
Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: Local Plan 2020

Question: [18: Policies] Do you have any comments on the range and scope of ...

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Adam Mead	<p>Not sure where to put this but there are errors in the Easter Compton DAP</p> <p>i) Dinky Deli closed in 2017. Its successor Dinky Local Store is a convenience store not a comparison store</p> <p>ii) if the approved but not executed housing development is Wyngarth (PT12/2878/F and PT13/0322/F), it has in fact been built</p> <p>iii) Although the employment opportunities on Cribbs Causeway are within 2 km of Easter Compton they are at the top of a long and very steep hill. Very few people are fit enough to cycle up this hill and fewer still would walk up it in rush hour as it has no pavement. If a shared use pavement were installed, care needs to be taken to avoid collisions between pedestrians and cyclists proceeding downhill at speeds of up to 30 mph.</p>	23 Feb 2021
Alan Jones - Hanham & District Greenbelt Conservation Society	<p>The list is not definitive, the majority of the Policies are not drafted nor ratified, so currently meaningless to comment. What is the procedure for consultation/ review/ implementation of these draft new policies - to what programme/timescale?</p> <p>Relating to Issue 16 above, a further Strategic Policy is required - 'How the current character of existing rural settlements would be maintained'.</p> <p>Policy required to 'Exclude WECA enforcing an area wide housing policy', leaving SGC free to establish and plan its own need, whilst meeting the difficulties of protecting the Green Belt.</p>	26 Feb 2021
Alex Child - The Retirement Housing Consortium	<p>A dedicated policy is required that encourages the provision of older persons housing</p>	01 Mar 2021
Amanda Grundy - Natural England	<p>New strategic and non-strategic policies:</p> <p>The list of potential policies does not include a policy relating to Biodiversity net gain. We understand the Council is considering how BNG will be addressed in the Local Plan in the context of the 25 Year Environment Plan and forthcoming Environment Bill. We would welcome further discussion on this matter in due course.</p> <p>We would expect further development of the strategic policy for 'infrastructure and contributions' to take account of comments above on recognising GI as part of essential infrastructure requirements and on the likely need for funding to support mitigation measures for managing effects on designated sites.</p> <p>In terms of policy development, it will be important to consider the value of GI as</p>	30 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>an integrating approach as well as a tangible ‘outcome.’ This could mean that a policy for GI explains how it is delivered through other policies.</p> <p>The Council is also consulting on some new strategic and non-strategic policies, including for Climate Change mitigation and adaptation; Energy Management in new development; Renewable and low Carbon Energy System; Creating well-designed places; NSIPs and related development; Nuclear New Build; and Oldbury A Station - Decommissioning. These all appear reasonable.</p>	
Andrew Rigler	See TRAPPD response.	31 Jan 2021
Andrew Shore	<p>Also need to consider stronger controls & limits, in a given area, on Houses of Multiple Occupancy. Article 4 is needed but also controls (like other authorities do) on volumes in a given area/locality. Conversions of family homes into HMOs is a particular problem, as reduces family homes and results in cramped conditions, insufficient parking, and (especially with student) a change in the character of an area.</p> <p>More focus needs to be placed on community facilities beyond shops, eg. Doctors (seems mentioned but only briefly) but also dentists (which I don’t see mentioned) & other community facilities. Not necessarily all needing to be walkable, but each community needs enough provision of both, which is not currently a sufficient focus of the planning policy.</p> <p>Extent of development within / across a locality needs to be more of a consideration. Too much emphasis on development all within the designated development areas (which then become defined as urban by planning officers, but actually can still contain mix of urban & rural) to ensure certain areas (eg, Stoke Gifford) are not over-developed at the expense of the environment where people have lived with more space & open-ness for many years. Many residents feel that too much development is being focussed into the same small number of areas.</p> <p>Parking provision is not considered properly. Whilst encourage more walking, cycling etc is desirable, the reality is often missed. I.e. that people need cars, frequently multiple cars in a household, even if not used all the time. Years ago cars were often used for much of the day, People often still need their own vehicles but do not use them all the time or every day (eg. Some days working from home, some in the W office). As not used all the time, it places extra demand (not less) on parking provision. By encouraging more public transport, walking, cycling etc then it (in reality) means insufficient car parking is provided as people will not want to give up their flexibility to drive when needed. This must be recognised. Parking space numbers need to be increased per dwelling in many areas. Also garages are too small, need to be larger to make them more usable for their intended purpose.</p> <p>Need to introduce Future Planning, I.e. the planning approach is currently focussed on development control. This results in applications being given permission, where a different application, or considering the future more might lead to a better development or design in the longer run. Or considering how one development may work well (or not) with another, rather than look at each application / piece of land</p>	01 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>on its own. But the planning process & policies needs to be altered to provide for this to happen.</p> <p>More focus need to be out, within your planning policies, on extent of recent development in a given area/locality, so as not to go too far.</p> <p>Also need more emphasis on the individual design of developments, encourage more individuality but also better respect existing dwellings when considering new developments & extensions.</p> <p>Need more focus on open spaces, greenery, trees in the locality of developments. Off-site provision is NOT an adequate alternative.</p> <p>Less consideration of developer claimed benefits to employment and financial contributions to the community. Instead need more focus on non revenue generating facilities (eg.dentists, doctors) and more consideration of living standards, space, traffic etc of existing residents in an area.</p>	
Angela Crabtree	<p>Please see the Trapp'd Response.</p> <p>(Thornbury Residents Against Poorly Planned Development)</p>	28 Feb 2021
Angie Carroll - Parish Council	Please stick to them as they are not at present..	16 Feb 2021
Anne Thomson - Burbank Neighbourhood Watch	No	21 Jan 2021
Annette McLaren	see section 3	28 Feb 2021
Ashfield Land	<p>Question 17: Policies:</p> <p>Yes the scope and range seems suitable.</p> <p>Question 18: Policies:</p> <p>No comments.</p> <p>Do you have any comments on the range and scope of policies we are proposing?</p> <p>7.23 We broadly support the range and scope of policies suggested. We do not have any specific comments on this stage but suggest that policies which will impact developer costs (through, for example, increased renewable energy demands) need to be viability tested throughout the Local Plans process to ensure they are achievable.</p>	31 Mar 2021
ATA Estates (Longwell Green) LLP and	The purpose of the consultation is to discuss the issues, priorities and potential approaches that the new Local Plan might take to manage change and growth within South Gloucestershire. This is confirmed on page 10 of the Consultation	06 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Sovereign Housing Associaton	<p>Document.</p> <p>The list of potential policies on pages 143 – 151 should therefore be regarded as premature, since the issues, priorities and potential approach for the Plan have not been properly considered, let alone decided upon. It is simply too early to decide on the range and scope of policies at this stage.</p> <p>The consideration of any policies should be carried out at the Phase 2 consultation stage in the Plan-making process when the overall strategy for the District will be considered, having regard to the requirements of the SDS. This will enable a more rounded assessment of any draft policies, noting the identified issues and priorities for the District and the approach for the Plan.</p>	
Barrie Hesketh	No	16 Feb 2021
Barwood Development Securities & The North West Thornbury Landowner Consortium	<p>Planning Policies:</p> <p>We support the review of the adopted planning policies contained within the various development plan documents for South Gloucestershire, and recognise the consultation documents reference to the forthcoming changes at the national level.</p> <p>In addition to the forthcoming changes associated with national planning policy and guidance, the Government is also bringing forward national changes to Building Regulations and legislation associated with zero Carbon ready homes, Biodiversity net gain, Broadband provision, and electric vehicular charging. The new Local Plan must accord with national standards and regulations, and it will be necessary to amend these policies as the national position is confirmed.</p> <p>The tables on pages 143 - 151 contain brief details of the range of potential policies being considered by the Authority. This is supported by Appendix 2 which provides draft detailed policy wording for specific new policies. We will comment on the detailed wording of all policies as they are produced, however, within this representation we have limited our comments to those detailed policies contained in Appendix 2.</p>	12 Apr 2021
BDW South West	<p>It is noted, due to the early stage of Local Plan preparation in addition to the WECA SDS, that a number of policies constitute a working title only.</p> <p>In this regard there is little to comment in terms of quantum and potential direction of growth for residential and employment uses.</p> <p>Comments in these regards are provided earlier in this questionnaire to relevant issues, priorities and strategies raised. We shall provide further comments in due course where relevant as preparation of the Local Plan and SDS continues.</p>	19 Apr 2021
