

---

## Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: Local Plan 2020

Question: [16: Creating Sustainable Rural Villages and Settlements] Are ther...

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
A. Ashyon	Environmental and Sustainable transport has to be key to new developments. People will get out of cars if there is a viable and reliable alternative.	31 Jan 2021
Adam Gould	<p>New Issue – Illogical Settlement Boundaries restricting sustainable development and not enabling consistent decision making on planning permission.</p> <p>Point 1 - There is no held methodology in place for the established settlement boundary in Frampton Cotterell. “The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) restricts the circumstances under which settlement boundaries can be used, stating 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.” (rural housing – NPPG)</p> <p>I was informed by South Glos. Strategic Planning Policy &amp; Specialist Advice Team, when asking about the Frampton Cotterell settlement boundary “The majority of settlement boundaries (and linked to them Green Belt boundaries) in South Gloucestershire were set a long time ago, through historic Local Plan documents (which pre-date the existence of South Gloucestershire). For this reason, we are not able to advise what the methodology used during this stage was.” (email evidence available upon request)</p> <p>I note the Wiltshire Core strategy Inspector under similar historical ambiguity raised this as an issue which resulted in Wiltshire council undertaking a settlement boundary review. This approach and conclusion is in line with the view taken by other Inspectors in councils throughout the UK (as evidenced through a national review of local plans).</p> <p>It is not currently possible to challenge the application of the established settlement boundary within Frampton Cotterell as there is no methodology held for how it was applied. Ultimately, this lack of accountability has led to a number of sustainable developments being rejected. After 2 years of review, I can conclude this is the only forum within South Glos. Council to address this issue therefore it is vital it is actively considered.</p> <p>Point 2 - There is a requirement to review all settlement boundaries. The South Gloucestershire local plan supports the use of settlement boundaries as outlined in the Local Plan: Core Strategy adopted December 2013. In addition, the core strategy states ‘the defined settlement boundaries to villages will be reviewed through the Policies, Sites and Places DPD or a replacement Local Plan or in Neighborhood Plans’. The ‘Policies, Sites and Places’ 2017 document states ‘a review of settlement boundaries are to be progressed in a new Local Plan’. There are no caveats in this document and South Glos are unable (upon request) to demonstrate/evidence that the review has taken place.</p>	27 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Whilst I have been informed (but have not been provided with evidence) that new settlement boundaries have been reviewed in locations where the council has decided to put more houses, I have been unable to obtain evidence from South Glos council (despite my best efforts) showing established settlement boundaries have been reviewed. For the avoidance of doubt, when I refer to ‘established settlement boundaries’ I refer to settlement boundaries which were set a long time ago (as noted in point 1 by the South Glos. Strategic Planning Policy &amp; Specialist Advice Team - ‘before the existence of south gloustershire’)</p> <p>In order to comply with the local plan and the PSP 2017, this established settlement boundary should have been reviewed and south glos. should have been able to evidence this. As part of establishing the ‘new’ local plan it would be appropriate for south glos to fulfil its policy commitment.</p> <p>Point 3 – The current settlement Boundary does not A, divide between and area of built/urban development (the settlement) and non-urban or rural development. One of the key definitions for settlement boundaries adopted by multiple peers is that they should ‘divide between and area of built/urban development (the settlement) and non-urban or rural development’. The settlement boundary in frampton cotterell excluding harris barton clearly demonstrates that the best practice approach described has not been applied. B, Follow defined physical features As can be seen from current and historical review of the settlement boundary within Frampton Cotterell, ‘Defined physical features’ such as a road, new developments, established developments, garages, electrical lines, hedges, walling and water supply have been inappropriately excluded.</p> <p>Point 4 – Recent acknowledgment by a South Glos. planning officer that the role the settlement boundary is out of date prior to approving development outside it. The planning officer within P19/16172/O (a development outside the settlement boundary and in green belt) noted “Whilst the Council’s spatial strategy can be given full weight, it is acknowledged that the situation on the ground has evolved in some areas since settlement boundaries were defined.” This remark was made prior to approving this outline planning permission. This demonstrates acknowledgment that the settlement boundary is out of date and was subsequently not used (in this instance) as a barrier to stop development. Development of a suitable settlement boundary based on a methodology would enable Planning Officers to follow policy and not to pick and choose when to apply settlement boundaries as a reason to restrict development.</p> <p>Point 5 – Considerable development has taken place outside of the settlement boundary currently excluding Harris Barton In the street harris barton and neighbouring streets within Frampton cotterell (currently outside the settlement boundary) and since 1978 there have been 4 new dwellings (one with approved outline in recent months) and 17 extensions. Please see Table A. In particular, it should be noted (A, E, N) relate to new dwellings which have been constructed post the settlement boundary being established.</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Furthermore, application 'I' relates to a 2019 outline application for a new dwelling which has been approved by the planning officers.</p> <p>Since undertaking this analysis in mid 2019 an additional approval of an extension has been granted outside the settlement boundary. In addition to approving the extension outside the settlement boundary, planning officers have surprisingly gone further than the request for the extension and indicated that "Notwithstanding the design objections raised in this pre-app enquiry, it is suggested that a new residential unit on the site would be acceptable in greenbelt terms." Please see planning app P20/09669/F for further details.</p> <p>This further demonstrates the inadequate nature of the settlement boundary and the illogical nature of its establishment.</p> <p>Table Year Description Source</p> <p>A 1978 Alterations and extensions to outbuildings to form dwellinghouse. N4290</p> <p>B 1987 Erection of two storey rear extension P87/1602</p> <p>C 1986 Erection of two storey rear extension P86/1788</p> <p>D 2008 Erection of two storey rear extension PT08/2385/F</p> <p>E 1986 Erection of detached house and garage P86/2687</p> <p>F 1986 Erection of single and two storey rear extensions, and a pair of domestic garages P86/1450</p> <p>G 2019 Erection of a two storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation P19/3326/F</p> <p>H 1995 Erection of two storey rear extension P95/2028</p> <p>I 2019 Outline approval for erection of detached dwelling P19/16172/O</p> <p>J 1992 Erection of first floor extension P92/2519</p> <p>K 2002 Erection of single story extension PT02/1966/F</p> <p>L 2007 Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension PT07/0401/F</p> <p>M 2019 Erection of a single storey rear extension P19/2405/PNH</p> <p>N 1986 Erection of detached bungalow (constructed post 2000) P86/1930</p> <p>O 2018 Partial garage conversion to form additional living accommodation. PT18/3543/F</p> <p>P 1993 Erection of first floor side extension P93/1394</p> <p>Q 2003 Erection of two storey rear extension PT03/1322/F</p> <p>R 1989 Erection of single storey rear extension P89/1454</p> <p>S 2008 Erection of 2 storey side extension PT08/2658/F</p> <p>T 2014 Erection of first floor rear extension PT14/4806/F</p> <p>U 2001 Erection of a single storey rear extension. PT01/2071/F</p> <p>V 2019 Erection of two storey side extension P19/18420/F</p> <p>Point 6 – The original settlement boundary was inappropriately set as it cut the established built form in two.</p> <p>I note a number of councils when setting settlement boundaries have taken the view to establish the settlement boundary around the "built form". As can be seen in the 1930-55 ordinance survey map for Frampton cotterell (ST68SE - A, Surveyed / Revised: Pre-1930 to 1954, Published: 1955) when compared to the current established settlement boundary, the initial Harris Barton area was artificially cut in two by the established settlement boundary. This further demonstrate that even if a methodology was held for the original establishment of the settlement boundary it would appear to be illogical by today's standards and possibly by historical</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>standards (which as communicated by point 1 are not known).</p> <p>Point 7 - There is currently an even distribution of historic and new development on both sides of the settlement boundary (the element surrounding Harris Barton). The distribution and ratio of new build to old build is consistent both within the settlement boundary and the area I'm referring you to. The new builds mixed with old builds is similar to the nature of houses within the settlement boundary therefore there is no argument that could be applied to resist the suggested change of the settlement boundary which also would not apply to the whole of the hamlet once known as Harris Barton.</p> <p>Point 8 – The mixed look and styles of the current houses outside the settlement boundary Due to the recent developments and add-ons within Harris Barton there is limited uniformity of design. As can be seen from google maps street view, there is a mix of styles of construction and age of properties. Roofing includes red, brown and slate tiles. Walls of the houses include pennant stone, pennant stone (over breeze blocks), painted concrete, pebble dash, white stone brick work, mock chocolate box and exposed red builders bricks. Driveways include tarmac, brick and gravel. Garage doors range from brown wood to yellow metal. Windows are upvc, wood, French door with balcony (new extension), white, green and brown. I believe only one house has a dormer, most are two storey and a few are a mix of one/two storey.</p> <p>Conclusion All the points above demonstrate the current settlement boundary is illogical and inconsistently applied. If you were to apply any of the methodologies adopted by your peers or applied the methodology that was used for the rest of the village I believe you would end up with including harris barton and the associated streets within the settlement boundary.</p>	
Adam Mead	<p>A bit worried about the transport options for residents in Rural Villages and New settlements. There is likely to be little employment in these areas although a lot in the Bristol North fringe, well within commuting distance by vehicle although not by bicycle or foot. The strategy seems far too optimistic that there will be adequate public transport to these places. As many of the jobs in the North Fringe will be in engineering which is unsuitable for home working, these residents will use their cars as much as they do now, even if these cars will not be diesel or petrol powered. If these workers cannot commute by car, South Gloucestershire will be a less attractive place for these employers.</p>	23 Feb 2021
Alan Jones - Hanham & District Greenbelt Conservation Society	<p>Within 'New Locations for Large scale growth' the document refers to 'inspirational ideas for new settlements and/ or long-term landowner delivery models' However, no actual models have been cited as examples of these ideas within the consultation document - again, evidence is required - where located/ how developed/ how is 'inspirational' actually measured?</p>	26 Feb 2021
Alan Piper	<p>SGC's consultation document incorrectly states: "Wickwar and Yate have walking and cycling access to a range of services and facilities and, or public transport connections." Yate has, but Wickwar does not.</p>	20 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	Consideration needs to be given to how people can commute to their place of work in an environmentally friendly manner. People in Wickwar who work don't work in Wickwar. They commute by car as they have no practical alternative. Traffic volumes through the village is therefore a significant issue.	
Ali Adams - Siston Parish Council	Protecting common and the green belt surrounding it is of vital importance to Siston Parish Council. SPC believes it has many good employers, but fears that by prioritising brown land the price the land to increase, this is encouraging business to move to cheaper sites.	24 Feb 2021
Amy Gould	Unsubstantiated Settlement Boundaries restrict sustainable development on already developed land around villages. I have confirmed there is no methodology held for established settlement boundaries with a chap in the south glos planning team. Unfortunately, south glos failed to keep its previous promise to review all settlement boundaries from its previous local plan	28 Feb 2021
Andrew Humphrey	Road access, take over lane joining a38 couldnt take any more traffic.	31 Jan 2021
Andrew Shore	Comments as in box 15 above	01 Mar 2021
Angela Chapman	I'm very concerned about the proposal of building on green belt land. It was designated as such for a reason. To protect our wonderful countryside, species of all wildlife and their habitats and creates space between towns and villages to allow people to enjoy all those things on their doorstep. Destroying it will cause people to migrate to seek what they miss, thereby causing further emissions , adding to global warming. If ones local area is attractive, you're more likely to stay local . Flood plains are there for a reason, and where they e been built on have caused havoc with flooding. Anywhere with two to five mikes of a river should not be built on. The future of overbuilt land near to rivers will eventually create enormous bills to local authorities, insurance companies etc. Villages need to remain as villages, towns as towns and cities as cities designated as such with space in between. Too many of these have been joined together with villages disappearing along with all the wildlife. The education of our children who are the future of the uk, need to have the diversity of learning from their local environment. Please don't destroy it.	23 Feb 2021
Angela Crabtree	Please see the Trapp'd Response.  (Thornbury Residents Against Poorly Planned Development)  AGAINST ANY DEVELOPMENT IN THE HAMLET OF KINGTON	28 Feb 2021
Angie Carroll - Parish Council	Listen to villagers and Parish councils about the need or not for development and take an interest in infrastructure..	16 Feb 2021
Anne Thomson - Burbank Neighbourhood Watch	No	21 Jan 2021
Annette McLaren	No additional buildings in this area but conversion of Barns and storage areas acceptable	28 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
Ann Fray	New proposed developments seem to be going against your plan and priorities in Wickwar!	25 Feb 2021
Anthony Mcwhirter	Flooding, there is a lot of water underground in the area. If areas are developed then where does the surplus water go.	26 Feb 2021
Ashfield Land	Please see enclosed representations.  7.21 As set out we consider that a review of the Green Belt is required; this should consider land for urban extensions to Bristol including places such as Hanham which is a highly sustainable location for growth.	31 Mar 2021
ATA Estates (Longwell Green) LLP and Sovereign Housing Association	Page 63 of the Consultation Document confirms that the prospect of the District meeting its housing needs, including an expected 'overspill' from Bristol, within the existing urban area is low. Sustainable sites which are up to 200m from the edges of existing urban areas must therefore be considered for housing.  However, many of these sustainable sites on the edges of the existing urban areas, including our client's site at Longwell Green, fall within the Green Belt. In our opinion, the development of such sites is the most sustainable and logical approach for delivering housing within the District, therefore, it should be incumbent upon the Council to conduct a detailed review of the Green Belt.	06 Apr 2021
Barratt Homes (Bristol) Ltd	Please see enclosed submission.	14 Apr 2021
Barrie Hesketh	Ensure visual developments match the surroundings.	16 Feb 2021
BDW South West	BDW agree that sustainable travel for access to services and facilities should be a primary consideration when appraising rural villages and settlements for their capacity to accommodate growth and in this regard it is again highlighted to the benefits of pursuing a route of further urban expansions to build upon the wealth of facilities and infrastructure that is in place and is capable of accommodating growth.	19 Apr 2021
Bloor Homes	Green Belt:  5.6 In considering development within the rural communities, we strongly endorse Option 2 as the preferred approach. This is supported by the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal, which explicitly identifies Option 2 as performing better (paragraph 4.126). The NPPF sets out the relevant policy approach to considering development in the Green Belt (paragraph 137), and the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should form part of the Green Belt Review (Paragraph 138).	01 Apr 2021
Bloor Homes and Maximus Strategic Warmley Ltd	Please see enclosed submission.	29 Mar 2021
Bloor Homes South West Ltd - Land at	It is also relevant to consider the various evidence base documents which supported the now withdrawn West of England Joint Spatial Plan (the JSP), and the Plan submitted for Examination by the relevant Authorities (including South	20 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Wotton Road	<p>Gloucestershire), which identified Charfield as a key location to accommodate significant growth in the region. The submitted JSP identified that around 1,200 new homes and approximately 5 hectares of new employment land should be planned for at Charfield, as one of a number of key new Strategic Development Locations (SDL).</p> <p>The inclusion of Charfield as an SDL was underpinned by an extensive evidence base that included recognition that growth at the settlement would be a catalyst for improved Public Transport infrastructure, this includes the potential reopening of the Charfield railway station which would provide direct connections to Bristol and Cheltenham. There is already land reserved to enable to re-opening of the railway station, new development at the settlement will assist by contributing towards wider strategic transport objectives such as this which is a key local objective. A business case already exists to re-open a railway station at Charfield, and the proposed development will bolster this further.</p> <p>In addition it was recognised that new homes at Charfield would provide the critical mass necessary to support additional bus services at the settlement to the benefit of the overall sustainability of Charfield as a place. Details of how additional bus service provision can be realised are included as part of the technical transportation information provided as part of the Planning Application pending determination on the site.</p> <p>Bloor Homes are collaboratively working with CEG who also have an Application pending determination at Charfield (ref. P19/2452/O) to bring forward community facilities and other associated improvements such as traffic calming measures and the provision of Public Transport solutions.</p> <p>Overall it is important that the potential at Charfield (as evidenced via the previous JSP process) is not overlooked in preparing the Council's new Plan, including the fact that Charfield is capable of accommodating a level of growth that is higher than many other villages also to be considered within any "rural locations" component of the new Local Plan in South Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Some level of discussion has already been presented in the consultation report that suggests small and medium scale growth is appropriate at rural settlements. It is too soon to decide what level of growth should be accommodated, it may be appropriate that large scale development at settlements such as Charfield may be the most appropriate way of accommodating the requisite growth. At this stage in the Plan, all settlements should be 'on the table' to be considered for growth, both inside and outside of the Green Belt.</p>	
Brian Hackland	See 15 above.	26 Feb 2021
Bristol and England Properties (BEP)	<p>5.12 We support the principle of seeking to ensure that development at the rural villages is Plan-led in light of the level of speculative development that has come forward at them in recent years.</p> <p>5.13 Whilst strategic levels of development will be required to sustainably meet the</p>	17 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>bulk of the Council's housing requirement, development at villages where large-scale development is not possible will still be required to support the vitality and viability of those settlements and address affordability issues.</p> <p>5.14 In terms of the approach to investigating the appropriate levels of growth that should come forward at the rural villages, the two options are appropriate starting points and will need to be subject to an appropriate Sustainability Appraisal to establish which should ultimately be pursued. The approach may then need to be refined in terms of identifying which rural settlements in the Green Belt should be prioritised based on the application of the guiding principles outlined within the consultation document.</p> <p>5.15 Indeed, we would note that the Phase 1 document is already suggesting that non-strategic growth at Green Belt settlements would have sustainability benefits over purely pursuing growth at non-Green Belt locations. This, coupled with the overall housing requirement will likely constitute the exceptional circumstances required to justify the release of Green Belt land for development. As such, we consider that Option 2 will need to be pursued and is supported on this basis.</p> <p>5.16 We also note that part of Frampton Cotterell is already outside of the Green Belt.</p>	
Bristol Zoological Society	Please see enclosed submission.	25 Mar 2021
Camilla Allen	<p>For the Kington Development you need to consider:</p> <p>Roads - lane that ware already narrow, bendy and have seen increased traffic over the years. It could not take more traffic from a large housing estate and would increase the danger to all the walkers/cyclists and horse riders that use our lanes.</p> <p>Flooding - flooding has increased despite council repairs in Kington Lane and Kington Road and developing all the green land around Kington would make it worse. Kington is on the edge of a flood plain with Park Farm on it.</p> <p>Green spaces/wildlife habitats - by developing in this area we would lose a substantial amount of flora, insects and animals. During the pandemic we have seen a massive increase in visitors to the area walking from Thornbury through to Oldbury-on-Severn. They relish being able to get into open green spaces, discover the streams, woodland, public footpaths and nature.</p> <p>Historic site - cannot believe they are contemplating building up around Thornbury Castle as this is a major historic building.</p>	23 Feb 2021
Caroline Phillips	<p>In some localities where hamlets/villages exist, the Green Belt has protected them from urban sprawl (Lyde Green development)</p> <p>Green Belt loss with expanding rural villages and settlements will only serve to be infill. More focus on keeping these areas. Wider context that many large developments on the doorstep of rural communities has not enriched the area and</p>	12 Mar 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	have only served to create a locality where people are living on top of one another and breeds resentment.	
Cate Davidson - Sodbury Town Council	<p>The table of page 124 should be revisited. I would expect the appropriate distance to a convenience store to be less than that to a supermarket, to which most people will drive anyway.</p> <p>The term ‘convenience store’ needs to be defined. Does a shop that is attached to a garage that sells milk but not bread classify as a convenience store?</p> <p>Why is it appropriate to be closer to a post office than a convenience store?</p> <p>Why is 2 miles an appropriate walking or cycling distance to a primary school? Not many, if any, primary school age children would walk or cycle this distance.</p> <p>Apart from the last item, why are walking a cycling distances the same?</p>	03 Mar 2021
Catherine Bird	<p>Instead of building MORE housing - look at ways to reduce the housing foot print</p> <p>Building flats more central to bristols city centre</p>	28 Feb 2021
Catherine Graham	Preservation of the Cotswold AONB landscape and heritage. Views and the aspect of ancient settlements in their surroundings appear not to have been considered to great detriment in the past. Once something has been built, both the landscape it is built in and any views from the surrounding area are lost forever. The conservation officers and biodiversity/ecology officers need to be consulted at an early stage.	08 Feb 2021
CEG and the Charfield Landowners Consortium (CEGCLC)	Please see accompanying covering letter.	23 Apr 2021
Charlcombe Estates	<p>Yes, land to the South of Tanhouse Lane, Engine Common should be allocated for residential development (see Plan).</p> <p>Principle of Development:</p> <p>As stated above, the intention is to provide a development of up to 8 residential properties, comprising a range and size of properties. The type of housing, which importantly meets an acknowledged and identified need, will add to the mix and tenure of dwelling in the locality.</p> <p>Heritage Issues:</p> <p>The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no statutorily Listed Buildings on the site.</p> <p>Highways:</p> <p>Charlcombe Estates have appointed transport consultants to advise on the transportation issues. A Transport Statement has been submitted with the</p>	04 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Application for the site.</p> <p>Vehicular access would be taken from Tanhouse Lane via a new access to the Highway Authority's standards.</p> <p>Trees:</p> <p>There are no trees within the site and the only trees relate to various hedge trees which can be retained. The development would be able to provide significant additional trees as part of the development.</p> <p>Flood Risk and Drainage:</p> <p>The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore, it can be noted that the proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere through the loss of flood plain storage.</p> <p>Ecology:</p> <p>A full range of ecological surveys have been undertaken. There are no protected species identified within the site. A net-gain in ecology can be provided as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>Landscape:</p> <p>The Applicants have undertaken a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the site by experienced landscape consultants. The site is not situated within any statutory or valued landscape designation either nationally or locally.</p> <p>Utilities:</p> <p>All of the utilities e.g. gas, electricity, water etc are within close proximity of the site and can be brought to the site without any particular issues.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The site is available with a willing landowner and experienced developer. It is suitable for residential development and can provide a range and mix of dwellings. Finally, there are no constraints which would prohibit its development and thus it is achievable.</p>	
Chris Rich - Mizmo Communications Ltd	No comment.	11 Mar 2021
Chris Stow	As I have mentioned earlier in my response I believe there should be an infill policy in villages, settlements or recognised groups of houses whether there is a settlement boundary or not and I have always found it odd that South Gloucestershire has an infill policy within the green belt but not in other areas.	08 Jan 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>I know that many other local authorities have infill policies in rural areas and as long as certain criteria are met such as it has to be an obvious gap in an existing line of houses or group of dwellings with a limit of one or two houses with gardens to match the existing dwellings then permission can be granted. You would not be allowed to build on the end of a row, for example, or squeeze in more housing in a gap which then undermines the existing build types.</p> <p>I have also mentioned that it should be possible to allow elderly people to be able to build a retirement dwelling, within their existing cartilage, in rural settlements in order to be able to remain in their community during their later years. Such a policy would also free up their existing property for a younger family and help sustain existing services and facilitate.</p> <p>I am sure that an infill policy as outlined above would go a long way towards South Gloucestershire meeting its housing needs going forward and as long as the houses, so built, reflected the vernacular of the existing stock they would enhance our rural communities and not occupy open, greenfield sites.</p>	
Christina Biggs - Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways	We recommend that you contact Brian Love at ConnectedCities who can explain their approach of siting all development near rail stations and embedding a car-free community from the start.	27 Feb 2021
Claire Normoyle	See our response concerning 'building block 4' in question 7	19 Feb 2021
Claire Young	<p>It is vital that local communities are engaged in any proposals that come forward and are listened to, which people in Coalpit Heath, Engine Common and Nibley did not feel happened during the development of the now abandoned Joint Spatial Plan.</p> <p>Action groups, such as VALID, and Parish Councils including Rangeworthy and Iron Acton, have raised concerns about inaccuracies in the DAPs. While thanking officers for addressing some of the points raised while the consultation was live, others still remain to be addressed. I trust that all the points I have previously raised on DAPs during this consultation will be considered as part of the consultation response.</p> <p>Some residents perceive that the sustainability of some communities is being downplayed relative to others through an inconsistent approach to assessment. One example is classifying the Sainsbury's Local on Badminton Road, Coalpit Heath as a supermarket, but not the Tesco Express on High Street, Winterbourne. It is important that there is consistency based on the function provided by each outlet rather than the form it takes.</p> <p>Shops and other businesses have suffered greatly during the pandemic, with many closing, and therefore the DAPs will be fluid entities that constantly need updating.</p> <p>When assessing what is within a reasonable cycling or walking distance, the safety of the route needs to be taken into account. For example, there is no continuous safe walking route to Rangeworthy Primary School from Iron Acton or Engine Common.</p>	12 Mar 2021
Clara Goss -	The South Gloucestershire Local Plan 2018 - 36 (Feb 2018) consultation previously	26 Apr

