 as another option.
- 4.3 The Draft Placemaking Plan now proposes to allocate sites SR14 and SR15 and makes no mention of site SR13, Land North of Loves Hill (See Appendix 1). The site is however referred to within two of the evidence documents supporting the Placemaking Plan.
- 4.4 One of these evidence documents is Appendix 1e to the HELAA Site Assessments: Villages. The site assessments document identifies a housing capacity on the site, which it describes as "Field West of Southlands Drive" (Tim 8) of 50 dwellings. It however wrongly states that the site is not available (p3). As referred to above, representations were submitted on the Placemaking Plan Options Document and the owner has been clear that the land is available.
- 4.5 The second of these evidence documents is the Placemaking Plan Site Assessment Report, November 2014. This identifies access constraints in relation to the land north of Loves Hill (in the report referred to as "Land West of Southlands Drive") and in this respect there are two options. One of these is to provide access from Southlands Drive which runs to the edge of the site and the other is to provide an access onto Loves Hill. It is recognised that with the latter measures are needed to establish satisfactory sight lines. Consideration has been given to this and appropriate sight lines can be achieved either through negotiation with adjoining land
- owners over the small adjustments necessary or through introduction of a traffic calming scheme that would bring the access forward, narrowing the road a degree and slowing traffic speeds. Overall, the Site Assessment Report concludes that the site should be considered in the Placemaking Plan as an option for development. This conclusion is supported and it is considered that the site should be allocated for residential development.
- 4.6 The site should be allocated for residential development for a number of reasons in order to ensure that the Placemaking Plan is sound in terms of facilitating sustainable development and effectively delivering the number of new homes required to meet the identified need. Development of the site, with appropriate landscaping and open space to conserve heritage assets, landscape views and provide community amenity, would represent infilling between existing

11 May 2016 Page 917 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

built areas of the village, within walking distance of village amenities. In this respect it is noted that the Site Assessment Report referred to above does not consider access to the village post office, one of the facilities listed in Policy RA1. This walking distance, and to the adjoining pharmacy, is approximately 570m from the site frontage onto Loves Hill.

- 4.7 Allocation of the site would also contribute to mitigation of the risk of housing delivery failing to meet the identified level of need. Within Timsbury site SR14 has been the subject of development proposals since at least 2002 and over a period of 14 years has failed to secure planning permission for residential development. It must therefore be regarded as a risk in terms of delivery.
- 4.8 Site SR15 is very sensitive in terms of views out from the village and from vantage points back towards the village. It is designated as a Visually Important Open Space in the adopted Local Plan and as the Site Assessment Report notes, there are wide and long views to the north, including long views towards the Cotswolds AONB and Beckford's Tower on the Lansdown ridge in Bath. There also views to and from the univallate hillfort, a Scheduled Monument on the ridge at the edge of Tunley to the east and consideration needs to be given to the setting of this heritage asset. It is difficult to envisage how development of 20 houses on this land, particularly if the existing garages remain in place, can be achieved without significant adverse impacts on views, in particular those out from the village. In this respect the adopted Local Plan designation of the land as a Visually Important Open Space is indicative of its sensitivity.
- 4.9 More broadly, as noted above, the identified housing land supply is very tight in relation to the identified need to deliver around 13,000 homes in Bath and North East Somerset and tis poses significant risks of under delivery. It is therefore important that sites that can facilitate sustainable development in accordance with the spatial strategy are enabled by the Placemaking Plan.
- 4.10 Allocation of the land to the north of Loves Hill (formerly site SR13) would create the possibility of this and sites SR14 and SR15 all proceeding, with overall delivery in Timsbury of about 70 dwellings. Whilst the supporting text to ore Strategy Policy RA1 refers to around 50 dwellings at each of the villages, such as Timsbury, that meet the policy criteria, this has been established at appeal not to be a cap on the number of homes appropriate to each village. In this appeal case, at Temple Cloud (ref APF0114/A/14/2228577) development of 70 dwellings was permitted. In the majority of the villages that meet the RA1 And RA2 policy criteria, as noted at 3.3 above, the Placemaking Plan proposes no housing site allocations.
- 4.11 We submit therefore that in order to make the Placemaking Plan sound, the land to the north of Loves Lane should be allocated for about 25-30 dwellings and provision of open green space for community use. The supporting text should make it clear that the site capacity figure is indicative and not a cap on development should a detailed design process establish that a higher number of dwellings can be satisfactorily accommodated.
- 4.12 The Timsbury HDB is not included within Annex 1 Policies Maps Changes to the published Draft Placemaking Plan. In order to facilitate sustainable development and to enable effective delivery of the required number of new homes it is submitted that the HDB for Timsbury should be amended to include the land north of Loves Hill, as shown at Appendix 2.
- 5. Conclusions
- 5.1 The Pre-Submission Draft Placemaking Plan is considered to be unsound for the reasons set out below.

Justified

5.2 The Draft Plan Policy Policies Map and para.148 are not justified in failing to allocate the land north of Loves Hill in Timsbury and to amend the HDB accordingly, as a reasonable alternative for delivery of housing in a sustainable manner in accordance with the adopted spatial strategy.

Consistent with national policy

5.3 The omission of the site north of Loves Hill as a proposed allocation and related amendment of the HDB prejudices the delivery of sustainable development contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11 Mav 2016 Page 918 of 956

Effective

5.4 The Placemaking Plan is subject to significant risk of failing to deliver the number of homes required to meet the identified need because of a lack of contingency within the identified supply across the district and reliance within Timsbury upon two sites, both of which are subject to risk.

Q5 Change Requested

Allocation of the land north of Loves Hill for residential development of about 25-30 dwellings as an indicative capacity but not a cap on residential quantum, plus provision of open space would, together with amendment of the HDB as proposed in Appendix 2, address the issues of soundness set out above and make the Plan sound in respect of these.

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?

In order to ensure that examination of the issues of soundness raised are fully informed

11 May 2016 Page 919 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Policy SR14

Name: Amanda Constantinidi		
	Organisation:	
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:	
Further Information available in the original comment	nt? No Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas	d? Yes, with minor changes an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
Incorrect boundary's to South of SR14 and East of SR15	5	
Q5 Change Requested		
Move boundary's		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip		
Respondent Number: 7133 Comment Number	r: 3	
·		
Name: Mrs E Russell	Organisation:	
Name: Mrs E Russell Agent Name: Andrew Winstone	Organisation: Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning	
Name: Mrs E Russell Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Further Information available in the original comment	Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning	No
Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound	Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning at? No Attachments sent with the comment? y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes')	No
Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning at? No Attachments sent with the comment? y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') d? an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective	No
Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas	Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning at? No Attachments sent with the comment? y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') d? an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective	No
Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Further Information available in the original comment Does the respondent consider the document is legally Does the respondent consider the document is sound If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla Not Positively Prepared Not Justified The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning at? No Attachments sent with the comment? y compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') d? an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated): Not Consisten Not Effective 7 Policy SR14	No

11 Mav 2016 Page 920 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

The brownfield nature of this site may make it suitable for development in principle, subject to resolution of any technical constraints. However the planning history calls into question the deliverability of the site for housing. Since 2002, three planning

applications have been made for residential development, and these have either been refused or withdrawn. Specifically, application no. 07/03509/FUL for 37 dwellings and office space was dismissed on appeal, with the Inspector finding that the proposal

constituted an over-intensive form of development which would be harmful to the rural character and appearance of the area.

A subsequent application submitted in 2009 for a reduced scheme comprising 27 dwellings (ref. 09/02468/FUL) was subject to an Article 36 Notice of Disposal issued in January 2014, and an objection from Timsbury Parish Council. Thus ultimately the application was not proceeded with, and it is evident that although the application was with BaNES for over four years, an acceptable development solution could not be found.