Bloor Homes	<p>Planning Policies:</p> <p>6.1 The intention to produce a single development plan with all relevant policies is supported. The recent Planning White Paper (PWP) indicated the intention to streamline Development Management policies – removing the need to repeat</p>	01 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>national policy. The scope of any Local Plan policies will therefore need to be reviewed as the draft Plan progresses. In this regard, we note that the NPPF already confirms that duplication of the Framework through Local Plans is unnecessary (paragraph 16(e)).</p> <p>6.2 Alongside the proposed changes to national planning policy, there are forthcoming regulatory changes which will impact on the Development Management Plan policies – in particular in regard to zero Carbon ready homes, Biodiversity net gain, Broadband provision, and electric vehicle charging. Forthcoming legislation is expected on all of these elements following consultations undertaken over the last few years. This is based upon the Government’s intention of creating a standardised national approach on these elements through changes to the Building Regulations and other wider legislative changes to ensure that the imposition of varied local standards does not undermine the delivery of housing in the short/medium term.</p>	
<p>Bloor Homes South West Ltd - Land at North West Yate</p>	<p>SECTION 8 PLANNING POLICIES:</p> <p>Some Policy Headings have been proposed under three categories – Strategy, Non-Strategic and Area Specific. We do not have specific comments on these at this time, however we reserve the right to comment further on the detailed wording at a later stage. Any policies with prescriptive wording or that place onerous requirements on development need to be very carefully considered and a clear evidence base, including viability testing, be provided. Policy wording needs to be sufficiently precise and detailed to be meaningful but the evidence base underpinning the policy requirement needs to be sufficiently transparent as to clearly set out the reasoned justification for the requirement. Where there are clear national directions on policy then it will be overwhelmingly preferable that this approach is followed, and there are not additional policy requirements imposed on development via planning, when matters are covered by other areas of regulation.</p> <p>Proposed Area Specific Policies:</p> <p>The approach to including specific policies for growth areas is welcomed. However, it is early in the Plan process to be determining the scope of settlements/specific areas that will need specific policies. It could be predetermination to have identified working policy areas before the Building Blocks process has been undertaken and the spatial approach determined. It is also important to be clear whether the area specific policies apply within the existing urban areas identified, or whether they will include adjoining areas capable of accommodating growth at that location. For example, will greenfield sites adjoining existing urban areas be covered by the area specific policies for the areas they adjoin, or the rural area policies?</p>	<p>25 Mar 2021</p>
<p>Bloor Homes South West Ltd - Land at South Farm</p>	<p>SECTION 8 PLANNING POLICIES:</p> <p>Some Policy Headings have been proposed under three categories – Strategy, Non-Strategic and Area Specific. We do not have specific comments on these at this time, however we reserve the right to comment further on the detailed wording at a later stage. Any policies with prescriptive wording or that place onerous</p>	<p>26 Mar 2021</p>

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>requirements on development need to be very carefully considered and a clear evidence base, including viability testing, be provided. Policy wording needs to be sufficiently precise and detailed to be meaningful but the evidence base underpinning the policy requirement needs to be sufficiently transparent as to clearly set out the reasoned justification for the requirement. Where there are clear national directions on policy then it will be overwhelmingly preferable that this approach is followed, and there are not additional policy requirements imposed on development via planning, when matters are covered by other areas of regulation.</p> <p>Proposed Area Specific Policies:</p> <p>The approach to including specific policies for growth areas is welcomed. However, it is early in the Plan process to be determining the scope of settlements/ specific areas that will need specific policies. It could be predetermination to have identified working policy areas before the Building Blocks process has been undertaken and the spatial approach determined. It is also important to be clear whether the area specific policies apply within the existing urban areas identified, or whether they will include adjoining areas capable of accommodating growth at that location. For example, will greenfield sites adjoining existing urban areas be covered by the area specific policies for the areas they adjoin, or the rural area policies?</p>	
Bloor Homes South West Ltd - Land at Wotton Road	<p>Some Policy Headings have been proposed under three categories – Strategy, Non-Strategic and Area Specific. We do not have specific comments on these at this time, however we reserve the right to comment further on the detailed wording at a later stage. Any policies with prescriptive wording or that place onerous requirements on development need to be very carefully considered and a clear evidence base, including viability testing, be provided. Policy wording needs to be sufficiently precise and detailed to be meaningful but the evidence base underpinning the policy requirement needs to be sufficiently transparent as to clearly set out the reasoned justification for the requirement. Where there are clear national directions on policy then it will be overwhelmingly preferable that this approach is followed, and there are not additional policy requirements imposed on development via planning, when matters are covered by other areas of regulation.</p>	20 Apr 2021
Brian Hackland	<p>As this chapter makes clear, these are early days for the development of, and consultation on the planning policies likely to form part of the local plan. Many of my points above are likely to be addressed through the planning policies as these are refined. The inclusion of an extensive list of potential strategic, non-strategic and location-based policies is helpful as an indication of future scope and direction. I will reserve judgement on these, for now, but comment through future consultations as the policies are developed and made public.</p>	26 Feb 2021
Bristol and England Properties (BEP)	<p>We would suggest that the Local Plan should look to avoid the duplication and repetition of policies already set out at a national level.</p> <p>6.2 For example, Paragraphs 143 - 147 of the NPPF provide a clear and concise approach to managing development in the Green Belt. There is no need for a policy which either repeats, or worse, reinterprets these paragraphs.</p>	17 May 2021
Bristol	<p>5.21 In addition, whilst the Society recognises that this current consultation</p>	25 Mar

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Zoological Society	<p>document does not relate to site specific matters, it would wish to explore with the Council the extent to which its growth plans may benefit from inclusion in the Plan making process going forward. The Society would welcome the opportunity of discussing further with the Council the potential merits of either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a criteria based approach to the consideration of proposals for visitor and tourist attractions; • a site specific policy relating to the future development opportunity and investment at the Society’s land holdings in South Gloucestershire. <p>5.22 The Society recognises the significance associated with the Green Belt within South Gloucestershire and the issues raised within the consultation document. It is noted that within the context of the emerging Combined Authority’s Spatial Development Strategy, the current consultation strategy envisages the potential need to undertake a strategic review of the Green Belt to accommodate its development needs. The issues raised by the Society’s investment in its South Gloucestershire site are certainly of that scale and as previously noted Planning Permission has already been granted for master planning proposals, albeit with significant elements of the approved plans not yet implemented. Within this context, there may be merit as the Plan making process gets more site specific in considering whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • given the existing development on site and that already planned, the extent to which the site fulfils the NPPF’s purposes of including land within the Green Belt and whether it should be removed from that designation as part of the strategic review contemplated with the consultation document; • if the site is retained in the Green Belt it should be treated as a “major developed site” as already seen elsewhere in South Gloucestershire as subject to separate specific policy criteria or treated under the approach advocated in paragraph 89 of the NPPF where the “partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites“ is treated as an exception to otherwise inappropriate development; • irrespective of the Green Belt status of the site, there is a site specific policy supporting further investment in its future as a major tourist and visitor attraction within the context of national, regional and local policy highlighted above. <p>5.23 Under either scenario, the Plan would benefit from the sort of criteria based policy to support proposals for tourism and visitor attractions - this and any site specific policy should reasonably look at the potential benefits of mixed use development and/or enabling development.</p> <p>5.24 In looking at the range of potential policies on pages 143 - 151 the Society would in short suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a need for a strategic policy or policies in respect of “employment, retail, leisure and other commercial development” to meet the needs of the NPPF and this should explicitly address the needs of the tourism and visitor economy; 	2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a need for criteria based policy on proposals for tourism and the visitor development proposals and it is unclear from the “Local Plan 2020 Working Policy title” or “Emerging Local Plan Priority” descriptions where this might sit; • there may well be benefit in a site specific policy relating to the Society’s major tourist attraction. 	