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
Redrow Homes Ltd	<p>identified Hambrook at Appendix 1 as a location suitable for further investigation to receive non-strategic growth. Hambrook was considered to be a sustainable location in terms of growth/transport infrastructure and considered by the JSP evidence:-Green Belt Assessment Stage 2, to have only limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The flood risk assessment was also positive.</p> <p>The Sustainable Access Profile prepared to support the previous consultation identified Hambrook as having access to a wide range of services and facilities within walking and cycling catchment areas, including number of employers (12 major employers and 3 safeguarded employment areas are within 2,000m walk or cycle, Stoke Gifford district centre and the Abbey Wood Retail Park are also within the 2,000m walk or cycling catchment).</p> <p>Pegasus promoted land at Bristol Road, Hambrook to the consultation on behalf of our client and included a Sustainability Appraisal as part of that submission which included the following reports;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Assessment;</li> <li>• Preliminary Ecology Appraisal;</li> <li>• Transport Sustainability Appraisal;</li> <li>• Heritage - Archaeological desk-based assessment and Setting Assessment;</li> <li>• Agricultural land Classification survey;</li> <li>• Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Sustainability Appraisal.</li> </ul> <p>An opportunities and constraints plan is attached at Appendix 2 which demonstrates how the site could come forward in response to its setting. A Concept Plan was also prepared.</p> <p>The majority of the site area is in Flood Zone 1, indicating a low level of risk from fluvial or tidal flood sources. A small portion of the site area is located in Flood Zone 2 and 3, adjacent to the watercourses. These areas could be utilised for less vulnerable uses, such as Public Open Space or water compatible development such as sports fields or areas for nature conservation. Residential development would be steered out of these areas.</p> <p>The majority of the site is shown to be unaffected by surface water flooding. There are some parts of the site area that are at risk from surface water flooding, although these are generally adjacent to the watercourses in areas also affected by fluvial flooding.</p> <p>The site is within the Hambrook Conservation Area and comprises the Eastern part of the Conservation Area. There is a Grade 2 Listed Building, Hambrook Grove and a Locally Listed park. A heritage led design response will ensure that any development that comes forward at the site results in less than substantial harm to</p>	2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>the aforementioned heritage assets.</p> <p>There are no SSSI.</p> <p>The land off Bristol Road, Hambrook is an exceptionally sustainable location in Bristol's urban fringe and well aligned with existing infrastructure with regards to walking, cycling and Public Transport the MetroBus route M3 (Bristol City Centre to Emersons Green) runs adjacent to the site frontage. The combination of the excellent sustainable travel opportunities within the surrounding area provides a significant opportunity for future residents to travel sustainably, as opposed to the private car.</p> <p>There are a wide range of exceptional facilities, amenities, and employment within easy walking and cycling distance of the development. The routes to these facilities are in good condition, with a number of Sustrans routes within close proximity; notably Sustrans Regional Route 16 passing adjacent to the site along the A4174.</p> <p>The MetroBus route M3 operates adjacent to the site along the A4174, providing fast, frequent and reliable Public Transport to a number of key destinations, such as Bristol City Centre, Aztec West, and South Bristol. The development is located in the perfect location for trips to be made by MetroBus as opposed to the private car.</p> <p>In summary, the site is located within a parcel of the Green Belt which is well defined and enclosed by several significant physical barriers which detaches it from the wider countryside. Former evidence, prepared to support the JSP, stated that the site does not form a significant part of the Green Belt compared to other parcels in the wider Green Belt.</p>	
Clifton Homes (SW) Ltd	<p>Please see accompanying representations referenced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 482 A3 CC 250221 FINAL Local Plan Reps – Land North of Haw Lane, Olveston.</li> </ul>	24 Mar 2021
Colin Gardner - TRAPP'D	<p>See our response concerning 'building block 4' in question 7.</p>	15 Mar 2021
Crest Nicholson South West Ltd	<p>It is difficult to comment fully when the Plan is in its early stages and there are not a precise number of homes, or amount of employment land, in mind for any individual village or settlement.</p> <p>CNSW don't agree that initially, sustainable travel for access to services and facilities should be a primary consideration in the location of development for the reasons already set out in this response as by their very nature, rural locations are often not located next to a plethora of services.</p> <p>More emphasis needs to be placed on how new, or enhanced services and facilities, or new transport infrastructure, may come forward, through the Local Plan or other Plans/strategies, that could improve access to sustainable travel in rural communities.</p> <p>CNSW do strongly agree however with the supporting text that states "When</p>	15 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>considering and investigating the level of growth that might be appropriate in individual villages and settlements, it is important to understand how any growth might support existing services and facilities, or provide new services and facilities, and in doing so help to create more sustainable communities. It is also important to understand and recognise that new transport infrastructure or development may also lead to an enhancement of the level of sustainable access to key services and facilities in specific villages and settlements” and would like to see this developed as the Local Plan progresses.</p>	
D. Hemmings	See attached representations.	23 Apr 2021
Dan Erben - Thornbury Market Garden	<p>An emphasis and much increased support for small and sustainable development and change of use, especially by actively supporting any such proposals, lowering administrative barriers, and supporting and rolling out initiatives along the lines of 'Right to Build' or the 'One Planet Development' policy successfully adopted in Wales.</p> <p>There is an interest in the community and you would gain much credit and have many local allies and supporters, e.g. Sustainable Thornbury, CATS, Ramblers, Filnore Woods Community Woodland, local naturalist groups, Morton Bridge Wildflower Meadow and Thornbury Community Orchard groups and also broader regional and national groups and organisations.</p>	23 Feb 2021
Daphne Dunning - Cromhall Parish Council	<p>These are stated in previous answers, but it is beyond even the most optimistic eyes to view building effects to Yate, Thornbury and Charfield as having a positive effect on the lives of the villagers in the northern quadrant of the county. Add in the undetermined small build sites to be slotted into the villages themselves and you have an irretrievable situation where wildly increased traffic, risk to health and safety, pollution, lack of access to jobs, penalty for necessary car use are all visited upon the area already lacking in resources or the financial will of big business and Government to do any more than carry out a 'dump and run' exercise on housing.</p>	03 Mar 2021
Daphne Dunning - Pucklechurch Parish Council	<p>Yes – the provision of adequate protections for the retention of designated commercial premises and other services provided within rural settlements beyond areas that are designated as protected areas of employment and similarly the preservation of assets of community value that provide social focal points – too many of these are subject to change of use to the detriment of community identity, the environment, local employment etc.</p> <p>In some localities where hamlets/villages exist, the greenbelt has protected them from urban sprawl (Lyde Green development)</p> <p>Green Belt loss with expanding rural villages and settlements will only serve to be infill. More focus on keeping these areas. Context that many large developments on the doorstep of rural communities has not enriched the area, only served to create a locality where people are living on top of one another.</p>	08 Apr 2021
David George	Community energy schemes	15 Feb 2021
David Grover	Mental health impact on residents in villages where new developments are planned	25 Feb