In its Placemaking Plan document (December 2013), the Parish Council assessed this 'cramped and north-facing site' as not being suitable for housing. The Parish Council pointed to problems concerning the position of the site access, and considered that the traffic generated from 28 or so houses issuing out onto the crossroads would make a bad situation 'intolerable' at peak times. Further, the Parish Council considered that the site should retain its employment tradition, and be used for a village hub and small

workshops. Policy SR14 requires a mixed use development of housing and employment on the site, to be limited to about an area of 1 hectare, to allow for the preservation and enhancement of the batch. However, it is not clear as to what the intended split between housing and employment is, and also the plan (Diagram 21) appears to include two existing residential properties within the developable area. Given the site's planning history over a considerable period of time, which has not yielded any operational planning consent, there must be some doubt as to whether Ian Jewson Planning Ltd Limited Company registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 07043110 Registered Office: Sandalwood, Purewell, Puriton, Somerset TA7 8BA this is a developable, deliverable site for housing. The SHLAA reports that the site 'could' come forward for development however it might take some time. Further, there can be no certainty that development of the site will deliver policy-compliant 40% affordable housing from a commercial viability perspective, given the possibility of abnormal costs arising from potential contamination of the site due to previous uses. Although it is accepted that the planning policy context has been updated over the last few years, it is noteworthy that the previous planning application submitted in 2009 included 33% affordable housing.

Test of Soundness

With reference to the above assessment, the draft Plan as proposed is not sound for the following reasons: Positively Prepared and Consistency with National Policy With regard to Timsbury, the draft Plan is not positively prepared as the two sites together are unlikely to meet the full housing provision required for the village. Core Strategy Policy RA1 villages are required to make a positive contribution towards meeting the wider, objectively assessed housing need for the B&NES District which is for around 13,000 dwellings over the period to 2029. In so doing, the requirement is that they provide sites for around 50 dwellings.

If they come forward (and there is some doubt as to their deliverability as matters stand), the SR14 and SR15 sites may potentially provide in the region of 35 – 45 dwellings, which clearly would fall short of the policy requirement. Paragraph 157 of the Framework requires Local Plans to plan positively for development required in the area, to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework which, amongst other things, includes the imperative to boost significantly the supply of housing. This requires sites to be allocated to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary.

To be positively prepared and consistent with national policy therefore, the Placemaking Plan needs to identify additional development land in Timsbury to ensure housing delivery requirements are met. Justified – For the reasons given above in relation to the Policy SR15 site, the draft Plan does not set out the most appropriate strategy for Timsbury and therefore cannot be deemed to be justified. Clearly there are major reservations about developing the land to the east of St. Mary's School on landscape/environmental grounds. Amongst other things, the SHLAA produced by BaNES finds that development on the site would

have a moderate impact on landscape character, and the Parish Council assessed the site as being unsuitable for housing

11 May 2016 Page 921 of 956

given its environmental sensitivity. BaNES had earlier proposed to designate this site as a Visually Important Green Space.

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?				
We wish to advise that at this stage we would like to participate at the oral stage of the Examination to enable us to explain to the Inspector the land south of Loves Hill site and its scheme and sustainability credentials in more detail.				
Respondent Number: 7214 Comment Number: 1				
Name: David & Jeam Boswell Organisation:				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR14				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Re. Wheelers Yd: all vehicular traffic should travel via a roundabout at the X-roads. 25 dwellings is far too many. Should be no more than 18 of which 1/3 should be some bungalows for elderly social housing.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				

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

11 May 2016 Page 922 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 159

Respondent Number: 6512 Comment Number: 1				
Name: Dan Hilton Organisation: St Mary's C of E School Timsbury				
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 Consisten Not Effective				
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 159 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
The site kererence (ii applicable) is.				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
It is the opinion of the full governing body of St. Mary's school Timsbury, that the paragraph 159 should include:				
There is currently no need for new access to the school, as identified by the school given it's current layout and structure. If these were to change, then this need would need to be reassessed. Thought needs to be given in any				
development upon SR15, for the future viability of the school site given any future development to the back of the				
school site.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Paragraph 159 should include:				
There is currently no need for new access to the school, as identified by the school given it's current layout and structure.				
If these were to change, then this need would need to be reassessed. Thought needs to be given in any development upon SR15, for the future viability of the school site given any future development to the back of the school site.				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box				
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?				

11 May 2016 Page 923 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Part: Para 164

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

Volume:

5, Rural Areas

Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 7 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Attachments sent with the comment? No 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 Consisten Not Effective The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 164 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment The draft fails to give sufficient weight to local consultations, and fails to recognise part of the clearly stated short, medium and long term vision for the site resulting from those consultations with the local residents made by the Parish Council in its preparations for the Placement and Neighbourhood Plans. Failure to recognise this could permit development which would prevent the possibility of these plans being brought to fruition. Bathnes Council have already been sent the supporting evidence. Q5 Change Requested Add to paragraph 164: "Pedestrian and cycle access should be enabled from North Road/Lansdown Crescent to the rear of St. Mary's Primary School and its Playing Field. Car and School coach access between the same locations should either be provided, or the land safeguarded for future provision." Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 Mav 2016 Page 924 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Policy SR15

New Design Principle 6

Respondent Number: 372	Comment Number: 1	L				
Name:	Or	ganisation:	Timsbury Pa	rish Council		
Agent Name:	Ag	ent Organis	ation:			
Further Information available in	n the original comment?	No	Attachme	nts sent with the	comment?	No
Does the respondent consider	the document is legally cor	npliant? (Tic	ck if indicated	l '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 Cons	isten 🗹	Not Effective	✓	
The representation relates to: \	/olume 5 Rural Areas ,P	olicy SR15				
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:					
Q4 Soundness Comment						
The general approach and many Draft Plan are supported by Tims		ury section i	n pages 43 to	47 of the Rural	Areas part of t	he
However, there are 2 key alteration residents and the Parish Council of sound and not open to challeng included additional comments stopossible future improvements to	in the Options Paper consure. Of the 273 respondents ating that their preference	Iltation proc who favour	cess in 2015. ⁻ red the devel	This will ensure t opment of SR15,	hat the Policies, 70 (25.65%),	
SR15 Access to Land East of St M	ary's School					
A key rationale of the choosing o the St Mary's school site, especia		to provide fo	or the potent	ial in the long te	rm for the need	ds of
We are aware that this may be in landowner and the village, include	<u> </u>			•	f the primary	
Without the inclusion of this prin challenge.	ciple, the site may be at ris	sk and the P	olicy SR15 ma	ay not be sound a	and so open to)
As a result we require that the te	ext of the Draft Local Plan s	hould be ch	anged to incl	ude the following	g suggested te	xt:
Context - New Para 161 The site is adjacent to St Mary's s to provide for any potential chan		area, and th	ne school's lo	ng term needs sh	nould be consic	bered
Highways - para 164						

Pedestrian and cycle access should be provided from North Road to St. Mary's School and its playing field. The site layout

11 May 2016

Page 925 of 956

Pedestrian and cycle access should be enabled from North Road to St. Mary's Primary School and its playing field.

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

should be such as to provide, or not prevent future development, for car and coach vehicle access to and from St. Mary's School site.

New Design Principle

The Public Right of Way (ref:BA2/34) should be redirected to enable people to walk through the site to the locally important green space to the northeast of the development.

Q5 Change Requested

Timsbury - We have noted the following errors for your attention:

1.Page 43 Paragraph 146

The designated neighbourhood planning area is Timsbury Parish, not Timsbury Parish Council.

2.Page 44 Paragraph 156

The batch close by site SR 14 is to the East, not South and South West.

3.Page 45 Diagram 21

Local Green Space GR 9. The full extent of Timsbury Recreational Field has not been shown. The South West corner is an integral part of the Recreational Field and should be coloured green.