Caroline Phillips	<p>Extensive, but requires further detailed policies for each to ensure this is fully reflective.</p> <p>Policies should be challenging to developers to provide a high standard of desirable eco-friendly housing, and commercial premises with supporting infrastructures. All with open green surrounding areas in the shape of open gardens or parks.</p>	12 Mar 2021
Cate Davidson - Sodbury Town Council	<p>Protecting the environment that we live in is so important that this should be a strategic policy in its own right. This policy needs to set out ways in which the local plan will improve the environment, protect and encourage wildlife, increase biodiversity, increase tree cover, etc. It should set ambitious targets which have an equal priority with those for housing and employment. Avoiding damaging the environment is no longer enough, we must now take positive steps to restore it.</p>	03 Mar 2021
Catherine Graham	<p>the policies need to be more specific and accountable and each planning application investigated thoroughly in the context of all alternative development proposals so that growth in housings planned and sustainable at all times unlike previously.</p>	08 Feb 2021
CEG and the Charfield Landowners Consortium (CEGCLC)	<p>Please see accompanying covering letter.</p>	23 Apr 2021
Charlcombe Estates	<p>Must ensure that development is not made unviable by imposing too many requirements.</p>	04 Mar 2021
Chris Rich - Mizmo Communications Ltd	<p>The delivery of Junction 18A (and associated development) should be included within the Strategic Travel policy of the Local Plan, to reflect the Council’s adopted policy as set out in JLTP4.</p>	11 Mar 2021
Christina Biggs - Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways	<p>We are very concerned that S Glos has failed to prioritise siting development at existing rail stations or potential rail stations on existing passenger or freight lines. The evidence is that this will put more cars on the road and cause further gridlock to North Bristol. It seems irresponsible to plan this level of development with so little consideration of existing public transport links and rail in particular.</p> <p>Evidence collected by the Centre for Cities indicates that road traffic levels in September 2020, during Covid, bounced back to higher than pre-Covid traffic levels, particularly in Bristol. This evidence was presented to the WECA Scrutiny transport sub-group in the autumn of 2020.</p> <p>The evidence is that rail travel has the lowest carbon footprint and causes the highest uplift in land value. Rail services do not only take passengers off the road but also transport cycles and light freight and disabled passengers, and stations can</p>	27 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	become rail-bus heads and a focus for car hire and walking. Britain and the Bristol area in particular have many local rail stations that young people like to use. S Glos will attract many more younger people by having adequate rail links.	
Chris Willmore - Yate Town Council	<p>Pages 137 to 199 – Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note that there aren't currently draft working policies for many of these strategic policies – so we expect to be consulted again once these are available, as the devil will be in the detail. • The same is true in relation to the Non-Strategic Policies - we need to see the draft wording before we can comment. 	16 Mar 2021
Clara Goss - Redrow Homes Ltd	<p>It is noted that the SGLP2020 proposes to contain both strategic and non-strategic policies.</p> <p>The WECA SDS will also contain strategic policies that will apply to South Gloucestershire. It will be necessary to ensure that both sets of strategic policies dovetail and that there is no inconsistency between strategic policies in the WECA SDS and the SGLP2020 for the purposes of decision making.</p> <p>Paragraph 22 of the NPPF states that;</p> <p>"Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure."</p> <p>Given the WECA SDS is stated as having a Plan period of 20 years the need for the SGLP2020 to also have a 20 year Plan period is reiterated to ensure conformity in Plan making and certainty for local communities.</p> <p>All policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence and should be locally specific avoiding the duplication of national planning policy guidance.</p> <p>It will also be necessary for all policies to be subject to whole Plan viability testing.</p>	26 Apr 2021
Clifton Homes (SW) Ltd	<p>Please see accompanying representations referenced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 482 A3 CC 250221 FINAL Local Plan Reps – Land North of Haw Lane, Olveston. 	24 Mar 2021
Colin Gardner - TRAPP'D	No comment.	15 Mar 2021
Crest Nicholson South West Ltd	It is considered too early at this stage to review and comment fully on any policies but CNSW welcome the opportunity to do so at a later date when the emerging SDS has been published and the next stage of the Local Plan has been prepared.	15 Mar 2021
Crest Nicholson South West Ltd - Land at Harry Stoke/East of	<p>Planning Policies:</p> <p>We support the review of the adopted planning policies contained within the various development plan documents for South Gloucestershire, and recognise the</p>	12 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Harry Stoke (South)	<p>consultation documents reference to the forthcoming changes at the national level.</p> <p>In addition to the forthcoming changes associated with national planning policy and guidance, the Government is also bringing forward national changes to Building Regulations and legislation associated with zero Carbon ready homes, Biodiversity net gain, Broadband provision, and electric vehicular charging. The new Local Plan must accord with national standards and regulations, and it will be necessary to amend these policies as the national position is confirmed.</p> <p>The tables on pages 143 - 151 contain brief details of the range of potential policies being considered by the Authority. This is supported by Appendix 2 which provides draft detailed policy wording for specific new policies. We will comment on the detailed wording of all policies as they are produced, however, within this document we have limited our comments to those detailed policies contained in Appendix 2.</p>	
Dan Erben - Thornbury Market Garden	Detailed in answers above.	23 Feb 2021
Daphne Dunning - Pucklechurch Parish Council	<p>Yes – PPC would like to see more robust policies put in place relevant to change of use from agricultural land to equestrian and more specific detail with reference to horse-keep that also takes account of cumulative effects on landscape character. This would warrant a SPD in its own right.</p> <p>Of 69 proposed policies and only 8 can be seen.</p> <p>Extensive, but a policy for each will ensure this is fully reflective.</p>	08 Apr 2021
David George	Residents parking schemes that charge on the recognition of high impact vehicles. Limits to commercial vehicle parking	15 Feb 2021
David Hathaway	The impact of construction is not considered. Consideration should be given when the cost of the construction phase is comparable to the overall benefit of the development, or when changes can be made to reduce the cost of development.	27 Feb 2021
David Heape	<p>Extensive, but requires further detailed policies for each to ensure this is fully reflective.</p> <p>Policies should be challenging to developers to provide a high standard of desirable eco-friendly housing, and commercial premises with supporting infrastructures. All with open green surrounding areas in the shape of open gardens or parks.</p>	12 Mar 2021
David Redgewell - South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside	<p>We would like to see stronger policy on Tourism with the Growth of Tourist Attractions such as Aerospace Bristol, Wild Place, Bristol Zoo, The Wave and regeneration of Kingswood historic town centre.</p> <p>A review of parking standards and charging for car parking to cover maintenance costs.</p> <p>Policy on Park and Ride site around the North and East of the city of Bristol.</p> <p>Electric charging points.</p>	28 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>HMO policy around The University of the West of England, Filton, Patchway, Chiswick and Lockleaze.</p> <p>Policy on Active travel.</p> <p>Liveable neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Mass rapid transit lights railway system.</p> <p>The lack of parking policy allows pavements parking in the Kingswood former Borough Council area with lack of Drop kerbs and castle kerbs at bus stops.</p> <p>There also needs to be a policy to develop public toilets facilities in Town centres, shopping centres with disabled access and changing place especially alongside the Bristol and Bath cycle way and at Severn Beach.</p> <p>Additional Comments sent to us by email, on Monday 1st March 2021, as per the below:</p> <p>We need to more traveller sites in the County.</p>	
Debbie Johnson	More time required to digest policies.	26 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"> Emersons Green Town Council does not agree with the draft Parking Standards Policy. 	01 Mar 2021
Edward Ware Homes	<p>6.1 For the sake of brevity we have not commented in detail on this matter. However, we would suggest that the Local Plan should look to avoid the duplication and repetition of policies already set out at a national level.</p>	05 May 2021