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>needs to be considered. Most people who live in smaller villages choose to live there because of location and low population ( the core reason why they are titled villages). Many residents choose to live in these low population density areas for specific reasons. If new developments are created, they change population density, green space declines and pollution levels rise significantly (noise, emissions etc.). If a small village has no amenities, increasing population increases the need to travel to areas where these amenities can be found. This adversely affects original residents mental health.</p>	2021
David Hathaway	<p>Affordable housing should be maximised in areas of good transport links and minimised in isolated rural areas with poor transport links. It is self-defeating to offer cheap housing in isolated rural villages as those people on lower incomes will then need to spend a substantial proportion of their income on commuting by private car.</p>	27 Feb 2021
David Heape	<p>In some localities where hamlets/villages exist, the Green Belt has protected them from urban sprawl (Lyde Green development)</p> <p>Green Belt loss with expanding rural villages and settlements will only serve to be infill. More focus on keeping these areas. Wider context that many large developments on the doorstep of rural communities has not enriched the area and have only served to create a locality where people are living on top of one another and breeds resentment.</p>	12 Mar 2021
David Redgewell - South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside	<p>The plan clear definition of Key village for serv centres.</p> <p>What are the service village that South Gloucestershire wishes to grow in Rural communities.</p> <p>In the historic County of Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Centres such as Charfield, Wickwar, Marshfield, Bitton, Alveston. Failfeld.</p> <p>Which key service centres will that Growth in rural affordability housing for key workers.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a policy on investment in Farming.</p> <p>When a Planning Application came in for a grain mill farmer were told to go to Avonmouth in Bristol.</p> <p>South Gloucestershire village are being turned into commuter villages for Bristol, Bath Spa. Gloucester, Stroud and Cheltenham Spa.</p> <p>I am still which villages are being allowed to Grow to support the rural economy.</p> <p>Tytherington has take some housing.</p> <p>Alveston has housing but with no affordability housing for rural employment needs.</p>	28 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	<p>Charfield is taking rural growth with a new station on the Metro West railway service from Bristol Temple Meads to Gloucester and Cheltenham Spa.</p> <p>Public bus service to Thornbury and to Wotton Under Edge Cam and Dursley and Gloucester. And bus service to Chipping Sodbury and Yate bus station.</p> <p>What is make up of a rural service centre in the plan a key village?</p> <p>BANES has key rural centre like Chew Magna, Chew Stoke, Pensford, Clutton.</p> <p>There is a list of villages but now indications of Growth.</p> <p>Charfield and Wickwar of course use Wotton Under Edge as the Town centre. And market towns of Chipping Sodbury, Thornbury. We not sure Yate is a market Town. It was a new town developed in the Bristol area by the then Gloucestershire County Council.</p> <p>The plan lacks a rural Tourism policy for camping sites, B and B and hotels .I am not sure what status in the Plan for allowing Growth in the village of Badminton.</p> <p>Additional Comments sent to us by email, on Monday 1st March 2021, as per the below:</p> <p>On rural communities we need to more social and affordable housing in our rural communities with good Public Transport links with villages service i.e. Public House, Church, village hall, Schools? shops, Garage rural employment in farming and other rural jobs including employment in Tourism camp site Bed and breakfast and hotels.</p> <p>We need key workers housing.</p>	
David Reynolds	The opinions of the local communities that are affected by these developments should be given priority.	28 Feb 2021
Debbie Johnson	Stop building on flood plans and wet areas.	26 Feb 2021
Diane Connors	Lack of transport links. Employment mainly outside the area meaning more car journeys needed. Lack of facilities meaning more car travel	28 Feb 2021
Diverse Partnerships (In Collaboration With Edward Ware Homes)	Please see submitted Local Plan 2020 Phase 1 Issues and Approaches Consultation Response Document.	05 May 2021
Donna Simmons - Emersons Green Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be no overdevelopment or change of character to local communities.</li> <li>• Procedures should be in place to ensure that new or improved existing infrastructure is in place before new developments are built.</li> </ul>	01 Mar 2021
Edward Ware	5.1 The approach to areas of flood risk is considered appropriate. We have	05 May

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Homes	<p>discussed this in more detail above, however, our position is that development in areas of higher flood risk is inherently less sustainable than development in areas of lower flood risk. The former should, therefore, be avoided where appropriate alternatives are available as per the guidance in the NPPF and PPG.</p> <p>5.2 With regard to AONBs, we support the exploration of a strategy to support growth in rural areas in the interests of maintaining the vitality and viability of these communities and combating affordability issues. However, we note that the need to protect valued landscapes means that development in these locations will need to be relatively small scale.</p> <p>5.3 With regard to rural communities in the Green Belt, we agree that the first stage is to establish whether the District's development needs can be met without impinging upon the Green Belt, or if there are exceptional circumstances that would justify its release.</p> <p>5.4 The guiding principles for identifying potential growth locations strongly indicates that land around the Bristol urban fringe, Yate and key transit routes (e.g. Coalpit Heath and Frampton Cotterell) have clear sustainability benefits over development in non-Green Belt locations that would justify their release.</p> <p>5.5 With regard to smaller settlements, the question is whether their development needs/requirements can be met through the exceptions set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF (limited infilling, redevelopment of Brownfield sites, rural exception sites for affordable housing etc) or if this would dictate a more direct approach (e.g. formal allocations).</p> <p>5.6 The Phase 1 document suggests that the housing requirement, coupled with constraints at villages beyond the Green Belt, will likely mean a proportion of growth needs to be directed to settlements within the Green Belt as well. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal which has indicated clear sustainability benefits associated with directing growth toward villages within the Green Belt (table 4.7 of the SA). This is a welcome start; however, we note that a flaw of the JSP and a common pitfall of other Local Plans is the failure to provide a robust assessment in support of the exceptional circumstances being demonstrated (e.g. Ashfield District Council and Amber Valley Borough Council fell at the Examination in public stage due to the poor quality of the evidence in respect of Green Belt release). We would suggest a dedicated topic paper be prepared in support of the Plan if, as we expect, Green Belt releases be required to support the development needs of the District.</p> <p>5.7 We agree that the new Local Plan will need to explore the possibility of growth at rural settlements in the Green Belt for a range of development scales to underpin housing delivery from the larger strategic sites that will also be necessary to meet the overall housing requirements.</p> <p>5.8 This will, ultimately, be dictated in part by the scale of the housing requirement and reliance that will be placed on strategic sites. A significant advantage of a dispersed approach to housing distribution is that delivery is likely to be less of an</p>	2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	<p>issue. However, we acknowledge that there are trade-offs with achieving wider sustainability objectives and so an appropriate balance will need to be struck.</p> <p>5.9 The obvious advantage for settlements in the Green Belt is that they tend to be better related to the Bristol Urban Fringe and market towns of Yate, Thornbury and Chipping Sodbury where services, facilities and employment opportunities are more readily accessible. There is, therefore, greater potential for development to achieve the sustainability objectives set out in the Phase 1 document.</p> <p>5.10 There are a handful of ways in which the Council could manage development at the rural villages; however, we would support the identification of allocations at settlements, either through this Plan or a subsequent site allocations plan. This is more important for the Green Belt villages given that boundaries can only be altered by Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans where exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated by the former.</p> <p>5.11 The process of identifying site allocations could be deferred to the Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) process, at least for certain Parishes where these are being progressed. However, it will be important for the Local Plan to establish what the requirement for these areas would be and establish the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify development within the Green Belt Parishes. A view can be taken at a later date as to whether a Site Allocations Plan would need to be progressed if insufficient progress has been made on any emerging NHPs.</p>	
Ellandi LLP On Behalf of Crestbridge Corporate Trustees Ltd and Crestbridge T...	No comments.	05 May 2021
Emma Jarvis	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Existing green Infrastructure zones and areas of visual importance in the landscape should be protected from large scale development.</p> <p>Good agricultural land in the county needs to be protected so that the region and the country can provide and protect its own food supply now and for future generations. The good agricultural land is the most efficient and productive at doing this per square metre, it cannot be replaced.</p>	28 Feb 2021
F. Francis	See attached representations.	26 Apr 2021
Gareth Fielding	Keep villages as villages	28 Feb 2021
Gareth Jackson - Alder King	It is difficult to comment fully when the Plan is in its early stages and there are not a precise number of homes, or amount of employment land, in mind for any individual village or settlement.	19 Mar 2021
Hannick Homes	Yes land at Windmill Farm, Sodbury Road, Wickwar should be allocated for	25 Mar