Site SR14. The site boundary is incorrectly shown. The area with 2 houses to the South of the site should not be included. It is not part of the site. As a result that site area in para 152 may need altering.

4. Page 4: A heading "St. Mary's School" has lost its apostrophe.

Context - New Para 161

The site is adjacent to St Mary's school, a key facility of the area, and the school's long term needs should be considered to provide for any potential changes to the school.

Highways - para 164

Pedestrian and cycle access should be enabled from North Road to St. Mary's Primary School and its playing field.

New Design Principle 6

Pedestrian and cycle access should be provided from North Road to St. Mary's School and its playing field. The site layout should be such as to provide, or not prevent future development, for car and coach vehicle access to and from St. Mary's School site.

New Design Principle

Not Positively Prepared

The Public Right of Way (ref:BA2/34) should be redirected to enable people to walk through the site to the locally important green space to the northeast of the development.

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:	6360	Comment Number:	1		
Name: Lynn Rogers		C	rganisation:		
Agent Name:		А	gent Organisat	cion:	
Further Information ava	ilable in t	he original comment?	No	Attachments sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is legally co	ompliant? (Tick	if indicated 'yes') ✓	
Does the respondent co	nsider th	e document is sound?	Yes, with min	or changes	

11 May 2016 Page 926 of 956

Not Consisten

Not Effective

If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Plan is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):

Not Justified

The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
A large part of the reason for villagers to choose the SR15 land was because of the possible links to St Mary's School with appropriate access. This is not mentioned or referred to in the vision for the sight.
Q5 Change Requested
Make reference as above.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6375 Comment Number: 1
Name: Cllr Douglas Deacon Organisation:
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □ The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The allocation of this land is not justified for the following reasons
The site will access onto North Road which is much complained about by residents would be a danger to road safety. The detrimental effect on the viewing area by significantly reducing the views to the open countryside and the loss of bench seating. The loss of the public footpath would no longer allow the general public, walkers and Ramblers to enjoy the beauty of the vista. The loss of garages and off road parking area would be lost and would need to be relocated somewhere on the site. This area of land allows the countryside to enter the village at this location, if developed would destroy an important village rural visual amenity. The number of houses proposed at this location is overdevelopment.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 927 of 956

Respondent Number: 6379 Comment Num	ber: 1		
Name: Gillian Jones	Organisation:		
Agent Name:	Agent Organis	sation:	
Further Information available in the original comm	nent? No	Attachments sent with the comment?	? Yes
Does the respondent consider the document is less the respondent consider the document is so of the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Not Positively Prepared Not Justified	und? No g Plan is unsound, is	, ,	
Not Positively Frepared Not Justined	Not cons	Sisteri Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Ar The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	eas ,Policy SR15		

Q4 Soundness Comment

- 1.Timsbury has a longstanding traffic flow problem in North Road and the 2 proposed developments are sited at each end of this pinch point (SR14 brownfield site) and SR15 near Landsdown Crescent. Developing at each end of this busy and narrow area will lead to further serious delays and congestion.
- 2.Traffic from the proposed development SR15 will enter North Road near a blind corner with the consequent increased danger of road incidents. As a pedestrian crossing there 3-4 times a week I frequently need to hurry across the road as cars appear rapidly around the blind corner. If I had a pushchair or a wheelchair this would be even more hazardous.
- 3. The proposed land is designated the only visually important open space in the village and was supported in its application by the parish council. Despite the statements in the plan that the views will be preserved from individual properties and that Policy SR15 requires that views from the village towards Farmborough Common, Tunley Hill and Bath must be maintained and the site should be designed to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties I do not believe this is possible to conform and that the development will in fact diminish the views from the village.
- 4.Timsbury Cof E school are not in a position to support any of the options that were set out in the placemaking plan. The school is set out so that children and visitors enter the school from Landsdown View and the school office, head teachers office and deputy headteachers office are all sited on this aspect of the building. There has been no discussion with the school governors or headteacher about how accessing the school through the playground would affect the school and whether they feel that this would be of benefit.
- 5. Siting housing behind the school would deprive the village children of the views towards Tunley Hill and this would be of great detriment to them. Should the housing at any time in the future extend to the boundary of the school playing field the children would walk through a lane with housing either side and disadvantage them from the assets they currently enjoy
- 6. The site proposed in the placemaking plan is considerably different in size and position to that which the village consulted on.

The size of the plot would hold considerably more than 20 houses and inevitably developers would wish to realise their investment. Once the site was sold the previous landowner, the parish council and residents of the village would be likely to have little influence on the whole site being developed.

7. The proposed development now extends to the back of The Mead with serious danger of their amenities being lost, for example, increase in noise, loss of views across the fields and loss of privacy. The Mead is on a higher level than SR15 and any development would be overlooked and impact on residents of The Mead.

Q5 Change Requested

- 1. The options should be reviewed with a view to both developments being to the west of the village. SR14 is a brownfield site and there is much agreement that this should be developed and it is in line with Govt Policy. Other possible sites are available near to SR14.
- 2. There should be no agreement to developing SR15 until a thorough and proper traffic survey is carried out and published as to the safety to pedestrians and vehicles if this development goes ahead. It is essential that if the traffic

11 Mav 2016 Page 928 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

situation becomes more hazardous and problematic that the root cause is not found to be because of poor and hurried decision making about the siting of this development.

- 3. The need to build on the only designated VIOS has not been made and I believe that the reasons for the loss of this amenity which was strongly supported by the parish council should be made public
- 4. The inspector should consult with the Governing Body of Timsbury C of E school about any proposed changes to access to the school buildings and the consequent safety for the children and school environment of this decision.
- 5. The inspector should consider the adverse consequences to the children of the village resulting from the loss of views from their school and of development up to the school field boundary.
- 6. The inspector must consider the effects on the village of selling a parcel of land much larger than that required for 20 houses to a developer and the consequent effect it would have on the amenities of the village.
- 7. The inspector must also explain how the views from The Mead towards Tunley Hill, Farmborough Common and Bath can be maintained as at present and as clearly stated in the consultation document. The Chair of the parish council and others have stated their support that the unparalleled views across from the Mead should be maintained and the amenity of The Mead residents and village as whole should be preserved.

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?

I am one of the residents that will be most affected by the development SR15

Respondent Number: 6391 Comment Number:	: 1
Name: Dr Robert Jones	Organisation:
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	n is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ☐ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas	, Policy SR15
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	

Q4 Soundness Comment

The Timsbury Placemaking Plan as it relates specifically to the land known as SR15 (adjacent to the Mead and Landsdown Crescent does not comply with the plan consulted upon during 2015. The land proposed for building is not identical to that in the original consultation. The proposal is also unsound from a traffic volume point of view making the area more dangerous for pedestrians. I also consider the original Timsbury Parish Council Consultation process to be seriously flawed.

Q5 Change Requested

Serious consideration must be given to traffic flow and safety for pedestrians (including children) attending the Timsbury School . The proposal flies in the face of the provisions set out and agreed for a visually important open space and the views from the Mead will be obscured, which is outside the parameters set out in BaNES own statements. The proposal is unsound as it is based on incorrect information provided by the Parish Council. The School is known not to be in support of this proposal as incorrectly stated by the representative of the Parish Council (Steering group Chair) at the public meeting held in Timsbury on 10th January, 2015. The school have sent letters out to parents about the possible dangers arising for children walking to the school following incidents of them being "clipped" by vehicles on narrow, and extremely congested roads. SR15 is a green field site and therefore development on this field is outside Government policy. Public amenty will be lost for the village if the village viewing area is removed. If the post office is relocated to

11 Mav 2016 Page 929 of 956

McColls following the consultation about possible closure of the existing shop the traffic in North Road area will be increased even further on top of the inevitable increase in volume which will result from a housing development in this location.