Ellandi LLP On Behalf of Crestbridge Corporate Trustees Ltd and Crestbridge T...	<p>We support the development of an area based policy that is specific to Yate. This should include bespoke/focused policy criteria that recognise Yate's latent potential for transformational change.</p> <p>The policies should provide guiding principles for the key moves required to deliver the vision for Yate which is emerging through the Town Improvement Plan and the Placemaking Report at Appendix 1.0 to these representations.</p> <p>The key moves in terms of infrastructure delivery are described in our response to Question 5. However, there will be additional design principles drawn from the emerging masterplanning work for the "island" site and Yate Riverside. For example, the building up of heights to mid-rise alongside taller elements within the</p>	05 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>centre of the site, key axial routes and provision of linking squares, flexibility of ground plane uses to secure a wider range of services and activities, integral green and blue infrastructure as part of the public realm and a move to reduced parking over the delivery phases as active travel becomes more prevalent.</p> <p>Yate specific design codes will need to be developed which do not stifle architectural creativity and also recognise that separation distances in urban areas should be different to suburban layouts and also that there is an opportunity to secure a balance between private and public amenity space requirements where new public realm is integral to the transformation of the Town Centre.</p> <p>Finally, there must be flexibility on the types of residential accommodation that could be provided within the masterplan area. Higher density development in the form of apartments/mid-density development with taller elements lends itself to easy adaptation for many different residential occupiers. The place making exercise that has commenced for Yate has the potential to create new markets over time that are currently under-represented/not provided for. Policy must therefore retain flexibility around the levels of affordable housing/open space/amenity space requirements for these different types of accommodation. For example, later living accommodation/extra care will have different amenity and affordable standards to a build to rent model but both types of accommodation could very well be viable in Yate in the future.</p>	
Emma Jarvis	<p>A planning policy needs to be added to protect of our best and good agricultural land. Does this come under PSP28 Supporting the Rural Economy, this is not clear? We are a rural farming county and cannot destroy this important asset of our heritage. Impact on the best and good agricultural land is a consideration. 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	<p>See attached representations.</p> <p>Policies and Draft Policies (Questions 17 – 34):</p> <p>The development of new and ambitious policy measures must meet the objectives and deliver against the priorities as set out in the Local Plan 2020 Phase 1 Issues and Approaches document. The development of new policies needs to be robustly evidenced and the impacts on adoption needs to be fully understood whilst being forward-looking and ambitious. Any new policy measures need to be based upon a robust evidence base to be found ‘sound’ (according to Paragraph 31 of the NPPF). This should include an assessment of their impact upon viability; both on an individual site level and on a whole-Plan basis. As such, we reserve the right to comment further following a review of the policy supporting evidence base.</p>	26 Apr 2021
Gareth Jackson - Alder King	<p>It is considered too early at this stage to review and comment fully on any policies but we welcome the opportunity to do so at a later date when the emerging SDS has been published and the next stage of the Local Plan has been prepared.</p>	19 Mar 2021
Gary Parsons -	<p>1. need to protect playing fields and places for formal sport and informal recreation.</p>	11 Feb

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Sport England	<p>2. promote new places for playing fields and places for formal sport and informal recreation.</p> <p>3. need to provide good design in development (new/regeneration): as in Active Design on SE website</p> <p>1. Activity for all Neighbourhoods, facilities and open spaces should be accessible to all users and should support sport and physical activity across all ages. Enabling those who want to be active, whilst encouraging those who are inactive to become active.</p> <p>2. Walkable communities Homes, schools, shops, community facilities, workplaces, open spaces and sports facilities should be within easy reach of each other. Creating the conditions for active travel between all locations</p> <p>3. Connected walking & cycling routes All destinations should be connected by a direct, legible and integrated network of walking and cycling routes. Routes must be safe, well lit, overlooked, welcoming, wellmaintained, durable and clearly signposted. Active travel (walking and cycling) should be prioritised over other modes of transport. Prioritising active travel through safe, integrated walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>4. Co-location of community facilities The co-location and concentration of retail, community and associated uses to support linked trips should be promoted. A mix of land uses and activities should be promoted that avoid the uniform zoning of large areas to single uses. Creating multiple reasons to visit a destination, minimising the number and length of trips and increasing the awareness and convenience of opportunities to participate in sport and physical activity.</p> <p>5. Network of Multifunctional Open Space A network of multifunctional open space should be created across all communities (existing and proposed) to support a range of activities including sport, recreational and play and other landscape features including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), woodland, wildlife habitat and productive landscapes (allotments, orchards). Facilities for sport, recreation and play should be of an appropriate scale, positioned in prominent locations, co-located with other appropriate uses whilst ensuring appropriate relationships with neighbouring uses. Providing multifunctional spaces opens up opportunities for sport and physical</p>	2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>activity and has numerous wider benefits.</p> <p>6. High Quality Streets and Spaces Flexible and durable high quality streets and public spaces should be promoted, employing high quality durable materials, street furniture and signage. Well designed streets and spaces support and sustain a broader variety of users and community activities</p> <p>7. Appropriate Infrastructure Supporting infrastructure to enable sport and physical activity to take place should be provided across all contexts including workplaces, sports facilities and public space, to facilitate all forms of activity. Providing and facilitating access to facilities and other infrastructure to enable all members of society to take part in sport and physical activity.</p> <p>8. Active Buildings The internal and external layout, design and use of buildings should promote opportunities for physical activity. Providing opportunities for activity inside and around buildings</p> <p>9. Management, maintenance, monitoring & evaluation The management, long-term maintenance and viability of sports facilities and public spaces should be considered in their design. Monitoring and evaluation should be used to assess the success of Active Design initiatives and to inform future directions to maximise activity outcomes from design interventions. A high standard of management, maintenance, monitoring and evaluation is essential to ensure the long-term desired functionality of all spaces.</p> <p>10. Activity Promotion & Local Champions Promoting the importance of participation in sport and physical activity as a means of improving health and wellbeing should be supported. Health promotion measures and local champions should be supported to inspire participation in sport and physical activity across neighbourhoods, workplaces and facilities. Physical measures need to be matched by community and stakeholder ambition, leadership and engagement.</p>	
Gerrit Rollema	Again over 100 policies, and 1 question to say yes or no... stupid.	10 Dec 2020
Hannah Saunders -	Pages 137 to 199 – Policies:	25 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Dodington Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members reviewed this section on Strategic/Non-Strategic Policies. • They were pleased to see the new Strategic Policy regarding how they are going to tackle Climate Change introduced. • They note that there aren't currently draft working policies for many of these strategic policies – so expect to be consulted again once these are available. • With regards to the Non-Strategic Policies they agreed with the inclusion of the 6 new policies.... in particular the Urban Living, Digital Connectivity and Broadband and Energy Management in new Development. • As with the strategic policies they noted that there aren't currently draft working policies for many of the non-strategic policies – so expect to be consulted again in the future. 	
Hannick Homes	It is important to ensure that the development is not made unviable by imposing too many requirements.	25 Mar 2021
Helen Johnstone - Stroud District Council	<p>Strategic policies: SDC would suggest a wider remit for Strategic Policy 2, promoting healthy and inclusive communities alongside Green Infrastructure (GI), to support proposed non-strategic policies relating to health impact assessments and inclusive design.</p> <p>SDC would suggest Strategic Policy 6 includes specific reference to affordable housing provision</p> <p>Non-strategic policies: 19 SDC suggest that the scope of the policy should include reference to geodiversity together with consideration of wider ecological networks and delivery to Building with Nature or equivalent standards.</p> <p>23 & 29 SDC suggest that the scope of the policies should include reference to accessibility to GI, open space and sport and recreation facilities for all, including support for the provision of Changing Places toilets.</p> <p>SDC support coordinated cross boundary consideration of the location and provision of GI, open space and sport and recreation facilities adjoining Stroud District. Stroud District Council would welcome the opportunity to work with South Gloucestershire Council to explore these opportunities as the Plan is developed.</p> <p>42 – 46 SDC suggest that provision of first-time/ entry level homes and community-led housing initiatives should be included in these policies.</p> <p>51 SDC support a wider policy remit to include the protection of other key community facilities/ services such as individual and village shops and other community uses.</p>	26 Feb 2021