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>residential development.</p> <p>Paragraph 67 of the NPPF deals with site identification and states: -</p> <p>“Strategic policy-making Authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of:</p> <p>a) specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the Plan period;</p> <p>and</p> <p>b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6 - 10 and, where possible, for years 11 - 15 of the Plan.”</p> <p>Availability:</p> <p>The site is available and deliverable now. There is a willing landowner and an experienced developer.</p> <p>Principle of Development:</p> <p>As stated above, the intention is to provide a development of approximately 45 residential properties, comprising a range and size of properties including a policy compliant level of affordable housing. The type of housing, which importantly meets an acknowledged and identified need, will add to the mix and tenure of dwelling in the locality.</p> <p>Heritage Issues:</p> <p>The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no statutorily Listed Buildings on the site.</p> <p>Highways:</p> <p>Hannick Homes have appointed transport consultants to advise on the transportation issues. At present no discussions have taken place with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Vehicular access would be taken from Sodbury Road via a new access to the Highway Authority’s standards.</p> <p>The internal layout will be designed to reflect a 20-mph speed limit and the development. The site is within walking distance of the local Primary School and other services and facilities in Wickwar, and is also served by a local bus route (No. 84).</p>	2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>The car parking levels are anticipated to reflect local policy guidelines and will be provided in garages or on driveways. Some visitor parking will also be accommodated within the scheme.</p> <p>Wickwar provides a variety of local facilities and services required on a daily basis, including shops, Pubs and Church. The availability of these facilities will encourage non-car travel from the site.</p> <p>Flood Risk and Drainage:</p> <p>The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore, it can be noted that the proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere through the loss of floodplain storage.</p> <p>Ecology:</p> <p>A full range of ecological surveys have been undertaken. There are no protected species identified within the site. A net-gain in ecology can be provided as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>Landscape:</p> <p>The site is not situated within any statutory or valued landscape designation either nationally or locally. The site is set within well defined landscape boundaries containing mature trees and hedges. The site is also well related to the existing settlement. There are some derelict agricultural buildings on the site which would be demolished as part of the proposals thus leading to an improvement on the visual appearance of the site. Accordingly, it is believed that the site has good landscape credentials to accommodate residential development of up to 45 dwellings without creating any significant harm.</p> <p>Utilities:</p> <p>All of the utilities e.g. gas, electricity, water etc are within close proximity of the site and can be brought to the site without any particular issues.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The site is available with a willing landowner and experienced developer. Hannick Homes have held discussions with the Parish Council regarding the development of the site. It is suitable for residential development and can provide a range and mix of dwellings including affordable to meet local needs. Finally, there are no constraints which would prohibit its development and thus it is achievable.</p>	
Hazel Jones - Hawkesbury Parish Council	Hawkesbury Parish Council do not want to see further development within our parish - an approved development of 21 homes has not yet commenced.	01 Mar 2021
Helen Johnstone - Stroud District	Investigation of the appropriate level of growth for rural villages and settlements should also have regard to the wider functional relationship with adjoining Local	26 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
Council	<p>Authority settlements.</p> <p>Stroud District has a number of market towns that act to serve wider rural hinterlands. For example Wotton-under-Edge serves parts of South Gloucestershire in terms of education, health, employment and retail. Development at Charfield may impact this town as well as villages lower down the SDC settlement hierarchy such as Kingswood. In addition, the Cotswolds AONB covers much of this rural area. Wotton-under-Edge is acknowledged as the largest (2nd-tier) settlement in this cluster, with an important employment, retail and community role as the main Local Service Centre. The full implications of development along the northern boundaries of the plan area need to be assessed in the context of sustaining the role of existing settlements and should take account of their position in the settlement hierarchy. The identification of particular settlements within each level of the hierarchy is a matter of judgement, but SDC has adopted a consistent and logical approach, which is justified with up-to-date evidence based on the existing role of the settlements, the level of strategic and other services and facilities, accessibility and overall sustainability.</p> <p>Stroud District Council would welcome the opportunity to work with South Gloucestershire Council to explore these opportunities and challenges as the Plan is developed.</p>	
Housley	<p>The impact of unplanned/speculative development - approved and in the course of construction - which has taken place in more rural areas (such as Wickwar) is taken into account when appropriate levels of future development</p> <p>Ensure that sustainable access to employment as well as facilities and services should be used to determine where new houses are built</p> <p>That information collated by South Gloucestershire Council about access to services and public transport in the Data and Access Profiles for each settlement, and how that data is interpreted, must be accurate and consistently applied within the criteria stated.</p>	19 Feb 2021
Ian Leslie	<p>Consider the noise and pollution levels. Noise pollution is detrimental to health. Easter Compton and Pilning are surrounded on three sides of the triangle by motorways producing excessive noise on rough road surfaces and polluting the air we breathe. Putting more industry and houses along the B4055 just compounds problems which the Council have as yet been unable to address. The Council just looks at other ways to compound the existing problems, not solve them.</p>	28 Feb 2021
IM Land	<p>64. As explained above, whilst Climate Change is highlighted throughout the Issues and Approaches document, it is important that this issue is reflected in the approach to the Spatial Strategy as well as how development sites themselves respond. It would be helpful if the Data Area Profiles address Carbon emissions by settlement when travel data including distance, mode and type are included.</p>	11 May 2021
IM Land Limited	<p>Please see enclosed submission.</p> <p>7.6 Our client considers that in order for the Plan to be successful the role and function of settlements across the District needs to have a higher priority (above Green Belt) within this allocation process.</p>	26 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>7.7 The Council is at a very early stage of the Local Plan process therefore we consider it to be critical to the success of the Plan that all settlements within and outside of the Green Belt are considered from the outset. We do not suggest that some development is then placed at each of these locations but rather, through a more detailed assessment with input from statutory consultees and ongoing public consultation, the Council will reach a point where they have a list of the most sustainable locations to deliver their housing requirement.</p> <p>7.8 All rural settlements should be considered on their own merits and through the SA process the most sustainable settlement options for development should be identified.</p> <p>7.9 As the Green Belt covers more than half of the District of South Gloucestershire, we consider it necessary to first evaluate all rural settlements based on their sustainability and access to services and facilities, rather than location within the Green Belt. The Council needs to determine which settlements are the most sustainable and capable of accommodating sustainable growth.</p> <p>7.10 We see the merit in allocating small sites in rural areas, yet in many villages across South Gloucestershire significant allocations would not represent sustainable development as they just do not have the correct level of existing local facilities.</p>	
Ivywell Capital (IC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assuming a level of development will need to be accommodated at the Rural Villages, the Local Plan should specify a housing requirement for each Parish and allocate specific sites to come forward. This will be especially important for Parishes in the Green Belt as it will be the Local Plan or potentially a Neighbourhood Plan that would formally release land from the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p>5.15 Not at this stage.</p>	17 May 2021
James Carpenter - Falfield Parish Council	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The Impact on Green infrastructure as identified on page 71 is a consideration to be added here.</p> <p>Impact on the best and good agricultural land is a consideration. This needs to be protected so that the region and the country can provide and protect its own food supply. The good agricultural land is the most efficient at doing this per square metre, it cannot be replaced.</p> <p>It has been noted that there is a dramatic change in the population in the Market Town of Thornbury, but some of the surrounding villages have also expanded. i.e. Falfield village is in the process of doubling in size by gaining 85 new homes, Tytherington also is expanding and there is a very large development ongoing in Wickwar. All the ones just mentioned have no amenities added to the area, such as good walking areas, sports sites, village green, shops. There is also a lack of good bus services in all of these areas. so personal cars are needed to get to any of the health facilities or good shopping areas with people travelling to places like Yate, Cribbs Causeway or Bradley Stoke. However, these large shopping areas should not be regarded as the centre of the universe, folk rarely want to travel long</p>	14 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	distances by car or bus every time they need access to a decent cost effective shop.	
James Durant - Cotswold Homes	The Council should consider holding meaningful discussions with the bus operators to understand what level of growth may be required at various settlements to provide much more regular services at those settlements whilst it still being a viable commercial enterprise. Whilst small growth may be more suitable in terms of the existing scale of a village, larger scale growth could in certain contexts make a settlement far more sustainable.	19 Apr 2021
John Acton	Not at the moment.	26 Mar 2021
John Brimacombe	Concerned at what appears to be a free for all in selling any arable land for housing in the Thornbury area for development on the back of the existing runaway developments.	28 Feb 2021
John Mills - Cotswolds Conservation Board	<p data-bbox="336 770 1342 846"><b>LANDSCAPE-LED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT IN THE COTSWOLDS NATIONAL LANDSCAPE AND ITS SETTING</b></p> <p data-bbox="336 875 1342 1025">As outlined in response to Question 5, we recommend that the South Gloucestershire Local Plan should advocate a landscape-led approach to development in the Cotswolds National Landscape and its setting. Key aspects of this landscape-led approach are outlined below.</p> <p data-bbox="336 1055 1342 1093"><b>Landscape and Visual Sensitivity and Capacity Study</b></p> <p data-bbox="336 1122 1342 1339">We recognise that the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) is a key mechanism for identifying potential site allocations. We strongly recommend that, as an integral part of the HELAA process, South Gloucestershire Council should undertake a Landscape and Visual Sensitivity and Capacity Study (LVSCA). A LVSCA should also be a key component in identifying ‘suitable areas’ for renewable energy, particularly wind and solar energy.</p> <p data-bbox="336 1368 1342 1480">Undertaking a LVSCA is particularly important in the Cotswolds National Landscape and its setting, given the great weight that should be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of this area.</p> <p data-bbox="336 1509 1342 1659">When assessing landscape sensitivity, sites within the Cotswolds National Landscape should be accorded the highest ‘value’. As such, sites within the National Landscape are likely to have a higher landscape sensitivity than sites within equivalent landscape character areas outside the National Landscape.</p> <p data-bbox="336 1688 1342 1928">Where such studies identify that the sensitivity of the landscape to specific types and scales of development is high, or medium-high (and where any development impacts could not be fully mitigated), the development should be deemed to exceed the capacity of the landscape to accommodate that development. In such cases, the site should not be allocated, except in exceptional circumstances. Within the Cotswolds National Landscape, such sites should be deemed to be major development (see ‘Major Development’ below).</p> <p data-bbox="336 1957 1342 2011">Where the identified landscape sensitivity is below these thresholds, assessments</p>	16 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>should be made of the specific quantum of development that could theoretically be accommodated on these sites, based on appropriate assumptions (for example, assumptions relating to design, density, layout, mitigation measures, etc.).</p> <p>Major development in the Cotswolds National Landscape</p> <p>We strongly recommend that South Gloucestershire Council should undertake an assessment of potential site allocations to see if they constitute ‘major development’ in the context of paragraph 172 and Footnote 55 of the NPPF.</p> <p>We acknowledge paragraph 172 of the NPPF addresses the issue of major development in the context of planning permissions (i.e. as part of the development management process). However, legal opinion has stated that ‘it would arguably amount to an error of law to fail to consider [major development] at the site allocations stage of plan making ... The consequence of doing so would be to risk allocating land for major development that was undeliverable because it was incapable of meeting the major development test in the NPPF’.</p> <p>The ‘Assessment of Site Allocations Against Major Development Considerations’ undertaken by the South Downs National Park Authority in 2015 and 2017 as part of their Local Plan process is an excellent case study in this regard. In addition, the Board’s draft Planning &amp; Development Position Statement (Appendix 7) provides a checklist of major development considerations.</p> <p>In line with paragraph 172 of the NPPF, there should be a presumption against allocating sites that would constitute major development. Such sites should only be allocated if exceptional circumstances apply and if it can be demonstrated that the development would be in the public interest. The assessment of major development status should include the three ‘tests’ specified in paragraph 172 of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is important to note that exceptional need does not necessarily equate to exceptional circumstances for a particular development. This is because, as stated in relevant case law ‘there may be alternative sites that are more suitable because development there would result in less harm to the AONB landscape’. Relevant case law also states that ‘no permission should be given for major development save to the extent the development was needed in the public interest, met a need that could not be addressed elsewhere or in some other way and met that need in a way that to the extent possible, moderated detrimental effect on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities’.</p> <p>When weighing up the public benefit of a proposed allocation or development, it should be borne in mind that AONBs are landscapes whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation’s interest to safeguard them.</p> <p>It is worth noting that proposed allocations / developments / sites don’t have to be strategic in scale in order to be considered major development in this context. Relatively small allocations / developments / sites could potentially constitute major development, depending on the factors such as the sensitivity of the</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>particular location.</p> <p>Development in the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape</p> <p>Principles</p> <p>Relevant case law has established that great weight should be given to the impact of a proposed development in the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape on views from the National Landscape.</p> <p>The views from the Cotswold escarpment are one of the ‘special qualities’ of the Cotswolds National Landscape and one of the ‘key features’ of the Escarpment Landscape Character Type (LCT). Long distance views across neighbouring lowlands is also one of the key features of The same is true of the High Wold Dip Slope LCT.</p> <p>The ‘great weight’ that applies to impacts on views from the Cotswolds National Landscape does not apply to views to the National Landscape. However, these views can still be an important material consideration. For example, the views to the Cotswold escarpment are one of the special qualities of the Cotswolds National Landscape. In addition, the South Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment recognises that the Cotswold Scarp forms a significant backcloth / backdrop / skyline to views looking east from Landscape Character Areas 5 (Wickwar Ridge and Vale) and 6 (Pucklechurch Ridge and Boyd Valley) .</p> <p>Any development within the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape should be sensitively located and designed to avoid adverse impacts on the National Landscape.</p> <p>Other relevant considerations for development in the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape include potential impacts on the tranquillity and / or dark skies of the National Landscape (for example, as a result of increase traffic movements, noise or light pollution).</p> <p>Further guidance on development in the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape is provided in the Board’s Position Statement on ‘Development in the Setting of the Cotswolds AONB’.</p> <p>Relevant settlements</p> <p>A number of settlements overlap with the boundary of the Cotswolds National Landscape or lie directly adjacent to it. These include (from north to south) Horton, Old Sodbury, Hinton, Doynton and Wick.</p> <p>A number of additional settlements could also be classed as being in the setting of the Cotswolds National Landscape (depending, to some degree, on the scale of any proposed allocations or development. These include (from north to south):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chipping Sodbury (also see our comments on ‘Building Block 3’, in response to</li> </ul>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Question 7);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yate (also see our comments on ‘Building Block 3’, in response to Question 7);</li> <li>• Pucklechurch;</li> <li>• Siston;</li> <li>• Bridgegate;</li> <li>• Oldland;</li> <li>• Potential eastern expansion of ‘east fringe’ beyond the A4175 (also see our comments on ‘Building Block 5’, in response to Question 7);</li> <li>• Bitton.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the principles outlined above should apply when allocations, suitable areas for renewable energy or other development are being considered in these locations.</p>	
Jo Marsh	<p>Villages have seen an increase in development have consequences such as an increase in traffic, parking issues, noise and crime levels. Ensuring adequate parking is provided, also, transport links, school placed and improved facilities, i.e. parks, shops</p>	11 Feb 2021
Jonathan Edwardes - Pilning and Severn Beach Parish Council	<p>Safeguarding land for employment must be considered alongside transport needs of the workers. Shift times must be reflected in bus and train times.</p> <p>The travel to work map obliterates Pilning Station, which will be part of the solution for Severnside. It also omits an arrow for the significant numbers of workers who cross the river from Chepstow and the Forest of Dean area. Numbers crossing the river were anticipated to increase by 25% pre-covid.</p> <p>The Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP) is too ‘top-down’ and this needs to be reversed.</p> <p>Additional comments sent by email on Monday 1st March 2021 -</p> <p>We reiterate our wish to see the inner edge of the Green Belt to be extended 'washing over' Pilning and Severn Beach and meeting with the edge of the Avonmouth Severnside Enterprise Area, as defined on SouthGlos Core Strategy (policy 17, fig 13a). This proposal meets with all the required purposes of Green Belt and, in addition, will provide compensation for those areas that your plan will propose to remove from the Green Belt, to enable development, elsewhere.</p>	26 Feb 2021
Kate Kelliher	<p>Better infrastructure and communications</p>	31 Jan 2021
Kate Maskell	<p>Limiting new housing esp on green land</p>	22 Feb 2021
Katherine Buff	<p>Building block 4 – rural villages and settlements – should see only modest growth appropriate to the needs of the individual communities. For the most part this will come through “windfall developments” of less than 9 houses, and it is therefore unlikely to be necessary to include in the Local Plan.</p>	26 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
Kevin Masters	I have read Trapp'd's response and wish to add my name to it.	25 Feb 2021
Kingdon	Yes, Crest Nicholson's planning application off Inglestone Road, Wickwar. This should not be even considered should you be following your SGC local plan of concerns and investigations. All the principles you have set out for protecting rural villages should apply here.	25 Feb 2021
Laurence Parsons	have I mentioned looking after current rural residents? Also consider the amount of development that has already taken place in recent years. Small communities that have had to endure large developments should be given a reprieve from further immediate developments, and not be treated as 'easy targets' simply because land is made available by a landowner in the Call for Sites.	17 Dec 2020
Lauren Cook - Stride Treglown	No comment on this matter	01 Mar 2021
Lee Preece	reduce ambiguity between central and local plans on whats allowable and encouraged (Local people for local jobs and to keep families together (affordability issue)	03 Feb 2021
Lee Taylor	Make sure your data is robust and system engineering is used to define requirements before you make decisions. Minimise size of developments and ensure they blend with the surrounding environment	23 Jan 2021
Lizzie Staley	whether the people who chose to live in those places want growth and change? People move to villages and rural settlements for the isolation, the peace, the quiet, to be surrounded by nature, to know all their neighbours.	28 Feb 2021
Louise Powell - Thornbury Town Council	Sustainability criteria should be appropriate to the location. i.e., the same criteria for requirements of proximity to certain services should not be the same in villages and rural areas as those in a Market Town Setting- this would be unrealistic and would prevent development in rural settings.	08 Apr 2021
Lynette Thoburn-Perrett	Wickwar does not have walking and cycling access to a range of services and facilities and, or public transport connections. SGC need to consider recent growth in villages and whether this has been carried out in a sustainable manner. Infrastructure improvements may be required before further developments are considered especially in Wickwar. The road infrastructure just cannot sustain any further development- the 2 new housing developments currently being built will already overload the poor communication highway that exists through the village.	25 Feb 2021
Mactaggart & Mickel - Frampton Cotterell	Mactaggart & Mickel control land at Poplars Farm, Frampton Cotterell which they believe is ideally situated for release from the Green Belt and allocated for a residential led development following garden suburban principles. Whilst the site lies within the Green Belt it is considered that given the need for additional housing land then this provides the exceptional circumstances for justifying the release of the land from the Green Belt and to create a robust long term boundary for the Green Belt in this area. The site has been put forward for the Call for Sites and this confirms that it is available and deliverable. Accordingly, a review of the Green Belt boundaries must be carried out as part of the preparation of this Local Plan. This site should be released and allocated for housing. Previously a Vision	07 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	Document has been prepared which shows how the development of the site can take place. This is being updated and will be submitted.	
Mactaggart & Mickel - Pilning	Identify land for residential development around Pilning.	25 Mar 2021
Matt Griffith - Business West	<p>67. Employment land, major allocations: We call for the inclusion on larger employment land reservations to attract major employers. This was a common practice for South Gloucestershire Council in the past, but has been forgotten over recent years.</p> <p>68. Having major international companies such as Airbus, GKN Aerospace and Rolls Royce operating from South Gloucestershire is key for the local economy, which was made possible thanks to the big employment land availability of the area.</p> <p>69. In line with the United Kingdom departure from the European Union and the efforts to open the country to investment from new markets, big allocations of employment land are essential. In order not to lose out to other parts of the country when these opportunities arise, we urge South Gloucestershire Council to consider the allocation of extensive commercial land when drafting the second phase of this Local Plan which will define the development and growth opportunities for the next 15 years.</p> <p>70. Employment land, fulfilling the full range of business need: As we have previously documented, South Gloucestershire and the West of England have faced rising employment land costs and declining availability over the past ten years. This is partly due to changing Central Government policy (such as change of use) putting greater pressure on existing supply, partly due to rising demand, but also due to an undersupply in new employment land – particularly in the locations that businesses most want to be. This is hurting our ability to attract and retain businesses and compete with other cities, for example Birmingham.</p> <p>71. South Gloucestershire has traditionally been a very important supplier of employment land for the growth of the whole West of England, with the North Fringe, Emersons Green and Avonmouth/Sevenside all providing important growth opportunities for different types of businesses. In addition, South Gloucestershire towns like Yate have provided additional important opportunities for light industrial and distribution. South Gloucestershire geographical positioning in the M5 and M4 ‘box,’ as well as the Port and access to wider regional markets and transport infrastructure make it an extremely important regional and national area.</p> <p>72. We welcome the work that South Gloucestershire has been doing, via the local and WECA SDS studies from Atkins on employment land needs. We would encourage South Gloucestershire to plan ambitiously for these identified needs and translate this into a supportive set of policy measures to help protect existing employment land and provide for future growth. We look forward to seeing the conclusions of this work in due course.</p>	25 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>73. We would also hope that South Gloucestershire can look to identify the full range of needs of businesses within the area – from existing strong sectors like aerospace, distribution and professional services, to new sectors and growth areas. For example, tourism and the visitor economy has seen strong growth in South Gloucestershire in recent years, from the Wave, Wild Place and the potential future growth of Bristol Zoo offering major regional and national attractions, yet there is little mention of this sector in the draft Plan documents. We encourage the next stage of the Plan to explore these needs with more detail.</p> <p>74. Cross-regional approach: Despite this being a Local Plan that just covers South Gloucestershire, there is a critical need for this Plan to comprehensively address and plan for South Gloucestershire’s linkages with its wider region. That should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Housing plans reflecting the wider regional housing market and needs – and how this process of incorporating these needs will happen.</li> <li>o Plans for employment land and employment provision need to reflect the balance of employment land supply and the markets in which demand for employment locations operate. This includes a likely requirement for additional employment land to meet wider West of England needs.</li> <li>o Spatial Plans need to be part of a wider understanding of the region’s patterns of demand, need and how this relates to transport infrastructure and employment locations and services.</li> <li>o Critically it also needs to plan for growth where the Carbon impact can be best mitigated, this is likely to mean some locations close to existing urban areas and along existing or potential transport infrastructure and corridors.</li> </ul>	
Matthew Blaken - DJ&P Newland Rennie Ltd	Whether the use of settlement boundaries are necessary or whether a case by case approach is more appropriate.	14 Dec 2020
Matthew McCollom	<p>Key consideration 3. It is my understanding that the main sewer serving Shortwood is already close to capacity.</p> <p>Key consideration 5 should also include flooding due to run off. The Lightwood group land sits at a higher elevation than the level of the road and houses on the adjacent section of Main Road. The area collects run off from the escarpment. In the light of changing weather patterns and the increase in heavy downpours any developments on these plots would decrease the capacity of the area to act as a soakaway and increase the likelihood of flooding along Main Road and off the western edge of the area onto the path alongside the outer edge of the ringroad (A4174), possibly rendering it impassable. The lower section of the path here already suffers significant run off from these fields.</p> <p>In Appendix 1 Option 1: Outside the Green Belt. This option would safeguard the existing extent of the Green Belt in South Gloucestershire and not undermine its purpose and is therefore preferable.</p>	28 Feb 2021
Maurice Wayne	No	08 Feb