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 have the opportunity to comment in person and also to make representations to the inspector (who is most welcome to attend the property to inspect the site in person). Respondent Number: 6463 Comment Number: 1 Name: Graham and Iris Nicholls Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? Nο 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 Consisten Not Effective ✓ The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: **O4 Soundness Comment** It does not comply with the plan agreed with the Timsbury Parish Council. On page 47 Diagram 22 shows the whole field including the present boundary along Lansdown Crescent being available for development. On page 46 it also comments that the field is 2.6ha in area but only 1.9ha is allocated for development.i.e. 73%. This is completely wrong not agreed with the Timsbury Council or the owner of the field. Building on 73% of the land will completely destroy the fact that it is a partial green space. The idea of a development here with no thought at all of the traffic problems in North Road is ludicrous. The entrance to any development on this field according to para 16.4 will be on the dangerous bend at the junction of North Road and Lansdown Crescent, at present the most dangerous part of North Road. With a development already planned at the western end of North Road it doesn't take a fortune teller to forecast an increase in accidents here. Q5 Change Requested We cannot see any change possible to make this proposal sound. The present green space will be destroyed, the comment in para 3 states that the viewing area/plinth should be re-provided i.e. moved. It is quite alright where it is at present so why move it? Obviously because the magnificent views we enjoy at present will be destroyed. There will be an increase in traffic on North Road at an already dangerous bend. Very few developments plan parking for two cars so there will be more cars parked overnight on North Road. This part of the placemaking plan can never be sound with the extremely limited and dangerous access to the field. 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?

11 May 2016 Page 930 of 956

Respondent Number: 6551 Comment Number: 1 Name: Rachel Quick Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	lo
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 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: Q4 Soundness Comment	
Point 2 - The Views towards Farmborough Common, Tunley Hill and Bath must be maintained. THEY WILL NOT BE, IF YOU BUILD 20 HOUSES ON LAND TO THE EAST OF ST MARYS SCHOOL! it will be impossible to see Farmborough Common, even by "re positioning" the viewing plinth, the view will be obscured. There is a massive amount of wildlife within this field that has not been considered. The 15m buffer from the mature trees will push this development across to the bungalows on the far side of Lansdown Crescent. There has presently been no discussion with regards to the traffic flow or access position to this new development. Currently the two roads of Lansdown Crescent neither has right of way dictated, and as such there are many "near misses" the road junction needs to be carefully thought out, and consideration made as to where the entrance to the new development will be. Consideration does not appear to have been made to provision for additional pupils at St Marys School, which is already at maximum capacity - surely new houses will bring more pupils. No justification has been made to the school provision	у
Q5 Change Requested My suggestion is that the entrance to the new development is put on the junction with North Road / Lansdown Crescer as a mini roundabout, this will slow traffic entering the village, which will help with speed issues along North Road. this will also control traffic coming into Lansdown Crescent and the new development. A round about from North Road / Lansdown Crescent will be more effective than putting the entrance to the new development from Lansdown Crescent. Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?	
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 1 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? N	lo
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):	

11 May 2016 Page 931 of 956

Not Consisten **✓**

Not Effective ✓

Not Justified **✓**

Not Positively Prepared **✓**

The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
At the south end of the site indicated in diagrams 20 and 21 (Wheelers site), the land and the two residential houses are privately owned and are not part of the area to be developed. The boundary shown on these diagrams is therefore legally incorrect.
Q5 Change Requested
Redraw the boundary in the legally correct place.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 2
Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation:
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The batch referred to in paragraph 156 is to the East of the site, and not the South and South West. It is therefore legally incorrect.
Q5 Change Requested
Delete "South and South West" and replace with "East"
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 3
Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No

11 May 2016 Page 932 of 956

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 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The draft fails to give sufficient weight to local consultations, and fails to recognise part of the clearly stated short, medium and long term vision for the site resulting from those consultations with the local residents made by the Parish Council in its preparations for the Placement and Neighbourhood Plans. Failure to recognise this could permit development which would prevent the possibility of these plans being brought to fruition. Bathnes Council have been sent the supporting evidence.
Q5 Change Requested
Paragraph 164: Add "Pedestrian and cycle access should be enabled from North Road/Lansdown Crescent to the rear of St. Mary's Primary school and its playing field, and the design of the site should be such as to provide, or at least not prevent future access for cars and school coaches between these locations."
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
with does the Respondent receive is necessary to participate at the Examination.
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation:
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation:
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: 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')
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: 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):
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: 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
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: 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):
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 4 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: 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 Consisten Not Effective

Q5 Change Requested

sent the supporting evidence.

Paragraph 164: Add "Pedestrian and cycle access should be enabled from North Road/Lansdown Crescent to the rear of St. Mary's Primary School and it's playing field and the design of the site should be such as to provide, or not prevent future provision, for car and school coach access to the school and its playing field.

development which would prevent the possibility of these plans being brought to fruition. Bathnes Council have been

11 May 2016 Page 933 of 956

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: 6579 Comment Number: 5 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The draft fails to give sufficient weight to local consultations, and fails to recognise part of the clearly stated short, medium and long term vision for the site resulting from those consultations with the local residents made by the Parish Council in its preparations for the Placement and Neighbourhood Plans. Failure to recognise this could permit development which would prevent the possibility of these plans being brought to fruition. Bathnes Council have been sent the supporting evidence.
Q5 Change Requested Page 47, Design Principle 6. Add the following: "Pedestrian and cycle access should be enabled between North Road/Lansdown Crescent and the rear of St Mary's Primary School and its playing field. Car and school coach access between these locations should also either be provided, or the design should be such as to not prevent the future provision of these facilities." Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Respondent Number: 6579 Comment Number: 6 Name: Dr Geoffrey Smith Organisation: 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 Propagated. A legality of the Consisten Description of the Positive Description of the Pos

11 May 2016 Page 934 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The draft fails to give sufficient weight to local consultations, and fails to recognise part of the clearly stated short, medium and long term vision for the site resulting from those consultations with the local residents made by the Parish Council in its preparations for the Placement and Neighbourhood Plans. Failure to recognise this could permit development which would prevent the possibility of these plans being brought to fruition. Bathnes Council have been sent the supporting evidence.
Q5 Change Requested
Paragraph 159 should be extended to include: "The site is adjacent to St. Mary's Primary School, a key facility of the area, and the school's and community's long term needs should be considered. No development should take place which would obstruct the clear views of the village expressed in the local consultation with BathNes."
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 6584 Comment Number: 1 Name: Helen Newman Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
At the Futures Day on 10 January 2015 we were advised that the development of this site would include an alternative access road and coach/car drop off point at the back of St Mary's school. There is no reference to this on the Draft Placemaking Plan which needs clarification. It is essential as part of this development that the school has a designated drop off point for parents and particularly school coaches which currently use Lansdown View/Crocombe and regularly cause obstruction and chaos due to the narrowness of the road and lack of parking. Only a few days ago there was yet another accident involving two vehicles in Lansdown View at school drop off time. Another highways consideration is the already congested North Road B3115 and if more dwellings are to be built in this
part of the village (including the Wheelers Yard site) this is only going to exacerbate the problem. Alterations to North Road (such as a one way system) must be considered and included when any further housing development is being looked at in this part of the village. Without essential highway consideration, the current road layouts cannot sustain further development in this part of the village.
Q5 Change Requested

11 May 2016 Page 935 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

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?

I feel it would be useful to have a representative from someone who lives in this part of the village which will be affected by any future planning decisions.

Respondent Number: 7042 Comme	nt Number: 1		
Name: Mary Holbrook	Organisation	:	
Agent Name:	Agent Organi	sation:	
Further Information available in the origina	l comment? No	Attachments sent with the	comment? No
Does the respondent consider the docume Does the respondent consider the docume If the respondent considers the Draft Place Not Positively Prepared Not Just	nt is sound? No making Plan is unsound, i		·
The representation relates to: Volume 5 R The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	ural Areas ,Policy SR15		

Q4 Soundness Comment

I am communicating directly with you because I am not happy with the draft placemaking plan in so far as it related to the Mead in Timsbury, especially when compared weith the proposed deevelopment at Wheelers. While I appreciate that this is an outline only, there are important issues to be addressed.