IM Land	65. IM Land broadly supports the range and scope of policies that are presented, but in the context of the submissions above, there is a need for policies on Climate	11 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Change to recognise the role the Spatial Strategy will play in address the declared emergency.</p> <p>66. We would like to raise concerns about the complexity and prescriptive nature of some policies that could have a counterproductive effect on innovation and choice for the development industry.</p> <p>67. It is also important that each of the policies are underpinned by a clear evidence base, do not give rise to duplication and form part of a whole Plan viability appraisal to ensure they support positive growth delivery.</p>	
IM Land Limited	Please see enclosed submission.	26 Mar 2021
Ivywell Capital (IC)	6.2 For example, Paragraphs 143 - 147 of the NPPF provide a clear and concise approach to managing development in the Green Belt. There is no need for a policy which either repeats, or worse, reinterprets these paragraphs.	17 May 2021
James Carpenter - Falfield Parish Council	<p>Yes.</p> <p>A planning policy needs to be added to give weighting to protection of our best and good agricultural land. 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>	14 Apr 2021
Jenny Raggett - Transport for New Homes	<p>A much clearer policy on the importance of public transport and spatial planning is needed, identifying very clearly where new development will be dependant on much improved public transport including new railway stations and services.</p> <p>New railway stations and mass transit need to zappear on the Propsals Map so that it is possible to see how places will work with modal shift happening not just on paper. Cross-boundary working and the coordination with a modern integrated transport network for Greater Bristol is essential.</p>	01 Mar 2021
John Acton	They seem comprehensive.	26 Mar 2021
John Brimacombe	Policies often good in principle but execution lacking, eg supporting infrastructure, transport, shops, health services.	28 Feb 2021
John Mills - Cotswolds Conservation Board	<p>The range and scope of the policies being proposed appears to be appropriate. However, we have comments to make on a couple of specific issues.</p> <p>Landscape-led approach to development in the Cotswolds National Landscape and its setting</p> <p>We acknowledge that the consultation document proposes that the Local Plan will include a non-strategic policy on 'Protecting Our Landscapes'. However, as outlined in response Question 5, we recommend that one of the priorities for the Local Plan should be to take a landscape-led approach to development in the Cotswolds National Landscape and its setting. As such, we recommend that there should a strategic policy specifically to address this issue.</p>	16 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Nature Recovery Networks</p> <p>We acknowledge that the consultation document proposes that the Local Plan will include a non-strategic policy on ‘Designated Biodiversity Sites & Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity’. However, the proposed policies do not appear to explicitly address the issue of nature recovery networks.</p> <p>Nature recovery networks are likely to become one of the main Local Plan-based mechanisms for halting and reversing ongoing declines in biodiversity. As such, we consider that nature recovery networks merit a strategic policy specifically to address this issue.</p>	
Jonathan Edwardes - Pilning and Severn Beach Parish Council	<p>Additional comments sent by email on Monday 1st March 2021 -</p> <p>We endorse the comments submitted by FoSBR in relation to rail proposals relating to Pilning, Severn Beach and Henbury Loop.</p> <p>Strategic transport, in particular commuting road traffic from Charlton Hayes to Severnside, should be planned for in order to reduce the impact on our rural villages.</p>	26 Feb 2021
Kate Kelliher	<p>Assume there will be a contraction in housing need because of Brexit. It would be nice to have scope to house some refugees with their various skills. Thinking in particular of the Syrian guy in the outer Isles who has built such a great reputation doing upholstery in the local Harris Tweed. We could have something like that.</p>	31 Jan 2021
Katherine Adair - UK Green Building Council	<p>UKGBC agree that climate change, green infrastructure, energy management and sustainability measures should be included in the range of new policies proposed.</p>	17 Mar 2021
Kevin Masters	<p>I have read Trapp'd's response and wish to add my name to it.</p>	25 Feb 2021
Laurence Parsons	<p>The policies are sound in principle, but they need to be adhered to.</p>	17 Dec 2020
Lauren Cook - Stride Treglown	<p>Land within the control of the university associated with the Frenchay campus is covered by three separate planning policy designations/allocations through the existing Development Plan. A map overlaying the separate policy designations was supplied within the Land Promotion Report submitted to South Gloucestershire Council as part of the call for sites in October 2020.</p> <p>The Core Strategy was adopted in December 2013 and Policy CS28 relates specifically to development at UWE Frenchay Campus. The supporting proposals map identifies all land, except the 11 hectares of former Hewlett Packard land as forming part of the Policy CS28 UWE allocation.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS12 allocates all land within the control of the university to the west of the historic campus as ‘land safeguarded for economic development’.</p>	01 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>South Gloucestershire’s Policies, Sites and Places Plan: Part 2 was adopted in November 2017 and through Policy PSP47 allocates the majority of the undeveloped land to the west of the main campus for a 21,700 seater sports stadium, ancillary and educational facilities. This is reflective of the planning permission secured by the university in 2013 for this development.</p> <p>South Gloucestershire Council’s Development Plan has sought to respond to the changing nature of the Frenchay Campus overtime with allocations in existence that relate to the use of land as a university, the safeguarding of land for economic development and the provision of a sports stadium. However, these extant planning policies that relate to the campus estate do not now accurately reflect either the extent of land ownership or the future aspirations of the university. The need to comprehensively update the policy framework for the Frenchay campus, including its undeveloped land is acknowledged at page 97 of the Local Plan consultation document.</p> <p>It is therefore expected that the policy framework specific to UWE would include explicit reference within the area specific policy that will be developed with the working title ‘Planning for the North Fringe of the Bristol Urban Area’ as well as a site specific policy for the campus as a whole, including the undeveloped parcel of land which presents the opportunity to being forward a significant mixed use Urban Lifestyles development.</p> <p>On Page 98 it is identified that the university campus is ‘difficult to access from surrounding communities because of poor walking and cycling legibility and route-quality.’ The university is committed to enabling enhanced connectivity between the campus and surrounding neighbourhoods. The university notes this comment, however, it is necessary to remain mindful that the campus is a private estate with defined public access. UWE Bristol would seek to enhance connectivity in the context of future development within the campus in collaboration with the Council and other local partners.</p>	
Lesley Brown	Local Plan 2020 Phase 2 - Planning policies #####	15 Feb 2021
Liz Pickering - Department for Education	19. We also request a reference within the Local Plan’s policies or supporting text to explain that developer contributions may be secured retrospectively, when it has been necessary to forward fund infrastructure projects in advance of anticipated housing growth. An example of this would be the Local Authority’s expansion of a Secondary School to ensure that places are available in time to support development coming forward. This helps to demonstrate that the Plan is positively prepared and deliverable over its period.	26 Mar 2021
Louise Powell - Thornbury Town Council	<p>The approach needs to strategically balance housing development with employment areas. This should include specific areas of flood risk where appropriate development could be built such as the Avonside, Severnside, Avonmouth employment areas.</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan should not be driving the development areas, instead the areas should be developed to balance employment and housing in a sustainable way</p>	08 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	with transport plans being reviewed accordingly.	
Mactaggart & Mickel - Frampton Cotterell	Must ensure that development is not made unviable by imposing too many requirements.	07 Apr 2021
Mactaggart & Mickel Homes England Ltd	See attached representations. 3.29 The development of new and ambitious policy measures are required to meet the objectives and to deliver against the priorities as set out in the Local Plan 2020 Phase 1 Issues and Approaches document. Whilst being forward looking and ambitious, the development of new policies needs to be robustly evidenced and the impacts on adoption needs to be fully understood. Any new policy measures need to be based upon a robust evidence base to be found 'sound' (in accordance with Paragraph 31 of the NPPF), and this should include an assessment of their cumulative impacts upon viability; both on an individual site level and on a whole-Plan basis.	05 May 2021
Mactaggart & Mickel - Pilning	Must ensure that development is not made unviable by imposing further requirements.	25 Mar 2021