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
		2021
Michael Sharpe-Neal	Creating sustainable environments with soul and community without destroying those that already exist.	28 Feb 2021
Michelle Greaves	<p>As mentioned above - avoid green belt / SSE sites at all costs.</p> <p>More focus on environment in developments : transitioning to more environmentally friendly ways of developing. We have a greater need to plan for carbon neutral, more electric cars, and more facility to reuse rather than recycle/ dispose of waste as well as develop in mind of the local wildlife and environment. This should impact any future developments, considering what materials are being used (are they sustainable/ renewable), the carbon footprint of taking out any work and facility for eco homes/ sustainable energy and what we do with the waste from these new houses (not just landfill). Is there a good green transport infrastructure in place. These considerations are big challenges and need to to be acknowledged - and came up on one of the online teams briefings talks today.</p>	03 Feb 2021
Midland Commercial	Please see enclosed submission.	26 Apr 2021
Mike Burgess	<p>Ensure that the increasingly popular (and perfectly sensible in planning as well as Pandemic Control ) move to " follow the Science" is based on GOOD science. By that I mean not relying on biased "research" funded by Speculative Builders to support dubious proposals .. such as Traffic Censuses carried out in school holidays, Or facilities "audits" which reflect outdated reality</p> <p>Issue 29 states that undeveloped areas are " being deprived of the benefits of growth." a degree of truth , but Wickwar for example has hosted growth of 30+% in the last 3 years alongside shrinkage in facilities, with no prospect of any change in trends .</p> <p>There is much merit in small/ medium developments , targeted at local families and older residents, but reliance on larger developments MUST be predicated on CONTRACTUALLY ENFORCEABLE REALISTIC ENHANCEMENTS especially as regards traffic flows as they impact Road Safety and inevitable growth in commuting.</p> <p>New developments which are inaccessible by REALISTIC alternative transport options should be declined</p> <p>Some villages may appear on road maps to be suitable for expansion, but more detailed ( eg OS at least 1:25000) examination my reveal insuperable issues . for example , here is a Traffic-light controlled single lane pinch point at the north end of Wickwar High Street which comprises a contorted ( horizontally &amp; vertically) road bounded at the north end by a frequently busy B-Road (the subordinate of which is a very popular through road from M4 &gt; M5) junction, while the south end gives onto the High Street which is a Conservation Area and is lined by parked cars 24/7. Improvement other than by VERY significant Diversion ( aka a by-pass) is impossible</p> <p>"Growth" does NOT mean simply permitting National Builders to build</p>	21 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	<p>Speculative developments for profit ( I am not seduced by their claims they are doing it in the national interest) with no concern for local conditions and concerns</p> <p>The SGC table of Key Services and Facilities lists 11 such issues.. Wickwar fails on 8 of them yet is perceived by one such builder to have potential for further 20+% growth ( 130&gt;150 Homes) on a 4.99ha site</p>	
Miller	<p>There must also be transport links for schools, that are not just for those on benefits or charged out at extortionate rates to those who are not on benefits. Free school buses for all also that helps your environment concerns.</p> <p>Linking of rural villages by safe pathways/cycleways such as between Wickwar and chipping Sodbury.</p>	01 Dec 2020
Mr. A. D. England	Please see enclosed submission.	29 Mar 2021
Mr. and Mrs. Drew and Mr. and Mrs. Bennett	It's important that where proportionate growth takes place at a rural village, the growth incorporates mixed use development to aid the sustainability of the village. The scheme envisaged for Cromhall in our Call for Sites Representation incorporates such a mixed use concept with a scheme of approximately 25 dwellings and 0.2ha of Commercial, Business and Service use.	19 Apr 2021
Mr. Blake - Oldland Parish Council	Rural means Rural and Rural Villages should not become small townships. Do not do away with the likes of common ground and gardens in return for 'block paving' driveway's and 'windows boxes'	17 Feb 2021
Neil Oviatt	<p>Why do planners not legally bind developers to build schools, hospitals, roads before taking their profit from the residential... this would show true commitment.</p> <p>Build new self-dependant villages like Buckover but make the infrastructure the priority and then high-class architecture! People want to live in the countryside, not just another ESTATE! People want , views, wildlife, real stone</p>	30 Nov 2020
Newland Homes - Land at Aust Road	5.15 Not at this stage.	14 May 2021
Newland Homes - Land West of The B4061 Bristol Road	5.15 Not at this stage.	13 May 2021
Nicholas Small - Stagecoach West	<p>The potential to catalyse a step change in self-containment in the settlement itself and among a wider cluster of rural communities, AND the potential to catalyse a step change in sustainable mobility, do not feature at all as considerations. Yet, these two issues lie at the heart of determining where in the rural area, if at all, development should take place as part of a robustly-based sustainable spatial approach.</p> <p>Obviously this potential is likely to exist in very few instances. However where it does exist, it makes it still the more important that it is properly evaluated from first principles. Not only that it makes it possible to appropriately locate development</p>	01 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>that does contribute to those housing needs that do exist in the rural part of the Plan area, much smaller though these unquestionably are. The vitality of rural communities and economies is an important consideration as NPPF makes clear.</p> <p>This being the case, in the context of having identified existing and credibly deliverable sustainable transport corridors, there may be a very few localities that do warrant some expansion and consolidation. These might be better understood as expanded villages and this would have some overlap with a new settlement concept.</p> <p>Charfield, where the Council continues to press for a new rail station is obviously just one such, and we have already made plain in a number of responses that there are significant bus based Public Transport opportunities here too, linking in with a wider corridor from BNF/Thornbury across Junction 14 of the M5 towards Wotton Under Edge. The immediate presence of major employment at Charfield just across the boundary within Stroud District at New Mills, within Kingswood Parish, where 10Ha further employment development is an emerging allocation in the Stroud District Local Plan Review, consolidating not only existing activities but a current major partly -implemented commitment, is in our view highly relevant to this area and the wider potential to anchor a greatly more attractive Public Transport corridor. We have separately made this point to Stroud District Council in our duly-made representations to them.</p> <p>We also note that Wickwar continues to be under significant development pressure. This is much more remote from key destinations to the South and West – with the exception of Yate. However there is an existing bus service that might be consolidated here. Uncomfortable though it is for us to state this, given how far Green Belt constrains the kinds of site that might come forward in the short term, there may be little practical choice to release some more land here in order to ensure that the housing trajectory can be maintained. If so then the limited potential for this much weaker corridor needs to be maximised.</p> <p>We have highlighted the Easter Compton area which could benefit from a relatively easily deliverable direct sustainable access connection between Bristol, at Cribbs Causeway. This would run South of, and outside, the current village across currently open land, largely following the route of an existing adopted highway, stopped up to motor vehicles. Development outside the village on this route could create a complementary small rural settlement that depending on urban design and the approach taken to the interface with the existing settlement, could in some important regards boost the self-containment of the existing village as well as transform its Public Transport and cycling choices.</p> <p>Off-line of these corridors it is hard to see that development on anything other than the smallest scale would be appropriate. Indeed there may even be a case to seek to limit population growth in the smallest and most obviously car-dependent rural settlements through other development control policies, with a greater focus only on meeting the needs associated with the local rural economy.</p>	
Nick Woodward	Rural settlements are naturally poor in infrastructure by definition, otherwise they would become towns. However, it is for this reason many people choose such a	28 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	<p>location. Continued to build unsustainable rural dwellings destroys the nature of a village - examples where this destruction has already happened for example are Charfield and Wickwar, where the view of the Cotswold has been lost forever.</p> <p>Information within your consultation document, with respect to good links for Wickwar are incorrect. There are very poor part-time bus services, footpaths and cycleways.</p>	
Nicola Flack	Look closely at each individual site. Housing for elderly people in Almondsbury needs to be as close to the heart of the village in Lower Almondsbury as possible so that they can access the essential services they need on foot doctor, dentist, shop and church. Housing for younger people who would like to commute on a bike or on a bus should be at the top of the hill with ready access to the A38.	31 Jan 2021
Nicola O'Connell	No comment	27 Feb 2021
North Thornbury Landowners Consortium	None.	29 Apr 2021
P. Church	See attached representations.	27 Apr 2021
Patricia Trull - South Glos Council	Poorly designed estates, and housing. Nothing that will stand the test of design time. Houses crammed in. Not enough parking on these new estates with narrow roads and parking areas.	08 Dec 2020
Patrick Williams	Extending Green Belt and AONB as stated in 13.	09 Mar 2021
Paula Evans - Rangeworthy Parish Council	Improved public transport, amenities such as school places and flooding.	26 Feb 2021
Pauline and Richard Wilson	<p>Are there any other planning issues you think we should consider?</p> <p>There is no mention of working from home impacting on car use and therefore carbon footprint.</p> <p>The issue of horsiculture around towns and villages is not addressed. This often includes unplanned development without permission or creeping development.</p> <p>Cotswold A.O.N.B.: Although this is a very important asset to South Gloucestershire and the country, this should not preclude small development, appropriately designed to fit in with the local vernacular style of architecture. Modern designed properties should not be allowed in the A.O.N.B.</p> <p>By 2023 the Cotswolds A.O.N.B. will have changed its name to Cotswolds National Landscape as recommended in The Glover Report. This should be acknowledged in all references to the Cotswolds.</p>	25 Feb 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	<p>The villages in the Cotswolds do need some mixed housing with affordable homes, but they must be of an appropriate style and not big developments.</p> <p>Green Belt: We do not understand the term ‘washed over by the Green Belt’ and how does this vary from ‘inset in the Green Belt’? Please use easy to understand language</p> <p>Please see response in Question 3 of this questionnaire Issues 24-26.</p>	
Persimmon Homes Severn Valley	Please see attached document.	11 May 2021
Peter Box	As I think that there is no case for 'Creating Sustainable Rural Villages and Settlements' I think any consideration of such planning issues to be irrelevant.	23 Feb 2021
Peter Rawlinson - Gleeson Strategic Land	Please refer to comments on Question 15 above.	10 Mar 2021
Progress Land Ltd	No, but planning allocations should focus on non-Green Belt sites and be outside the higher flood zones in line with National policy in the NPPF.	11 May 2021
Rachel Beard	Flood plain areas should not be developed.	28 Feb 2021
Rachel Davis - Wickwar Parish Council	<p>Wickwar is between the two market towns of Yate and Thornbury and is also a short cut route for traffic travelling to the M5 north and south towards Bristol. The additional building proposed for Yate and Thornbury will only increase the current high level of traffic. Perhaps the consultation document should look at this issue with highways and propose action to mitigate this problem as a key requirement before any new development in those areas is taken forward. Additional traffic as the result of any new development will also need to be assessed on the road through Wickwar.</p> <p>Infrastructure is very poor in Wickwar as shown by the Data Access Profile (DAP) report as there are no shops, doctors, dentists, library provision, post office, secondary schools, train station and a very poor public transport service. The roads through Wickwar are seeing very high volumes of traffic for a designated B road. Should not the consultation plan address this aspect by requiring developers to address these short falls as a contractual obligation so that any development can be proven to be sustainable?</p>	01 Mar 2021
Rebecca Woodward	Rural settlements are naturally poor in infrastructure by definition, or else they become towns. Not every village needs to become a town. Increasing unsustainable rural dwellings both destroys the nature of “ a village” and adds to numbers of journeys required for education, healthcare, employment and leisure. Some of the information sited in your consultation document about good links for Wickwar are incorrect. We do not have good public transport or footpath and cycleway links with our neighbouring settlements. The only access is via non paved increasingly busy roads. Speculative, unplanned developments in rural communities need to stop.	28 Feb 2021
Redcliffe Homes	Yes, land at Church Lane, Cromhall should be allocated for residential	04 Mar