The plan is not POSITIVELY PREPARED or JUSTIFIED i.e. it is not the most appropriate strategy for the Mead. It is only EFFECTIVE i.e. deliverable if I as landowner agree to make the land available and at the moment I have strong reservations about the plan with which I believe many in the village would concur. It could enable the delivery of sustainable development were land use less profligate.

My comments are as follows:

Policy SR15. Para 1 The number of dwellings has gradually increased to "around 20". When I agreed to the larger area as indicated in my original plan, this was to allow planning flexibility not to increase the area occupied by housing. I note that 1.9 ha out of 2.6 (again presumably the area indicated in my plan since the entire field is 4.11 ha) is to be used for housing. On the other hand I note that the site at Wheelers is 1.48ha and 1 ha is proposed for 25 dwellings plus employment space. 25 houses/ha as against "around 20" for 1.9 ha. Not the kind of development I had in mind.

SR15 Para 5

While I would not wish to cause damage to the trees I cannot agree to this buffer zone, since it will contribute to a loss of view which local people value highly by causing the development to extend further into the field .For a start these trees are not mature. Most of them are grown out hedging and may be as old or younger than those at Wheelers where no such buffer has been proposed although the batch is subject to a TPO. This buffer cannot be justified. Were the same criteria applied to Wheelers it would greatly reduce the number of properties that could be erected. This buffer will contribute to a loss of the view which local people value highly by causing the development to extend further into the field. Were these trees oak 150 years old, such a margin might be justified. Most of these trees could be replaced within 40 or 50 years. A view will be lost forever.

I am speaking for myself and many in the village when I state that the development should be restricted in size and compact in nature. There should be pedestrian access to the school and it would be far sighted even if the school is not to be redeveloped to make provision for access or egress on this side at some point in the future.

11 May 2016 Page 936 of 956

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 7119 Comment Number: 1
Name: John Murray Organisation:
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 Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
I was asked by Email to participate in comments regarding the proposed housing development in Timsbury . To reiterate my previous comments, I voted for the Lansdown Crescent development ,but unless a more efficient road structure is put in place ie a one way system further building would lead to already congested roads .Both North and South Roads are heavily congested with roadside parking .
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?
Respondent Number: 7133 Comment Number: 4
Name: Mrs E Russell Organisation:
Agent Name: Andrew Winstone Agent Organisation: Ian Jewson Planning
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 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment

11 May 2016 Page 937 of 956

Policy SR15 Land to the East of St Mary's School and Paragraphs 159 - 165

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

SR15 is a greenfield site, and it is particularly noteworthy that the site was part of a larger area identified as a Visually Important Green Space (VIGS) during the preparation of the BaNES Core Strategy. Indeed, the VIGS designation remained an option in the Placemaking Plan Options document (November 2014), and the current consultation Plan still identifies the site as acting as an important green wedge into the village (paragraph 162).

The importance of the site in terms of its contribution to the open rural landscape is emphasised by the presence of a viewing point located to the south of the site. This explains the open views across it to areas of local landscape importance, including Farmborough Common which is a significant feature of the Hinton Blewett and Newton St. Loe Plateau Lands. The importance of the views across the site from various directions, including from The Mead to the west, are explained in the draft Plan. It is significant that the Parish Council assessed this site as being an unsuitable allocation for housing, in part given its environmental sensitivity, in its SHLAA assessments carried out in November 2013.

Given the sensitivity of the site in landscape terms, the draft Plan seeks to confine housing to the western and southern part of the site, and even then an off-set of 15 metres is required from the mature trees adjoining the western boundary. The amount of land that might be suitable for housing is therefore very unclear, and whilst the current consultation draft suggests that around 20 dwellings might be accommodated, the previous Options document proposed around 10 to 15 dwellings.

The Placemaking Plan Options document also highlighted a potential constraint to development in terms of access; it appears that part of the access road and/or the visibility splays would need to be achieved on third party land and this requires further investigation. Nowhere does this appear to be addressed in the current consultation version of the Plan.

The site has not been promoted by the landowner through the BaNES SHLAA. Whilst there is reference to a letter from the landowner in the Draft Placemaking Plan Allocated Sites Pro-forma (which forms part of the evidence base), no further details are provided other than that the landowner has been in discussions with the Parish Council and is seeking to redevelop the site in the short term. However, the site is not subject to any planning application.

In summary, the sensitivity of the site in landscape/environmental terms calls into question the suitability of the site for housing, and this is echoed by the Parish Council's SHLAA assessment exercise. Furthermore, there is no publicly available firm evidence that indicates that the site is available for development. It is therefore uncertain as to whether this site is developable, and if so, how many dwellings it might in practice yield.

Test of Soundness

With reference to the above assessment, the draft Plan as proposed is not sound for the following reasons: Positively Prepared and Consistency with National Policy With regard to Timsbury, the draft Plan is not positively prepared as the two sites together are unlikely to meet the full housing provision required for the village. Core Strategy Policy RA1 villages are required to make a positive contribution towards meeting the wider, objectively assessed housing need for the B&NES District which is for around 13,000 dwellings over the period to 2029. In so doing, the requirement is that they provide sites for around 50 dwellings.

If they come forward (and there is some doubt as to their deliverability as matters stand), the SR14 and SR15 sites may potentially provide in the region of 35 – 45 dwellings, which clearly would fall short of the policy requirement. Paragraph 157 of the Framework requires Local Plans to plan positively for development required in the area, to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework which, amongst other things, includes the imperative to boost significantly the supply of housing. This requires sites to be allocated to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary.

To be positively prepared and consistent with national policy therefore, the Placemaking Plan needs to identify additional development land in Timsbury to ensure housing delivery requirements are met. Justified – For the reasons given above in relation to the Policy SR15 site, the draft Plan does not set out the most appropriate strategy for Timsbury and therefore cannot be deemed to be justified. Clearly there are major reservations about developing the land to the east of St. Mary's School on landscape/environmental grounds. Amongst other things, the SHLAA produced by BaNES finds that development on the site would

11 May 2016 Page 938 of 956

have a moderate impact on landscape character, and the Parish Council assessed the site as being unsuitable for housing given its environmental sensitivity. BaNES had earlier proposed to designate this site as a Visually Important Green Space.

Land south of Loves Hill, Timsbury (identified as Tim 2 in the BaNES SHLAA) provides a suitable, available and achievable alternative site for housing provision in the village. Comparing the evidence, the BaNES SHLAA assesses this alternative site as having an impact on landscape character which overall would be low. The SHLAA exercise carried out by the Parish Council concluded that the Tim 2 site is a potential allocation for development subject to on- or off-site mitigation. The site south of Loves Hill has the further advantage of delivering housing on a greater but still modest scale, with a proportionate increase in the delivery of affordable homes in a District where affordable housing need is 'high'.

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?		
We wish to advise that at this stage we would like to participate at the oral stage of the Examination to enable us to explain to the Inspector the land south of Loves Hill site and its scheme and sustainability credentials in more detail.		
Respondent Number: 7140 Comment Number: 1		
Name: Marilyn Deacon Organisation:		
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 Consisten ☐ Not Effective ☐		
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR15		
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:		
Q4 Soundness Comment		
The allocation of this area of open countryside is totally not justified. This area gives open and clear views to the Cotswold area of outstanding natural beauty and local views, which is enhanced by a viewing lecturn and bench seating. The area of land has an access that is very dangerous and leads on to North road which has a high volume of traffic, more housing will increase the traffic on to this road. The residents of Timsbury have expressed their concerns for many years about the safety of this road, with increased traffic things can only get worse.		
Q5 Change Requested		
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?		