Margaret Haynes	The policies seem excellent and well thought-through. My concern is that despite the SGC plan seeming comprehensive and sensible, the reality in recent years has been that speculative developments seem to gain planning approval very easily (in the case of Wickwar, there have been two large developments in recent years, with another speculative application about to be lodged). It is hard to see how the development in Wickwar is anything other than contrary to the issues and policies raised in the plan (in terms of sustainability, transport, protecting the environment, conserving the rural nature of villages etc) - and yet they have nonetheless been approved. Our hope is that SGC will indeed follow through the principles and priorities stated in the plan, and will therefore reject speculative planning applications which do not conform to it (I am thinking particularly of the current application in Wickwar from Crest Nicholson, but this is no doubt only one example of the applications that will continue to be submitted) and focus on encouraging / approving housing development that is in line with your policies.	27 Feb 2021
Martyn Hall	The travellers part I don't agree with since they are non law abiding non tax paying and don't deserve any rights - you need to increase policing and laws to move them on . Gipsies are the only true people who deserve rights	26 Feb 2021
Matt Griffith - Business West	76. We are supportive of the new policy topic creation of "Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation" to support and reinforce the climate and sustainability aims of the Local Plan. 77. We are also particularly interested in the details of the strategic policies: "New Homes for the Plan Period" (existing CS15), "Providing land for Economic Development" (existing CS11), Strategic travel and transport Schemes (existing CS7, PSP13, PSP14, PSP15) and Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects	25 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>(existing CS36).</p> <p>78. On the non-strategic side, policies that are of foremost importance for our members are: “Pollution and mitigation” (existing PSP21), “Development in the Green Belt” (existing PSP7), Planning for Affordable Housing (existing CS18), “Digital Connectivity & Broadband,” “Sustainable Travel and Access” (existing CS8, PSP11) and “Walking and Cycling Networks” (existing PSP10).</p> <p>79. Lastly, we welcome and look forward to reading the updated policies on Area Specific Planning for the North Fringe of Bristol Urban Area (existing CS25, CS26, CS27) and for the East Fringe of Bristol Urban Area (existing CS29).</p>	
Matthew McCollom	The principles are sound. The manner of implementation is the key.	28 Feb 2021
Maurice Wayne	No	08 Feb 2021
Michael Wilberforce - Bristol City Council	<p>Bristol City Council notes that a policy on strategic travel and transport schemes is among the strategic policies it is proposed to consult on at a later stage. Bristol City Council emphasises the need for this policy to address cross-boundary transport considerations and proposals such as the need for a Park and Ride on the M32 Corridor.</p> <p>The South Gloucestershire Local Plan will also require policies to ensure that the local transport impacts of development proposals, including impacts on Bristol, are managed in a way that provides for sustainable travel and highway safety.</p>	26 Mar 2021
Michelle Greaves	need to go further - more environmental intentions	03 Feb 2021
Mr. A. D. England	<p>Please see enclosed submission.</p> <p>8.1 Whilst we are supportive of the new Climate Change and energy measures proposed, it is recommended that a consistent approach is adopted across the region to provide developers with certainty. Any new policy measures need to be based upon a proportionate evidence base to be found ‘sound’ and this should include an assessment of their impact upon viability; both on an individual site level and on a whole-Plan basis to ensure that other policy aspirations are not unduly impacted (e.g. affordable housing).</p> <p>8.2 Viability will be a key issue in determining the soundness of the Local Plan 2020. The viability of individual developments and Plan policies should be tested at the Plan making stage. Without a robust approach to viability assessment, land will be withheld from the market and housing delivery will be threatened, leading to an unsound Plan and housing delivery targets not being met. This will be particularly important in the aftermath of uncertainties caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit. This further lends support for the identification of deliverable sites when allocating housing land, such as that proposed at land South of Gloucester Road, Cope Park and Crantock Drive and West of the M4.</p>	29 Mar 2021
Mr. Blake -	Said it all above	17 Feb

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Oldland Parish Council		2021
Neil Oviatt	<p>I think you should protect the Lanes around market towns and prevent large scale estates being developed,</p> <p>Animal highways should be developed around these lanes , woodland planted with incentives for small land owners rather than the current incentive for them of selling to a developer..</p> <p>Take Crossways Lane in Thornbury; you would be far better to offer greater incentives for these home owners to plant woodland and build 1 house per acre than allow mass density build that no-one sees longevity in.</p> <p>You talk of Densisty which always means putting as many houses as possible on a site! People with a choice do not want a dense neighbourhood</p>	30 Nov 2020
Newland Homes - Land at Aust Road	<p>6.1 For the sake of brevity, we have not commented in detail on this matter. However, we would suggest that the Local Plan should look to avoid the duplication and repetition of policies already set out at a national level.</p> <p>6.2 For example, Paragraphs 143 - 147 of the NPPF provide a clear and concise approach to managing development in the Green Belt. There is no need for a policy which either repeats, or worse, reinterprets these paragraphs.</p>	14 May 2021
Newland Homes - Land West of The B4061 Bristol Road	<p>6.1 For the sake of brevity, we have not commented in detail on this matter. However, we would suggest that the Local Plan should look to avoid the duplication and repetition of policies already set out at a national level.</p> <p>6.2 For example, Paragraphs 143 - 147 of the NPPF provide a clear and concise approach to managing development in the Green Belt. There is no need for a policy which either repeats, or worse, reinterprets these paragraphs.</p>	13 May 2021
Nicholas Small - Stagecoach West	<p>Within the scope of these representations, we do not intend to comment on any emerging ‘development management’ policies at this stage of the Plan-making process. In many respects this would be premature pending a much clearer view of how Government intends to implement any changes on which it consulted in August 2020 as a part of the Planning for the Future White Paper Consultation.</p> <p>However could well take the opportunity to consider and respond to additional detail as and when it is set out within future rounds of consultation.</p>	01 Mar 2021
Nick Woodward	<p>In principle, an integrated approach of housing, combined with easy, carbon neutral, access to employment, healthcare, education and leisure is essential. Road congestion is becoming a huge issue, so the close people live to services the less they will rely upon the car.</p>	28 Feb 2021
Nicola O'Connell	No comment	27 Feb 2021
North Thornbury Landowners Consortium	None.	29 Apr 2021
Patrick Williams	A policy is needed on knowing when to stop developing on green field sites.	09 Mar

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Continual urban growth is not an option and may not actually be needed. More emphasis on reuse of land, and changing the use of buildings, recognising the impact of Brexit and more Internet based operations and protecting rural areas and the environment.</p> <p>The policies proposed cover the range of topics expected, except one. Policy of decline in a reducing GDP environment.</p> <p>The policy on Green Belt must focus on how to extend it to protect communities that are not currently within it, such as Thornbury, Yate and Chipping Sodbury.</p> <p>In the planning process too much emphasis is given to the Developers as opposed to the communities they impact. The planning process has become undemocratic, valid objections ignored etc. In my experience having attended planning meetings in this area Urban Councillors in Staple Hill, Kingswood etc have the right to impact rural areas that they do not represent and fundamentally show very little care or respect for. This has to stop. Development decisions must have a much greater emphasis on those local Councils and communities that will be directly impacted and can make valid judgments based on knowledge and experience and working with the local residents they represent.</p>	2021
Paula Evans - Rangeworthy Parish Council	Listen to the local opinion of people who know the “lie of the land”. We are not ‘NIMBY’s’ but are attuned to how people feel about local planning issues within our community. It is very frustrating to have our reasoning dismissed at the stroke of a pen. It makes Parish Councils look very ineffectual when we are trying our very best to protect our environments.	26 Feb 2021
Paul Cottington - National Farmers Union	The key policies for agriculture are as yet undefined.	15 Feb 2021
Pauline and Richard Wilson	<p>These are all very commendable but too generalised in the main. It needs specific practical ideas on how each policy is to be achieved. Saying the same thing under heading ‘Emerging Local Plan priorities’ for example, ‘achieving sustainable travel ad transport’ doesn’t help and shows a lack of forethought.</p> <p>It is noted that Appendix 1 - Green Belt has been missed out of this Questionnaire. Yet for a number of residents this is probably one of the most contentious issues and therefore policy. The Appendix even includes two options of type of approach to development and one would therefore assume some comment is required as to which is the best approach.</p> <p>Appendix 1 Page 156 Option 1 Schedule ancient monuments: Old Sodbury hillfort, Hinton hillfort and battle site are both scheduled ancient monuments and should be on the list.</p>	25 Feb 2021
Persimmon Homes Severn Valley	Please see attached document.	11 May 2021
Peter Box	I dispute the range and scope proposed: South Gloucestershire should concentrate on providing housing where and only where people are able to work with minimum	23 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	travel.	