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>development (see Plan).</p> <p>Principle of Development:</p> <p>As stated above, the intention is to provide a development of up to 70 residential properties, comprising a range and size of properties including a policy compliant level of Affordable Housing. The type of housing, which importantly meets an acknowledged and identified need, will add to the mix and tenure of dwelling in the locality.</p> <p>Heritage Issues:</p> <p>The site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no statutorily Listed Buildings on the site.</p> <p>Highways:</p> <p>Redcliffe Homes have appointed transport consultants to advise on the transportation issues. At present no discussions have taken place with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Vehicular access would be taken from Church Lane via a new access to the Highway Authority's standards.</p> <p>The internal layout will be designed to reflect a 20-mph speed limit and the development will provide access for emergency vehicles, refuse and recycling collection and service vehicles. The site will not be solely dependent on the car because it can be accessed on foot and by cycle and will have access to Public Transport services in the village centre.</p> <p>The car parking levels are anticipated to reflect local policy guidelines and will be provided in garages or on driveways. Some visitor parking will also be accommodated within the scheme. Parking will also be provided to the adjacent Primary School as they experience problems with car parking, turning and manoeuvring.</p> <p>Cromhall provides a variety of local facilities and services required on a daily basis, including shops, Pubs and Church. The availability of these facilities will encourage non-car travel from the site. A continuous footway can be provided between the site and local facilities and amenities.</p> <p>Trees:</p> <p>There are no trees within the site and the only trees relate to various hedge trees which can be retained. The development would be able to provide significant additional trees as part of the development.</p> <p>Flood Risk and Drainage:</p>	2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore, it can be noted that the proposed development will not increase flood risk elsewhere through the loss of flood plain storage.</p> <p>Ecology:</p> <p>A full range of ecological surveys have been undertaken. There are no protected species identified within the site. A net-gain in ecology can be provided as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>Landscape:</p> <p>The Applicants have undertaken a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the site by experienced landscape consultants. The site is not situated within any statutory or valued landscape designation either nationally or locally.</p> <p>Utilities:</p> <p>All of the utilities e.g. gas, electricity, water etc are within close proximity of the site and can be brought to the site without any particular issues.</p> <p>Other:</p> <p>Discussions have taken place with the Headmistress of Cromhall Primary School which lies adjacent to the site. She is extremely supportive of additional housing in the village as the School is not at full capacity and so development on this site would help sustain the Primary School. Also, the development of the site would be able to provide a parking area for the School as it experiences problems at the beginning and end of the School day when parents drop off and collect their children.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The site is available with a willing landowner and experienced developer. It is suitable for residential development and can provide a range and mix of dwellings including affordable to meet local needs. Finally, there are no constraints which would prohibit its development and thus it is achievable.</p>	
Redcliffe Homes	Please see enclosed representations.	01 Jun 2021
Redrow Homes (SW)	Please see enclosed representations.	29 Apr 2021
Richard Bentham	Please promote motorcycles as a mode of efficient, low pollution, less congested commuting. Your plan mentions them twice. Not good enough! Provide secure parking & promote awareness with roadside poster campaign. Your report often states the commuting/shopping distances are too far or difficult to walk. Cycling is suitable for some people travelling a few miles. Not everyone is able to cycle.	26 Jan 2021
Richard Lloyd	In response to question 9, I commented on policies in relation to the Cotswolds	03 Mar