11 May 2016 Page 939 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Para 172

Respondent Number: 6511 Comment Number: 4 Name: Chris Head Organisation: 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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 172 The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment The introductory paragraphs to East and West Harptree 82 and 172 respectively contain different derivations for the name Harptree; 172 - It is believed that the origin of the name "Harptree" was derived from 'Herpetreu' that means 'the military road by the wood' from the old English 'herepoep' and 'treow'.
Q5 Change Requested Change both to; One suggested explanation for the name Harptree is from "hartreg", an Old English word for a grey hollow. Another from the Domesday Book is Harpetreu meaning 'The military road by the wood' from the Old English herepoep and treow. Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)?
Respondent Number: 7125 Comment Number: 1 Name: Organisation: Parsonage Farm Agent Name: James Stacey Agent Organisation: Tetlow King Planning 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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 5 Rural Areas , Para 172 The Site Reference (if applicable) is: SRA

11 May 2016 Page 940 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Q4 Soundness Comment

I represent the landowner of Parsonage Farm, West Harptree and write in reference to the Placemaking Plan Draft Plan consultation. Attached to this representation is a plan showing the extent of my client's land.

Background

In the November 2014 Placemaking Plan Options document, the development of part of my client's site (SR3) alongside the development of site SR4 was acknowledged as the Parish Council's preferred approach for future housing in West Harptree. However, the Options document stated no preferred option at that time. No representations were made by my client to the previous consultation (Options document) as he was not actively pursuing development at that time. As a local resident, it is my client's wish to see any development at the village brought forward in a sensitive, coherent manner, with respect for the natural limits of the area.

The Council will be aware that my client's site inclusion in the Placemaking Plan received a high degree of local support, as shown by representations to the Options consultation, including from West Harptree Parish Council. A proper collaborative approach to the Placemaking Plan should be taken to ensure that the views of local people on developments within their communities are properly

considered. The removal of my client's site SR3 as an option for future development on the basis of the grant of permission of site SR2 for 17 dwellings is unjustified as it fails to reflect the policy approach set out for RA1 villages. This was made clear in responses to the Options consultation and in the consideration of the planning application for SR2 in which West Harptree was confirmed as being an RA1 village.

I am instructed to make representations to the Placemaking Plan to have the highly sustainable and locally supported site reinstated as an entirely appropriate housing allocation. The Options document's proposal for around 10 dwellings is considered appropriate at SR3, given the site's location within the AONB and close to the village's Conservation Area. In addition to this, as shown on the enclosed plan, my client also owns further land which would be suitable for development, extending to the south of the development permitted at Leacroft House (SR2).

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF sets a strong emphasis on the delivery of sustainable development. Fundamental to the social role is "supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations" (paragraph 7).

Paragraph 14 states that, "at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.

The allocation of site SR3 would provide for sustainable development, as already highlighted in the Sustainability Appraisal analysis of the site. It would provide policy compliant levels of affordable housing and also enhance the economic vitality of the village whilst helping to ensure the Council are able to demonstrate that the housing numbers proposed in the Core Strategy are achievable. A suggested draft policy can be found at the end of this letter.

Local Policy Framework

Policy RA1 stipulates that at villages which are outside the Green Belt residential proposals will be supported provided that the proposal accords with other policies such as those on design; has a post office, community meeting place and convenience shop; and at least a daily bus service to main centres. West Harptree is outside the Green Belt, has a post office, church, convenience shop and

two public houses. This is confirmed on the West Harptree Parish Council website which states on the 'Welcome to West Harptree' page that "the village boasts a thriving shop, post office, doctor's surgery, dentist, beauty salon and two public houses". It also benefits from local bus services which connect it to main centres, including bus service 672 run by Bugler Coaches which runs a service to Bristol 3 times daily from Monday to Saturday.

Policy RA1 also states that "Residential development on sites outside the Green Belt adjoining the housing development boundary at these villages will be acceptable if identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan." The Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan has not yet reached 'draft' stage, and as such there are no current proposed allocations.

11 May 2016 Page 941 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

It is therefore considered that West Harptree is a village which meets the criteria of Policy RA1 and will need to provide for "around 50 dwellings" in accordance with Chapter 5b of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy, and as acknowledged in the Placemaking Plan Options and Draft consultation documents. This is in addition to small scale windfall sites (including in-fill development) within the housing development boundary.

The classification of West Harptree as an RA1 village was accepted in the consideration of the outline application for development of Leacroft House (site SR2, under application ref. 14/05899/OUT). The committee report to that application stated "West Harptree meets the criteria of Policy RA1 in the adopted B&NES Core Strategy." The policy statement that the village's location within the AONB "could inhibit opportunities for residential development" was given limited weight by the officer, who also acknowledged that the reference to 50 dwellings at West Harptree is not a cap on development. As with each of the potential allocation sites, my client's land is outside the housing development boundary, however the Options document and recent SA considered this a viable option for high quality development that will blend sensitively with the sensitive landscape and rural village character.

It is therefore considered that in addition to the proposed allocation of site SR2 which has been granted permission for up to 17 dwellings, my client's land should be prioritised as the most suitable site for an additional allocation in West Harptree. As previously indicated in the Options consultation document, and in the Sustainability Appraisal to the Draft Placemaking Plan this will ensure the Council is able to demonstrate that it is able to meet the housing numbers proposed in rural areas, and in a location adjacent to the existing housing development boundary as supported by previous comments to the Options Document; it is notable that no negative responses were lodged in response to the site's proposed allocation in that document.

Site Suitability

West Harptree is washed over by the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and as such site SR3 and the further land within my client's ownership falls within this designation. The site is bordered by residential development to the south and west with the eastern boundary delineated by the A368, and has footpath access to the centre of the village. Development of the site would therefore be a logical extension to the built up area of West Harptree and would create a well defined, formalised edge to the village and provide for a gateway on approach from the north east. This would complement the recently permitted scheme at site SR2, which forms a major part of the northern boundary of my client's land; the two sites together create a logical extension to the village development boundary.

Unlike sites SR1 and SR4 which extend more clearly into the open countryside, development of SR3 would not encroach beyond the clear visual boundary to the village into the rural surroundings. It is noted within the November 2015 Options paper that development of the site "could be acceptable" provided appropriate planting is included as part of any scheme to protect the wider countryside. My client's land would also have the benefit of enabling the provision of a reasonable number of dwellings, as required by Core Strategy policy RA1, and should be prioritised for allocation as this would reduce the need for piecemeal development around the village.

Annex C of the Bath and North East Somerset Council Placemaking Plan Sustainability Appraisal assesses four sites around West Harptree. Site SR3 is shown to be sustainable in an assessment against thirteen objectives, including access on foot to the centre of the village, to the bus stops serving the village and to a number of public rights of way; these benefits are not attributed to SR1 or SR2. Importantly, the development of the site is recognised as increasing the viability of the village shop (and other village businesses) and increasing opportunities for social interaction.

The note that my client's site is "unlikely to deliver any quantum of Affordable Housing compared to other sites in village" is unjustified; the Sustainability Appraisal should be based on very clear evidence which in this case is absent. My client would be willing to discuss the potential to include a mix of market and affordable housing in accordance with Policy CP9 which could help diversify the local housing mix and in particular enable local people wanting to stay in the village to buy or rent new homes.

We note that the SA does not provide any response against Objective 1 for both SR3 and SR4; we assume this is an error, as the commentary clearly indicates that both these sites have the same benefits as SR1 and SR2.