Peter Rawlinson - Gleeson Strategic Land	<p>Gleeson does not have any specific comments on the range and scope of policies proposed but it does point out that any requirement to meet certain standards should also be in accordance with the Building Regulations and should avoid any unnecessary duplication of these.</p> <p>Careful consideration will also need to be given to the ability of new developments to remain viable whilst meeting proposed standards. The NPPF paragraph 34 sets out that policy requirements for the provision of infrastructure such as education, health, transport, flood and water management, green and digital infrastructure should not undermine the deliverability of the Plan. If a proposed standard is not viable then there is risk that new development either does not come forward or it does at the cost of something else, such as reduced Affordable Housing. This is especially important in the urban areas of the District where development on previously developed land is often more expensive. If sites are unable to meet a policy standard and cannot come forward this will also negatively impact the Council's housing delivery in future years.</p>	10 Mar 2021
Progress Land Ltd	No.	11 May 2021
Rebecca Woodward	In principle an integrated approach of housing combined with easy, carbon neutral, access to employment, healthcare, education and leisure is essential. Road congestion is becoming a huge issue so the closer people live to services the less they will travel by car.	28 Feb 2021
Redcliffe Homes	Must ensure that development is not made unviable by imposing too many requirements.	04 Mar 2021
Redcliffe Homes	No comments.	01 Jun 2021
Redrow Homes (SW)	<p>Please see enclosed representations.</p> <p>5.1 We note the consideration of the new planning policies that the Local Plan 2020 may contained set out at pages 138 - 151 of the consultation document. We agree that there is an opportunity to reconsider the detailed planning policy framework for the SGC area to react to changing factors such as the Climate Change emergency and the need to support existing communities and businesses following the COVID-19 pandemic and its related recession.</p> <p>5.2 We have examined the emerging proposed strategic and non-strategic policies and do not disagree with the general scope of policies that are being proposed. We have also seen and read the draft policies that the Phase 1 Plan provides, and have comments in relation to the following:</p>	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

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Richard Lloyd	No comment	03 Mar 2021
Robert Harris - Olveston Parish Council	No	26 Feb 2021
Robert Hitchins Ltd and Harrow Estates PLC	<p>Please see enclosed submission.</p> <p>Whilst supportive of the new Climate Change and energy measures proposed, we would advocate that a consistent approach is adopted nationally across the West of England to provide developers with greater certainty. Any new policy measures need to be based upon a proportionate evidence base which is deemed to be ‘sound’ and this should include an assessment of their impact upon viability; both on an individual site level and on a whole-Plan basis to ensure that other policy aspirations are not unduly impacted (e.g. affordable housing).</p>	01 Jun 2021
Roger Hall	See TRAPP'D response.	25 Feb 2021
Rohan Torkildsen - Historic England	We also welcome the proposed Strategic Heritage Policy and associated commitment to the need for the location and design of new development to positively respond to the character and significance of historic places, spaces and individual designated and non-designated heritage assets, whether they relate to archaeology, buildings, Conservation Areas, and or historic parks and gardens, and their settings.	10 Mar 2021
Rosalyn Pyle	no	28 Feb 2021
Ruth Hall - Wessex Water	<p>We would like to see the proposed policy on Residential Amenity include a section as follows</p> <p>Residential and other regularly occupied/sensitive development will not be permitted in locations likely to be adversely affected by the operation of sewage treatment, sewage pumping and other water treatment or supply infrastructure.</p> <p>Where necessary the applicant will agree arrangements with Wessex Water to prepare and complete supporting impact assessments to demonstrate that development proposals are unaffected from odour emissions, noise, vibration, flies or other nuisance with or without mitigation and that any mitigation requirements are conditioned on the development.</p>	02 Mar 2021
Sam Scott - South Glos Labour Group of Councillors	The Policy on Planning for Affordable Housing is not yet written. What is your definition of affordable? Although there are about 30 mentions of affordable housing in the document, there is only 1 mention of social rented housing in the entire document – on page 40. So-called affordable housing (usually home ownership) is often not actually very affordable, whereas social rented housing is much more affordable for people on low incomes with little in the way of savings.	02 Mar 2021
Sean and Jacqueline Rinaldi	No.	26 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Simon Fitton - YTL Developments (UK) Ltd	The range and scope of policies are generally fine; it remains to see through national policy evolution to what extent many of the issues can be covered through national standards and policy. In turn this could allow the Local Plan to meet the Government's stringent standards on timescales for adoption.	16 Mar 2021
Simon Moore	The policies should be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There must be no further development of agricultural or green land. 2. Restoration of the natural environment of South Gloucestershire. 3. Carbon zero by a defined date. 4. All development in the county to include heat pumps, solar panels, electric car charging points, full insulation - without exception. 5. The price paid for any development land must no longer reflect development value - the days of making today's landowners into millionaires must stop. The value belongs to the community. Price paid for land must be its original use value. 	28 Feb 2021
Simon Steele-Perkins - Waddeton Park Limited	<p>Though a worthwhile intention, it is quite difficult to address this consultation question at this stage without knowing more of the relationship between the Local Plan and the SDS.</p> <p>The general principles to be followed however in presenting policies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To have as few policies as possible, to make the preparation of the Plan simpler (reducing the amount of consultation time and process), and to improve clarity and certainty in the Plan's use with less scope for confusion and conflict between policies; • To avoid repetition of national planning policy; • To only have the policies needed to implement the clearly expressed Spatial Strategy; • To write policies in terms of the outcomes sought, not in terms of specific land uses. <p>Whilst there seem to be a lot of policies proposed overall it is not clear whether there is sufficient intended on the process by which development proposals – particularly for large sites - should come forward, and on the performance required from development.</p>	06 May 2021
Sophie Spencer - CPRE Avon and Bristol [South Gloucestershire District]	<p>There are many references to achieving outcomes that rely partially or solely on input from others. There should be a policy laying out the procedures to be followed when essential third-party action is not forthcoming. Local health services are particularly apposite.</p> <p>We are aware that Government has consulted on what we and many others see, as placing further restrictions on local participation in the planning process. We think irrespective of the outcome, the current policy is too limiting and generally interpreted by the public as being contemptuous of their opinions. We urge the Council to expand the opportunities for the electorate to converse with councillors on planning matters.</p>	02 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>A policy for energy management in existing properties is urgently required, as are interim revisions to existing policies which permit construction to standards that will necessitate expensive retro-fitting.</p> <p>Policy New Nuclear Build should be revised to reflect the current position namely, that it is nationally of low priority and will see little or more likely no, activity during the lifetime of the Plan.</p>	
Sophie Wainwright - South Glos Disability Equality Network	- We would ask that the Council sets a reasonable requirement for the proportion of adapted, accessible or age-friendly housing available/built.	13 Apr 2021
South West Strategic Developments (SWSD)	<p>Please see enclosed representations.</p> <p>8.23 We broadly support the range and scope of policies suggested. We do not have any specific comments at this stage but suggest that policies which will impact developer costs (through, for example, increased renewable energy demands) need to be viability tested throughout the Local Plans process to ensure they are achievable.</p>	31 Mar 2021
Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd	3.45. With regard to emerging planning policies, it is noted that an infrastructure and contributions policy is to be included. In advance of that policy being drafted prior to the Phase 2 consultation, Spitfire would like to take the opportunity to highlight that when drafting that policy, the Council fully considers the cumulative cost of contributions and the impact this may have on the viability of schemes.	21 Apr 2021
St. Modwen Developments and The Tortworth Estate	<p>The scope and range of policies appears comprehensive and should assist in delivering development that meets the aims and objectives of the Plan. We are particularly supportive of the intention to include policies relating to Climate Change mitigation, new housing, strategic travel and infrastructure, sustainable modes of travel, and the rural economy.</p> <p>It will of course be necessary to ensure that all policy requirements are carefully considered to find the appropriate balance between managing development and ensuring there is sufficient flexibility to allow delivery of new development (i.e. so that the Plan is effective in the context of the NPPF's tests of soundness).</p> <p>Policies should be concise in their wording, and the Council should also consider whether it is necessary to enshrine certain technical requirements in Local Policy if it would essentially be a repetition of national standards (e.g. Building Regs requirements).</p>	05 Mar 2021
Stephen Hickmans	Look at all avenues before rushing into development.	26 Jan 2021
Strongvox Homes	6.1 For the sake of brevity, we have not commented in detail on this matter. However, we would suggest that the Local Plan should look to avoid the duplication and repetition of policies already set out at a national level.	11 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	6.2 For example, Paragraphs 143 - 147 of the NPPF provide a clear and concise approach to managing development in the Green Belt. There is no need for a policy which either repeats, or worse, reinterprets these paragraphs.	