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	AONB, noting that the Cotswolds AONB is one of a family of AONBs (now called National Landscapes) and there needs to be a consistency of policy across the whole of the AONB. The Cotswolds Conservation Board is working on two position statements on “Planning and Development” and on “Housing”. The finally agreed versions of these Position Statements will apply across the whole of the AONB. They should be endorsed by South Gloucestershire Council.	2021
Richard Walker - Lightwood Strategic	<p>This section seems focused in the future of least sustainable villages/settlements villages that are not realistically capable of offering a larger expansion opportunity, yet may benefit from additional housing stock during the Plan period. As such we consider that this Section 7 is not relevant to Rock House Farm, Shortwood where a greater the local small/medium scale of development should be planned for.</p> <p>Intelligent assessment needs to be made of the status of Shortwood as an area of ribbon development and of the role of land within its environs (primarily to the North and South of Main Road, but potentially to the South) in the future development of the East Fringe, and the significant need for more housing in the most sustainable locations.</p>	01 Jun 2021
Robert Harris - Olveston Parish Council	No	26 Feb 2021
Robert Hitchins Ltd	Please see enclosed submission.	01 Jun 2021
Robert Hitchins Ltd and Harrow Estates PLC	Please see enclosed submission.	01 Jun 2021
Robin Perry	see 11.	21 Feb 2021
Roger Hall	See TRAPP'D response.	25 Feb 2021
Rosalyn Pyle	Long term sustainability, climate emergency and loss of wildlife habitat.	28 Feb 2021
Roy Irwin	As a small village or settlement has no dedicated parish council particular attention should be given to the views of residents rather than just the parish council which for a number of reasons may not represent the village or settlement (either because there are no members of the Parish Council who are resident in that settlement or there are two competing developments and they would prefer to see the one further away proceed)	01 Mar 2021
Ruth Hall - Wessex Water	Development sites should not be located in close proximity to existing Sewage Treatment Works. Odour buffer zones should be maintained to protect residential amenity.	02 Mar 2021
Sarah Blackmore - VALID Action Group	<p>We would like to point out some inconsistencies with the Data Access Profiles (DAPs) with regards to Winterbourn and Coalpit Heath.</p> <p>Winterbourne</p> <p>The appraisal states that Winterbourne has 3 Comparison Retail Stores - in fact it</p>	26 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>has at least 30. Besides those already listed in the appraisal there are the following:</p> <p>Flaxpits Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bakery</li> <li>Motor Parts Store</li> <li>Barbers</li> <li>Charity Shop</li> <li>Hairdressers</li> <li>Estate Agents</li> <li>Photography Studio</li> <li>Fish and Chip Shop</li> <li>Cafe</li> <li>Turf Accountants</li> <li>Opticians</li> </ul> <p>Park Avenue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hairdressers</li> <li>Beauty Rooms</li> <li>Chinese Takeaway</li> </ul> <p>High Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bicycle Shop</li> <li>Funeral Director</li> <li>Charity Shop</li> <li>Hairdressers and Beauty Salon</li> <li>Estate Agents</li> <li>Car Tyre Depot</li> <li>2 Indian Restaurants</li> <li>Solicitors</li> </ul> <p>Bradley Avenue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barbers</li> <li>Veterinary Practice</li> <li>Chinese Takeway</li> <li>Pizza Takeaway</li> <li>Tatooist</li> <li>Hairdressers</li> </ul> <p>Hicks Common Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Winterbourne Auto Centre</li> </ul> <p>Down Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Salon 52 beauty salon,</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the above there is a community Arts Theatre at Winterbourne International Academy. Also, a community swimming pool and sports fitness facility with hireable facilities e.g. children's soft play. A hockey club, and judo club also run from here.</p> <p>The Winterbourne Community Centre has not been included - this is used daily by community groups and is also open in the evenings with bar facilities.</p> <p>Fromeside youth Club and Fromeside Gym Club, on the next site have also not been included. They appear to be around the 800 metres boundary.</p> <p>The shopping facilities at the Tesco Express, High Street, are classed as a convenience store. However, Sainsbury's Local on the Badminton Road, Coalpit heath, has been classed as a supermarket. It is claimed that a week's shopping could be bought there. However, I know from experience that this is not the case as there</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>is a very limited choice and as there are not a great number of deliveries, they are often out of quite simple basics. It has a similar footfall and is a similar size to the Tesco Express in Winterbourne. Therefore the two should be scored in the same way. If Sainsbury's continues to be classed as a supermarket, although it is not large enough to be officially to be classed as one, then the same should apply to Tesco's meaning that Winterbourne has 2 supermarkets.</p> <p>I notice that Winterbourne is not listed as having access to Emersons Green as a Designated Town Centre. However, Coalpit Heath is said to have access. This is rather strange as large parts of Winterbourne are closer to Emersons Green than Coalpit Heath and is within the 5.6 kms specified. In addition, Winterbourne also has access to the centres at Bradley Stoke and Abbey Wood shopping park. I'm not sure if they have omitted the designated town centre section for Winterbourne in error.</p> <p>Coalpit Heath</p> <p>It is claimed there are 'a large number of different types of comparison retail stores'. It states that there are 15 of these but they are just listed as 'various' rather than named individually. All the stores should be identified and named. The Post Office is a Post Office in a local convenience store rather than a dedicated building. The G.P. surgery is a branch surgery from a main surgery in Yate which is only manned part time by one doctor and doesn't include after work appointments. It sometimes closes altogether leaving only the Yate surgery operational.</p> <p>Only one of the 5 primary schools mentioned is accessible. The next nearest is across a very busy main road and does not fall within a safe walking route.</p> <p>It seems odd to base the distances on measurements taken "as the crow flies" as it is totally impractical not accurately measuring the distances people would have to walk or cycle.</p> <p>I notice that in the Strategy section dealing with where growth can go. the green infrastructure table at 4 omits the land opposite Roundways.</p> <p>In Appendix 1 Coalpit Heath is listed in the areas of high flood risk (Zones 2 &amp; 3) but this doesn't show up in the appropriate profile table.</p> <p>The Blackberry Park development off of Park Lane has been included in Frampton Cotterell's DAPs whereas this development is actually with the Coalpit Heath/Westerleigh Parish boundary.</p>	
Sarah Hardcastle - Friends of Ridge Wood	<p>Protection of SSSIs and SNCIs should be paramount given the known threats to wildlife and biodiversity locally and nationally. Unfortunately at present developers do not seem unduly perturbed by these when proposing sites for new development. Benefits of green spaces for physical and mental health is also a key consideration, hence greenfield development should be a last resort.</p> <p>It is important to speak to local people when deciding where to site new development in rural areas. For example, the local plan document identifies Wickwar as a village with walking and cycling access to a range of services and facilities, and /or good public transport links to these. In reality, the vast majority of residents access all services by car, due to a lack of safe walking / cycling routes. It is vital that future decision-making be based on a realistic assessment of each area.</p>	28 Feb 2021
Sean and Jacqueline Rinaldi	<p>Rural villages and settlements – should see only modest growth appropriate to the needs of the individual communities. For the most part this will come through “windfall developments” of less than 9 houses, and it is therefore unlikely to be</p>	26 Mar 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	necessary to include in the Local Plan.	
Shelley O'Callaghan	The number of houses in Wickwar as a village with no amenities. Not to add amenities but to connect to chipping g sodbury with a cycle path to encourage the village and town to use cars less.	04 Dec 2020
Simon Fitton - YTL Developments (UK) Ltd	N/A.	16 Mar 2021
Simon Moore	Development only on developed sites. The council must bring to an end any further development on agricultural of the green sites. The natural environment must be protected as the local authority's priority.	28 Feb 2021
Simon Steele-Perkins - Waddeton Park Limited	Not relevant to our interest in this consultation response.	06 May 2021
Sophie Spencer - CPRE Avon and Bristol [South Gloucestershire District]	Establishing an appropriate density for housing rather than catering for commuter homes at fewer than 25 dwellings per hectare.	02 Mar 2021
South West Strategic Developments (SWSD)	Please see enclosed representations.  8.21 As set out we consider that a review of the Green Belt is required, this should consider land for both large scale urban extensions to Bristol, but also smaller discrete sites in villages that are currently 'washed over' by the Green Belt designation to support the facilities they provide, and engender the provision of expanded and improved services.	31 Mar 2021
St. Modwen Developments and The Tortworth Estate	The importance of the rural Northern arc of South Gloucestershire is key to the Local Plan's success in terms of delivering the District wide approach to redressing any imbalances of the past. In doing so, the relationship and influence of growth within Stroud District to the North must be acknowledged and considered within the Plan's approach to the rural areas. We acknowledge that any potential locations for large scale growth will be set out in the Council's Phase 2 document so will reserve the opportunity to make further representations at the appropriate juncture.	05 Mar 2021
Stephen Hickmans	All of the above mentioned Places of outstanding natural beauty should be preserved and be something Councils should be proud of	26 Jan 2021
Steven Freke	Sustainability in small villages is not possible due to lack of facilities/services and the use of the car as a primary transport means. The Hamlet of Kington is not identified on the plan for rural growth investigation, why not? 85 properties and approx 175 residents should be recognised!!	27 Feb 2021
Steve Seward	Planning must consider all impacts on existing ways of life and strongly defend those people who prefer to be away from highly populated areas	13 Feb 2021
Strongvox	5.1 The approach to areas of flood risk is considered appropriate. We have	11 May