11 May 2016 Page 942 of 956

Q5 Change Requested

Recommended changes

In order to have a sound plan taking into account all reasonable alternatives it is formally requested that the plan is amended to allocate the land edged red on the attached plan. A suggested vision for the site is set out below:

- SR3 Parsonage Farm: Vision for the Site
- A development which complements the local area, blending well with recent neighbouring development and the conservation area setting. The site will provide market and affordable housing.

A policy for the development of my client's land as set out in the Options consultation document remains appropriate for inclusion within the final Placemaking Plan, as amended below. The proposed number of dwellings is indicative only, taking into account the number of homes previously set out for SR3 in the Options consultation document.

Emerging Policy Approach: SR3

Development and Design Principles

- 1. Around 25 dwellings
- 2. Have particular regard to site layout, building height, and soft landscaping, to respond positively to this sensitive location.
- 3. The site should be designed to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residential properties.
- 4. Ensure that undeveloped parts of the site are given suitable landscape treatment in order to achieve an appropriate relationship with development on site and the wider area.

The document should also clarify that West Harptree meets the criteria of an RA1 village; as this may leave a residual requirement for further allocations, the Council should reconsider its approach to SR1 and SR4, each of which also performed well against the Sustainability Appraisal.

Without allocation of my client's land (and potentially the other 'alternatives' SR1 and SR4), the village is placed at greater risk of speculative planning applications by developers less invested in West Harptree's future. As the village clearly meets the criteria of an RA1 settlement, the Council should act collaboratively with its stakeholders to allocate suitable sites now to ensure high quality development can take place close to the heart of the village.

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

11 May 2016 Page 943 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Policy SR2

Respondent Number: 7075 Comment Number: 1 Name: Austin Payne Organisation:
Agent Name: Chris Dadds Agent Organisation: Peter Brett Associate
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 5 Rural Areas , Policy SR2
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Policy SR2 is Sound but there are details of the Policy which should be amended, as per the attached letter (see below).
We represent the owners of land at Bristol Road, West Harptree. The land is included in the Draft Placemaking Plan (Pre-Submission version) as Policy SR2. However, for some reason it is referred to as Leafield rather than its proper name of Leacroft House. We, nor the owners of the land, have any idea where the name Leafield has come from and we suggest that, to avoid confusion, the name is corrected in the document.
We submitted an outline application (Ref 14/05899/OUT) for the land in question which was approved by the council on 3rd November 2015. This confirmed the principle of development of the land and this is reflected in the emerging policy.
The owners of the site confirm that the site is available for development and indeed the site is currently being marketed to developers in order that they bring forward development. Therefore the allocation of the land in the emerging plan is supported.
Q5 Change Requested
Development Requirements and Design Principles
Criteria 1 Housing numbers
Planning application 14/05899/OUT proposed a mix of new and redeveloped dwellings for the site such that a net

Planning application 14/05899/OUT proposed a mix of new and redeveloped dwellings for the site such that a net increase of 17 dwellings was proposed. The planning approval referred to this number. However, the site could, in principle, accommodate more than this number of dwellings and the efficient use of land might mean that the an alternative number of dwellings, higher or lower, might come forward.

Based on the scale of the allocated land and in the context of West Harptree meeting the adopted Core Strategy criteria of an RA1 village, the site might accommodate 30 – 40 dwellings. This would need to be subject of further technical work to confirm the impacts of this level of development on the site and its surroundings. However, it is clear that the site itself could accommodate this level of development within the context of the landscape and the "strong boundary hedgeline" referred to in para 182 of the draft plan.

Further detailed work will need to be undertaken to confirm the appropriate level of growth for the site. However, it is

11 Mav 2016 Page 944 of 956

clear that the restriction on the site of 17 dwellings set out in Policy SR2 is overly restrictive in the context of the village as an acknowledged sustainable location and the wider imperative to increase the housing land supply and use land effectively.

Criteria 8 Trees

The criteria suggests the retention of all trees along the western boundary, which we assume to be the boundary to Bristol Road. A tree survey undertaken in conjunction with application 14/05899/OUT categorised all trees on the site and many along this boundary we identified as Category C – the poorest level. These trees are Cypress and as part of the approved scheme these trees were agreed to be removed.

Within the site, those trees which are considered to be of real quality and worthy of retention have now been subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). It is surprising that the TPO is not referred to in the policy wording and it is recommended that these are included in the description of the site.

Criteria 8 should be amended to state:

Trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders within the site should be retained and protected.

Criteria 10 Dark Corridor

The bat survey carried out for the outline planning application identified a small number of bats utilising buildings on site. It was agreed as part of the approved application that the buildings be removed and therefore there will be no bat roosts within the site. There is a larger roost within the adjacent dwelling (Jarmadene) and this will be unaffected by the proposals. Those bats roosting in this building will still have a dark route to the open countryside to the south west of the site.

Given the nature of the site and surroundings it is considered unnecessary to require a dark corridor to be provided across the site.

We trust that the above comments are useful and we will be happy to provide further evidence/supporting material in regard of any/all of these points during the consideration of the emerging 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?

It is important for the delivery of the Council's Strategy that the role of RA1 villages such as West Harptree are debated and clarified.

11 May 2016 Page 945 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 5, Rural Areas Part: Infrastructure Rural Areas

Respondent Number: 6820 Comment Number: 5 Name: Clive Honeychurch Organisation:
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') $\ \Box$
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 5 Rural Areas , Infrastructure Rural Areas The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
In respect of Volume 5, proposals for Rural Areas, I see no provisions for the consideration of a rail station to the East of Saltford. It would greatly reduce traffic congestion on A4 through Saltford and on the Keynsham by pass, if commuters to Bath and Bristol could be persuaded to use a park and ride located here.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 946 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Plan Order Reference

Organisation: Bathford Parish Council

Volume: 6, Appendices Part: Annex 1 Map - Policy RA1 HDBs (Batheaston)

Comment Number:

Respondent Number:

Name:

990

Agent Name:	Agent Orga	nisation:		
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	•	(Tick if indicate	d 'yes') 🔲	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	?			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound	, is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared \(\square\) Not Justified \(\square\)	Not Co	onsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Annex 1 N	1ap - Policy RA1	HDBs (Batheaston)	
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Page 53 Please note that the Batheaston Housing Developarish of Bathford and is incorrect. It therefore needs aramended.				
Q5 Change Requested				
Change pages 53 and 85 as requested				
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked	if yes)? 🔽		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip				
I only wish to participate if the council does not confirm	to me that t	hey will make t	he requested changes.	
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number:	2			
Name:	Organisatio	n: Persimmon	Homes Severn Valley	
Agent Name:	Agent Orga			
Further Information available in the original comment	? No	Attachme	ents sent with the comment?	No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	compliant?	(Tick if indicate	d 'yes') 🔲	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	? No			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	n is unsound	, is it because it	is (ticked where indicated):	
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Co	onsisten 🗹	Not Effective 🔽	
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices	, Annex 1 N	1ap - Policy RA1	HDBs (Batheaston)	
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:				
Q4 Soundness Comment				
Boundary Changes are not Clear				

Appendix 6 contains a series of maps setting out changes to the housing development boundaries. However as presented these maps are unclear because they do not enable the specific changes to each boundary to be identified. The maps merely show the boundary as changed without indicating the previous boundary. It is therefore impossible to comment meaningfully on the change boundaries.

Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?

11 May 2016 Page 948 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 6, Appendices Part: Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR8 Revisions to allotments

Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 2 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices , Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR8 Revisions to allotments The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
This large allotment site should be protected under the local food growing para 460 of the draft place making plan, part 1 page 172. Unsound because it not 'postively prepared' location map and photos attached. Site: Park Road, Keysham.
Q5 Change Requested
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to participate at the Examination?
Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 3
Name: Helen Woodley Organisation:
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices , Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR8 Revisions to allotments The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
This small allotment site should be protected under the local food growing para 460 of the draft placemaking plan, pt 1, page 172. Unsound becasue not 'positvely prepared'! Location, map and photo attached. Site: Wickhouse Close,

11 May 2016 Page 949 of 956

saltford.	
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 Examinat	ion?

11 Mav 2016 Page 950 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 6, Appendices Part: Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (B&NES)

Respondent Number: 314 Comment Number: 10 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes
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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices , Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (B&NES) The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment These historic allotment sites should be protocted under para 460 of the draft placemaking plan pt 1, page 172, was local green spaces. Unsound because not positively prepared. Location map NW, SW, NE, SE and site survey: B- Hayden; D Old Mills Paulton active sites (NE map) 4,5,7,10,11 - historic sites NW map) 2. These potential new site could be protected as local green spaces: NE map) 26 NW map) 12, 18, 16, 21, 27, 28 SW map) 17, 18, 19, 20
Maps and site survey notes attached. Site survey 2004 carried out by BANES allotment asoccaition. Q5 Change Requested
See Q4. 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: 314 Comment Number: 11 Name: Helen Woodley Organisation: Agent Name: Agent Organisation: Further Information available in the original comment? No Attachments sent with the comment? Yes

11 May 2016 Page 951 of 956

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 Consisten □ Not Effective □
The representation relates to: Volume 6. Appendices. Appendices. Appendices. Appendices. Appendices.
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices , Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (B&NES)
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
The map is incomplete. Unsound because not positively prepared. I attach additional information for some of the
historic alloments sites that are still undeveloped marked on 2 maps. Request these to be added, other green spaces
too. 3 detailed outlines are included, please contact me if photos are required.
Q5 Change Requested
re the two city maps attached, historic allotments sites.
Map A - ref policy LCR6A local green spaces (Bath), the numbered ones are historic alloment sites details below.
I also started adding some of the other green spaces apprently missing from page 85 of the appendices document.
Map B 3 sites to north of the main map
1. Greenbank Gardens - also mentioned - SB18 (RUH) Active 2002
2. Baytree road - private site , active
3. Deadmill Lane - returning to use
4. Elmhurst Estate - was managed by parish council till 1974
5. Catherine Way council owned nut not curently in use
6. Minster way - allotments in use in recent times, good siter for warminster road site SB12
7. Rockcliffe Road needs access
8. Horseshoe Walk private mini allotment
9. Lyncombe Hill, council owned, was allotments now green sapce
10. Greenway Lane as for 9 11. Perrymead
12. King Georges Road, allotments till recently, developmetn refused
13. Lymore Avenue, House has extended a garden over what were active allotments until recently.
14. Claude Avenue, small businesses, part still undeveloped private plots.
15. rear of sladebrook ave.
16. behind jubilee pub, has long reverted to farmland but had been bath's oldest alloment sites.
17. Pustme field, horseradish evidence of old allotment / nursery, good potential site for foxhill SB11
Disease would be seen by added to LCDCA Man 2. Additionally, the court of the court
Please would these be added to LCR6A Map? Additionally, the map is very incomplete - please include all local green
spaces.
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examination (ticked if yes)? \Box

11 May 2016 Page 952 of 956

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

Deependent Number C12C Community	. r
Respondent Number: 6426 Comment Number	
Name:	Organisation: Persimmon Homes Severn Valley
Agent Name:	Agent Organisation:
Further Information available in the original commen	nt? No Attachments sent with the comment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	ly compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \square
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	d? No
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound, is it because it is (ticked where indicated):
Not Positively Prepared ✓ Not Justified ✓	Not Consisten ✓ Not Effective ✓
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (B&NES)
Q4 Soundness Comment	
designation. Therefore as new designations in this plan clear. The scale of the plan presented in Appendix 6 do provide the necessary clarity required. Larger scale plan clarity in these, particularly where small areas are iden	PF makes clear the LGS designation is akin to green belt in it is important that the landside designated is made absolutely bes not enable that to happen and as such the plan does not ins are included in the Area Documents, but there is also a lack of stified and because of the use of a green tone with no specific and it is not appropriate to have to rely on the web based policy
Q5 Change Requested	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examin	nation (ticked if yes)?

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

11 May 2016 Page 953 of 956

Plan Order Reference

Volume: 6, Appendices Part: Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (Bath)

Respondent Number: 990 Comment Number: 1
Name: Organisation: Bathford Parish Council
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 Consisten Not Effective
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices , Annex 1 Map - Policy LCR6A Local Green Spaces (Bath)
The Site Reference (if applicable) is:
Q4 Soundness Comment
Page 85 Please be aware that Bathford Parish Council have applied for the Withy Bed to be designated as a village green and this may happen before the publication of the plan. In which case, you might like to prepare a modified map in advance of the decision so that the new village green can be incorporated in the plan. Details are available from BANES officer Graeme Stark
Q5 Change Requested
Change pages 53 and 85 as 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?

I only wish to participate if the council does not confirm to me that they will make the requested changes.

11 May 2016 Page 954 of 956

Schedule of Duly Made comments received (in Plan Order)

Volume:

Plan Order Reference

Part: Annex 1 Map - Policy NE2A Landscapes and Settings of Settlements

6, Appendices

Respondent Number: 224 Comment Number	: 26			
Name: Caroline Kay	Organisatio	on: Bath Pres	ervation Trust	
Agent Name:				
Further Information available in the original comment	t? No	Attachr	nents sent with the com	ment? No
Does the respondent consider the document is legally	y compliant?	(Tick if indica	ted 'yes') 🔽	
Does the respondent consider the document is sound	l? No			
If the respondent considers the Draft Placemaking Pla	an is unsound	d, is it because	it is (ticked where indic	ated):
Not Positively Prepared ☐ Not Justified ✓	Not C	onsisten 🗌	Not Effective	
The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices The Site Reference (if applicable) is:	, Annex 1 N	Иар - Policy N	E2A Landscapes and Sett	tings of Settle
Q4 Soundness Comment				
The map NE2A in the Appendices does not match with tarea proposed for a park and ride facility (site B in the cathe landscape setting on the interactive map but exclud	consultation	- loosely Batha	-	
Q5 Change Requested				
Ensure that the Bathampton meadows area excluded in per the interactive Landscape setting layer in MyMaps. adjacent fields.	•		•	
Does the Respondent wish to participate at the Examina	ation (ticked	if yes)? ✓		
Why does the Respondent feel it is necessary to particip	pate at the E	xamination?		
The Bath Preservation Trust made several substantive s at the hearings for the Core Strategy. We continue to he			0	• •

placemaking plan

Respondent Number: 4767 Comment Numbe	per: 3				
Name: Mark Funnell Organisation: National Trust					
Agent Name: Agent Organisation:					
Further Information available in the original commen	ent? No Attachments sent with the comment? No				
Does the respondent consider the document is legally compliant? (Tick if indicated 'yes') \Box					
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 □				

11 May 2016 Page 955 of 956

The representation relates to: Volume 6 Appendices , Annex 1 Map - Policy NE2A Landscapes and Settings of Settle The Site Reference (if applicable) is:

Q4 Soundness Comment

The map related to policy NE2A does not match up with the 'Landscape Setting' layer on the 'MyMaps' interactive map. Specifically, the area proposed for a new park and ride facility (site B in the autumn 2015 consultation) is shown as part of the landscape setting in the interactive map, but for some reason excluded in the policy NE2A map in the Appendices. The land in question is as much part of the landscape setting of Bath as adjacent fields. No planning permission has been granted for PR development on the land – indeed, the Council is currently undertaking a review of sites and options.

Q5 Change Requested

Include the land in question within the orange shading in the 'Policy NE2A Landscapes and Settings of Settlements' map in the Appendices.

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 raise concerns about the mapping anomaly - unless it can be corrected or clarified to our satisfaction prior to the oral examination

11 May 2016 Page 956 of 956