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Homes	<p>discussed this in more detail above, however, our position is that development in areas of higher flood risk is inherently less sustainable than development in areas of lower flood risk. The former should, therefore, be avoided where appropriate alternatives are available as per the guidance in the NPPF and PPG.</p> <p>5.2 With regard to AONBs, we support the exploration of a strategy to support growth in rural areas in the interests of maintaining the vitality and viability of these communities and combating affordability issues. However, we note that the need to protect valued landscapes means that development in these locations will need to be relatively small scale.</p> <p>5.3 With regard to rural communities in the Green Belt, we agree that the first stage is to establish whether the District's development needs can be met without impinging upon the Green Belt, or if there are exceptional circumstances that would justify its release.</p> <p>5.4 The guiding principles for identifying potential growth locations strongly indicates that land around the Bristol urban fringe, Yate and key transit routes (e.g. Coalpit Heath and Frampton Cotterell) have clear sustainability benefits over development in non-Green Belt locations that would justify their release.</p> <p>5.5 With regard to smaller settlements, the question is whether their development needs/requirements can be met through the exceptions set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF (limited infilling, redevelopment of Brownfield sites, rural exceptions sites for affordable housing etc) or if this would dictate a more direct approach (e.g. formal allocations).</p> <p>5.6 The Phase 1 document suggests that the housing requirement, coupled with constraints at villages beyond the Green Belt, will likely mean a proportion of growth needs to be directed to settlements within the Green Belt as well. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal which has indicated clear sustainability benefits associated with directing growth toward villages within the Green Belt (table 4.7 of the SA). This is a welcome start; however, we note that a flaw of the JSP and a common pitfall of other Local Plans is the failure to provide a robust assessment in support of the exceptional circumstances being demonstrated (e.g. Ashfield District Council and Amber Valley Borough Council fell at the Examination in Public stage due to the poor quality of the evidence in respect of Green Belt release). We would suggest a dedicated topic paper be prepared in support of the Plan if, as we expect, Green Belt releases be required to support the development needs of the District.</p> <p>5.7 We agree that the new Local Plan will need to explore the possibility of growth at rural settlements in the Green Belt for a range of development scales to underpin housing delivery from the larger strategic sites that will also be necessary to meet the overall housing requirements.</p> <p>5.8 This will, ultimately, be dictated in part by the scale of the housing requirement and reliance that will be placed on strategic sites. A significant advantage of a dispersed approach to housing distribution is that delivery is likely to be less of an</p>	2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>issue. However, we acknowledge that there are trade-offs with achieving wider sustainability objectives and so an appropriate balance will need to be struck.</p> <p>5.9 The obvious advantage for settlements in the Green Belt is that they tend to be better related to the Bristol Urban Fringe and market towns of Yate, Thornbury and Chipping Sodbury where services, facilities and employment opportunities are more readily accessible. There is, therefore, greater potential for development to achieve the sustainability objectives set out in the Phase 1 document.</p> <p>5.10 There are a handful of ways in which the Council could manage development at the rural villages; however, we would support the identification of allocations at settlements, either through this Plan or a subsequent site allocations plan. This is more important for the Green Belt villages given that boundaries can only be altered by Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans where exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated by the former.</p> <p>5.11 The process of identifying site allocations could be deferred to the Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) process, at least for certain Parishes where these are being progressed. However, it will be important for the Local Plan to establish what the requirement for these areas would be and establish the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify development within the Green Belt Parishes. A view can be taken at a later date as to whether a Site Allocations Plan would need to be progressed if insufficient progress has been made on any emerging NHPs.</p>	
Sue Green - Home Builders Federation	The HBF have no further comments on Creating Sustainable Rural Villages & Settlements. The Council is referred to the HBF's answer to Question 15 above.	05 Mar 2021
Sue Hope	Please check all details in the DAP as these have been challenged.	26 Feb 2021
Sue Simmons - Westerleigh Parish Council	Re-utilisation of previous railway stations and used or disused rail lines such as Coalpit Heath.	23 Feb 2021
Susan Smith	Road networks. Can the road infrastructure cope with the new developments. They need to be in place first. Also create proper cycle and walking paths that are not shared .	16 Feb 2021
Terry Chamberlain and Alan Jobbins	<p>5. SECTION 7: CREATING SUSTAINABLE RURAL VILLAGES AND SETTLEMENTS:</p> <p>Do you agree with our proposed approach to the national policy issues highlighted, like flood risk, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Green Belt, and other planning considerations and issues?</p> <p>5.1 The approach to areas of flood risk is considered appropriate. We have discussed this in more detail above, however, our position is that development in areas of higher flood risk is inherently less sustainable than development in areas of lower flood risk. The former should, therefore, be avoided where appropriate alternatives are available as per the guidance in the NPPF and PPG.</p>	05 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>5.2 With regard to AONBs, we support the exploration of a strategy to support growth in rural areas in the interests of maintaining the vitality and viability of these communities and combating affordability issues. However, we note that the need to protect valued landscapes means that development in these locations will need to be relatively small scale.</p> <p>5.3 With regard to rural communities in the Green Belt, we agree that the first stage is to establish whether the District's development needs can be met without impinging upon the Green Belt, or if there are exceptional circumstances that would justify its release.</p> <p>5.4 The guiding principles for identifying potential growth locations strongly indicates that land around the Bristol urban fringe, Yate and key transit routes (e.g. Coalpit Heath and Frampton Cotterell) have clear sustainability benefits over development in non-Green Belt locations that would justify their release.</p> <p>5.5 With regard to smaller settlements, the question is whether their development needs/requirements can be met through the exceptions set out in paragraph 145 of the NPPF (limited infilling, redevelopment of Brownfield sites, rural exceptions sites for affordable housing etc) or if this would dictate a more direct approach (e.g. formal allocations).</p> <p>5.6 The Phase 1 document suggests that the housing requirement, coupled with constraints at villages beyond the Green Belt, will likely mean a proportion of growth needs to be directed to settlements within the Green Belt as well. This is supported by the Sustainability Appraisal which has indicated clear sustainability benefits associated with directing growth toward villages within the Green Belt (table 4.7 of the SA). This is a welcome start; however, we note that a flaw of the JSP and a common pitfall of other Local Plans is the failure to provide a robust assessment in support of the exceptional circumstances being demonstrated (e.g. Ashfield District Council and Amber Valley Borough Council fell at the Examination in Public stage due to the poor quality of the evidence in respect of Green Belt release). We would suggest a dedicated topic paper be prepared in support of the Plan if, as we expect, Green Belt releases be required to support the development needs of the District.</p> <p>5.7 We agree that the new Local Plan will need to explore the possibility of growth at rural settlements in the Green Belt for a range of development scales to underpin housing delivery from the larger strategic sites that will also be necessary to meet the overall housing requirements.</p> <p>5.8 This will, ultimately, be dictated in part by the scale of the housing requirement and reliance that will be placed on strategic sites. A significant advantage of a dispersed approach to housing distribution is that delivery is likely to be less of an issue. However, we acknowledge that there are trade-offs with achieving wider sustainability objectives and so an appropriate balance will need to be struck.</p> <p>5.9 The obvious advantage for settlements in the Green Belt is that they tend to be better related to the Bristol Urban Fringe and market towns of Yate, Thornbury and</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Chipping Sodbury where services, facilities and employment opportunities are more readily accessible. There is, therefore, greater potential for development to achieve the sustainability objectives set out in the Phase 1 document through development at rural settlements.</p> <p>5.10 There are a handful of ways in which the Council could manage development at the rural villages; however, we would support the identification of allocations at settlements, either through this Plan or a subsequent site allocations plan. This is more important for the Green Belt villages given that boundaries can only be altered by Local Plans. This may be the preferred approach in the interests of ensuring delivery at these settlements can come forward earlier in the Plan period.</p> <p>5.11 Alternatively, the process of identifying site allocations could be deferred to the Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) process, at least for certain parishes where these are being progressed. However, it will be important for the Local Plan to establish what the requirement for these areas would be and establish the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify development within the identified Parishes. A view can be taken at a later date as to whether a Site Allocations Plan would need to be progressed if insufficient progress has been made on any emerging NHPs.</p> <p>5.12 We support the principle of seeking to ensure that development at the rural villages is Plan-led in light of the level of speculative development that has come forward at them in recent years.</p> <p>5.13 Whilst strategic levels of development will be required to sustainably meet the bulk of the Council's housing requirement, development at villages where large-scale development is not possible will still be required to support the vitality and viability of those settlements and address affordability issues.</p> <p>5.14 In terms of the approach to investigating the appropriate levels of growth that should come forward at the rural villages, the two options are appropriate starting points and will need to be subject to an appropriate Sustainability Appraisal to establish which should ultimately be pursued. The approach may then need to be refined in terms of identifying which rural settlements in the Green Belt should be prioritised based on the application of the guiding principles outlined within the consultation document.</p> <p>Are there any other planning issues you think we should consider?</p> <p>5.15 Not at this stage.</p>	
The Badminton Estate	<p>Please see accompanying representation.</p> <p>6.1 A review of the proposed working policies contained within the Phase 1 consultation document has been undertaken and overall the Estate welcomes the Council's proposed range of both strategic and non-strategic policies, noting particularly the proposed policy referring to the strategy for growth and protection where it is assumed this will provide the policy wording and settlement hierarchy for how development should be distributed across the District.</p>	04 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>6.2 It is noted the draft wording for this policy will be issued at the Phase 2 consultation. We would therefore like to take the opportunity to help influence the wording of this policy to ensure that sustainable growth that is proportionate to rural settlements can be achieved. In doing so, I refer to an adopted Local Plan policy (Policy DS3) contained within the Cotswold Local Plan (adopted 2018). That policy allows for ‘small-scale’ residential development in what Cotswold District Council define as ‘non-principal settlements’ subject to a criterion. The exact wording of that policy is as follows:</p> <p>“Small-scale residential development in non-Principal Settlements.</p> <p>1. In non-Principal Settlements, small-scale residential development will be permitted provided it:</p> <p>a) Demonstrably supports or enhances the vitality of the local community and the continued availability of services and facilities locally;</p> <p>b) Is of a proportionate scale and maintains and enhances sustainable patterns of development;</p> <p>c) Complements the form and character of the settlement; and</p> <p>d) Does not have an adverse cumulative impact on the settlement having regard to other developments permitted during the Local Plan period.</p> <p>2. Applicants proposing two or more residential units on sites in non-Principal Settlements should complete a rural housing pro-forma and submit this with the Planning Application.”</p> <p>6.3 Cotswold District Council do not have a defined list of those settlements that are ‘non-Principal’, but instead provide a flexible policy approach which allows rural settlements with greater sustainability credentials, such as having access to everyday services such as shops, Post Offices, Schools and good Public Transport links to neighbouring towns, to grow incrementally, a key aim that South Gloucestershire Council are clearly trying to achieve within their emerging LP. Further, Cotswold District Council recognise that rural settlements that have fewer services and facilities can still be defined as ‘non-Principal Settlements’ where they have “reasonable access” to neighbouring rural settlements that contain a larger range. Paragraph 6.3.4 of the Cotswold Local Plan states “distance, quality of route, topography and pedestrian safety are important issues when considering the accessibility of services and facilities.” It is considered South Gloucestershire Council should adopt a similar, flexible approach to allow for proportionate, incremental development in rural areas where it would support not only the villages themselves, but neighbouring villages, reflecting the requirements of Paragraph 78 of the NPPF. It will be at this point where the correct reading and interpretation of the DAPs is vital in order to achieve this.</p> <p>6.4 The criteria attached to Policy DS3 provides a ‘safety net’ to ensure development in rural areas respects, conserves and enhances the rural character and</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>appearance of the landscape as well as any other environmental constraints, having regard to flood risk zones and areas containing heritage assets. As such, the policy requires development to be designed to reflect the local character of settlements ensuring the scale of development is proportionate to the size of the settlement. Further, the policy requires the decision-maker to take into account any other recent development of the village to ensure no adverse cumulative impacts are caused from the new development. The rural housing pro-forma required to be completed for any proposals containing two or more dwellings ensures the Applicant provides the level of detail required to ensure the policy requirements of Policy DS3 are met within a Planning Application.</p> <p>6.5 Overall, we consider a similar policy could be contained within the emerging LP to help the Council create sustainable rural villages and settlements without causing any adverse impacts upon the character and form of those villages, nor impacting upon the environmental designations likely to be contained within those areas. To that end, we would like to invite Officers at the Council to discuss the opportunity of implementing such a policy within the emerging LP.</p>	
Theodore Butt Philip - South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Council Group	<p>We are concerned at the number of inaccuracies contained within the DAPs, many of which we know have been reported to the Council, however the accuracy of these is vital in determining the future development of the district and hope that a thorough review of them will be undertaken to ensure their accuracy in advance of the next stage of consultation.</p> <p>Care should be taken in the use of the DAPs. Almost inevitably, new development will be on the edge of existing communities and distances to services will be considerably greater than the central data points used for the DAPs.</p> <p>All this data needs to be constantly and rigorously reviewed to ensure it is up to date for future decision making.</p>	12 Mar 2021
The Tortworth Estate	<p>The importance of the rural Northern arc of South Gloucestershire is key to the Local Plan's success in terms of delivering the District wide approach to redressing any imbalances of the past. In doing so, the relationship and influence of growth within Stroud District to the North must be acknowledged and considered within the Plan's approach to the rural areas. We acknowledge that there are many potential locations for sustainable rural growth and these will be set out in future Local Plan consultation document, so will reserve the opportunity to make further representations at the appropriate juncture.</p> <p>Regarding rural development and the Green Belt, the Tortworth Estate's site interests all lie outside of the Green Belt and therefore present opportunities for sustainable rural growth that would be more straightforward to deliver than those in the Green Belt. We therefore support Strategy Option 1 (Outside the Green Belt). We would also support Strategy Option 2 (Both inside and outside the Green Belt) in the event that there are no other reasonable options for delivering sustainable growth without using Green Belt land (as per the NPPF requirement).</p>	05 Mar 2021
Tom Cotton - Road Haulage Association	No comment.	01 Mar 2021

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
Tony Kerr	No consideration appears to be given to how a sustainable rural village is defined or how a rural village is tested for sustainability. What population is required to serve local facilities such as shops and schools? Broad band connectivity is essential if rural villages are to thrive, and meet needs of residents and businesses.	17 Feb 2021
Trevor James	Encourage local sustainable business practices. More local working to reduce commuting. Create many safe cycling/walking routes between villages and urban areas – a whole network is needed (as seen in Europe).	26 Feb 2021
Tristan Clark - South Gloucestershire Council	To avoid having to build an environmentally calamitous number of new roads/ bypasses it is imperative that South Gloucestershire Council and WECA seriously investigate the potential for reopening numerous former train stations (such as those at Coalpit Heath and Winterbourne). We cannot simultaneously tackle climate change and adopt a laissez-faire approach to building new roads. Reintroduced train stations would not require an identical level of infrastructure; the facilities at each station could be suited to the size of the settlement it serves and its optimal capacity.	01 Mar 2021
Trystan Mabbitt - Hanson UK - Heidelberg Cement Group	No.	18 Mar 2021
Victoria Bailey - Oldbury on Severn Parish Council	Emphasis should be on balancing the demographics and trying to provide homes affordable for young people and suitable for older people to downsize into.	24 Mar 2021
Vistry Group	Please refer to enclosed representations.  Are there any other planning issues you think we should consider?  When determining the level of growth to be directed to a settlement it is important that consideration is given to the funding and delivery of enhanced infrastructure required to support both the existing and increasing population. The quantum of development should be commensurate with the level of investment required to viably and successfully deliver new and improved infrastructure that will significantly benefit both existing and future residents.	06 May 2021
Waddeton Park Ltd - Land at Hicks Common Road	61. As explained above, whilst Climate Change is highlighted throughout the Issues and Approaches document, it is important that this issue is reflected in the approach to the Spatial Strategy as well as how development sites themselves respond through construction. It would be helpful if the Data Area Profiles address Carbon emissions by settlement when travel data, including distance, mode and type are included.	17 May 2021
William Howell	No	23 Feb 2021
William Sharpe-Neal	Do not agree to develop new housing at the land to the west of Thornbury Castle listed as land at Park Mill Farm and Quarry Farm. It will ruin our local community in Kington and damage Thornbury as a historic market town. The area is currently	28 Feb 2021

---

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>User Response: Text</b>	<b>Response Created</b>
	made up of historic listed buildings and beautiful countryside. Such a development would be a disgrace to our history and way of life and should be avoided at all cost.	

Report run at 4 Feb 2022 10:27:15. Total records: 170