Sue Green - Home Builders Federation	<p>As set out in the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence, which should be adequate, proportionate and focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned (para 31). If the Council is proposing to require optional technical standards, robust evidence to justify such policy requirements should be provided. The Council is referred to the HBF's answer to Question 11 above.</p> <p>The 2019 NPPF also confirms that Local Plans should avoid unnecessary duplication (para 16f). The Council is referred to the Government's proposed changes to Parts L (Conservation of Fuel & Power), F (Ventilation), M (Access to & Use of Buildings), R (Physical Infrastructure for High-Speed Electronic Communications Networks) & S (Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential & Non-residential Buildings) of the Building Regulations and the Government's proposals for biodiversity gain set out in the Environment Bill. As set out in the Planning for the Future White Paper a simpler planning process improves certainty. The Council is referred to the HBF's answers to Questions 22 and 27 below.</p> <p>Viability will be a key issue in determining the soundness of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan at Examination. In plan-making, viability is inseparable from the deliverability of development. As set out in the 2019 NPPF, the contributions expected from development including the level & types of affordable housing provision required and other infrastructure for education, health, transport, flood & water management, open space, digital communication, etc. should be set out in the Local Plan (para 34). As stated in the 2019 NPPF, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations that the deliverability of the Local Plan is threatened (para 34). The viability of individual developments and plan policies should be tested at the plan making stage. Without a robust approach to viability assessment, land will be withheld from the market and housing delivery will be threatened, leading to an unsound Plan and housing delivery targets not being met. Viability assessment should not be conducted on the margins of viability. This will be particularly important in the aftermath of uncertainties caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit. The Council's updated viability assessment should fully account for all additional costs associated with proposed policy requirements (see HBF answers to Q7 & Q11 above and Q22 & Q28 below).</p>	05 Mar 2021
Sue Simmons - Westerleigh Parish Council	In general the document is currently very broad and principles based – and, of course, the principles appear sound. Everyone would want to create sustainable communities, provide energy efficient housing, protect Heritage Assets and so on. The issue will be IF, how and where these principles are implemented.	23 Feb 2021
Susan Smith	No	16 Feb 2021
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Land at Mangotsfield	<p>SECTION 8 PLANNING POLICIES:</p> <p>Some Policy Headings have been proposed under three categories – Strategy, Non-Strategic and Area Specific. We do not have specific comments on these at this</p>	20 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>time, however we reserve the right to comment further on the detailed wording at a later stage. Any policies with prescriptive wording or that place onerous requirements on development need to be very carefully considered and a clear evidence base, including viability testing, be provided. Policy wording needs to be sufficiently precise and detailed to be meaningful but the evidence base underpinning the policy requirement needs to be sufficiently transparent as to clearly set out the reasoned justification for the requirement. Where there are clear national directions on policy then it will be overwhelmingly preferable that this approach is followed, and there are not additional policy requirements imposed on development via planning, when matters are covered by other areas of regulation. For example, if the Council is intending to require any optional technical standards via future planning policy, then robust evidence to justify this approach will be required. The Council should also have regard to proposed changes to Building Regulations which are forthcoming, and the essential role played by viability testing, to ensure that the combined impact of policies in the Plan does not have a negative impact on the viability and deliverability of necessary development. It is also very relevant for the Council to consider their combined commitment to working with other neighbouring Authorities as part of the preparation of the SDS, this will include policies and priorities linked to Climate Change (and other areas of policy or a strategic nature) and so a consistent and comprehensive approach is required.</p> <p>Proposed Area Specific Policies:</p> <p>The approach to including specific policies for growth areas is welcomed. However, it is early in the Plan process to be determining the scope of settlements/specific areas that will need specific policies. It could be predetermination to have identified working policy areas before the Building Blocks process has been undertaken and the spatial approach determined. It is also important to be clear whether the area specific policies apply within the existing urban areas identified, or whether they will include adjoining areas capable of accommodating growth at that location. For example, will greenfield sites adjoining existing urban areas be covered by the area specific policies for the areas they adjoin, or the rural area policies?</p>	
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd - Land at Vilner Farm	<p>Any policies with prescriptive wording or that place onerous requirements on development need to be very carefully considered and a clear evidence base, including viability testing, be provided. Policy wording needs to be sufficiently precise and detailed to be meaningful but the evidence base underpinning the policy requirement needs to be sufficiently transparent as to clearly set out the reasoned justification for the requirement. Where there are clear national directions on policy then it will be overwhelmingly preferable that this approach is followed, and there are not additional policy requirements imposed on development via planning, when matters are covered by other areas of regulation. For example, if the Council is intending to require any optional technical standards via future planning policy, then robust evidence to justify this approach will be required. The Council should also have regard to proposed changes to Building Regulations which are forthcoming, and the essential role played by viability testing, to ensure that the combined impact of policies in the Plan does not have a negative impact on the viability and deliverability of necessary development. It is also very relevant for the</p>	20 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Council to consider their combined commitment to working with other neighbouring Authorities as part of the preparation of the SDS, this will include policies and priorities linked to Climate Change (and other areas of policy or a strategic nature) and so a consistent and comprehensive approach is required.</p> <p>PROPOSED AREA SPECIFIC POLICIES:</p> <p>The approach to including specific policies for growth areas is welcomed. However, it is early in the Plan process to be determining the scope of settlements/ specific areas that will need specific policies. It could be predetermination to have identified working policy areas before the Building Blocks process has been undertaken and the spatial approach determined. It is also important to be clear whether the area specific policies apply within the existing urban areas identified, or whether they will include adjoining areas capable of accommodating growth at that location. For example, will greenfield sites adjoining existing settlements be covered by the area specific policies for the areas they adjoin, or the rural area policies?</p>	
Terry Chamberlain and Alan Jobbins	<p>6.1 For the sake of brevity we have not commented in detail on this matter. However, we would suggest that the Local Plan should look to avoid the duplication and repetition of policies already set out at a national level.</p> <p>6.2 For example, Paragraphs 143 - 147 of the NPPF provide a clear and concise approach to managing development in the Green Belt. There is no need for a policy which either repeats, or worse, reinterprets these paragraphs.</p>	05 May 2021
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> <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</p>	04 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>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 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</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	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.	
The Tortworth Estate	<p>The scope and range of policies appears comprehensive and should assist in delivering development that meets the aims and objectives of the Plan. We are particularly supportive of the intention to include policies relating to Climate Change mitigation, new housing, strategic travel and infrastructure, sustainable modes of travel, and the rural economy.</p> <p>It will of course be necessary to ensure that all policy requirements are carefully considered to find the appropriate balance between managing development and ensuring there is sufficient flexibility to allow delivery of new development (i.e. so that the Plan is effective in the context of the NPPF's tests of soundness). The Council should also consider whether it is necessary to enshrine certain technical requirements in Local Policy if it would essentially be a repetition of national standards (e.g. Building Regs requirements).</p>	05 Mar 2021
Tom Cotton - Road Haulage Association	See our response at 3.	01 Mar 2021
Top To Bottom Ltd and Hanham Community Trust	<p>See attached representations.</p> <p>The development of new and ambitious policy measures must meet the objectives and deliver against the priorities as set out in the Local Plan 2020 Phase 1 Issues and Approaches document. The development of new policies needs to be robustly evidenced and the impacts on adoption needs to be fully understood whilst being forward-looking and ambitious. Any new policy measures need to be based upon a robust evidence base to be found 'sound' (according to Paragraph 31 of the NPPF). This should include an assessment of their impact upon viability; both on an individual site level and on a whole-Plan basis. As such, we reserve the right to comment further following a review of the policy supporting evidence base.</p>	11 May 2021
Trystan Mabbitt - Hanson UK - Heidelberg Cement Group	Consultation on draft policies and supporting text would be welcomed in due course.	18 Mar 2021
Victoria Bailey - Oldbury on Severn Parish Council	<p>The scope of 'Flood Risk and Surface Water management (currently PSP 20) is of critical importance to the execution of a successful Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and observance of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. Given that 40% of South Gloucestershire drains into the Severn Estuary and SGC have a role as Coastal Protection Authority, and the prediction of coastal flooding this should be reflected in the Policy.</p> <p>We will comment further when the draft policy is published for consultation.</p>	24 Mar 2021
Vistry Group	<p>Please refer to enclosed representations.</p> <p>Section 8: Planning Policies:</p> <p>Do you agree with the range and scope of policies we are proposing to include in</p>	06 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>our new Local Plan?</p> <p>Do you have any comments on the range and scope of policies we are proposing?</p> <p>The starting point for determining the scope and content of the SGLP should be the NPPF. Paragraphs 15 and 16 of the NPPF set out what a Plan should do. Notably, Plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve sustainable development; • Be aspirational but deliverable; • Be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement; • Contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals; • Be accessible; and • Serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in the NPPF where relevant). <p>In respect of the final point, it is worth noting that the direction of travel under the Government’s proposed planning reforms[6] is that the NPPF will become the primary source of policies for development management.</p> <p>[6] Planning for the Future (August 2020).</p>	
Vistry Group - Land at Post Farm	<p>SECTION 8 PLANNING POLICIES:</p> <p>Some Policy Headings have been proposed under three categories – Strategy, Non-Strategic and Area Specific. We do not have specific comments on these at this time, however we reserve the right to comment further on the detailed wording at a later stage. Any policies with prescriptive wording or that place onerous requirements on development need to be very carefully considered and a clear evidence base, including viability testing, be provided. Policy wording needs to be precise and detailed to be meaningful and the evidence base underpinning the policy requirement needs to be transparent, clearly setting out the reasoned justification for the requirement. Where there are clear national directions on policy then it will be overwhelmingly preferable that this approach is followed, and that there are not additional policy requirements imposed on development via planning, when matters are covered by other areas of regulation.</p> <p>PROPOSED AREA SPECIFIC POLICIES:</p> <p>The approach to including specific policies for growth areas is welcomed. However, it is early in the Plan process to be determining the scope of settlements/particular areas that will need specific policies. It could be predetermination to have identified working policy areas before the Building Blocks process has been undertaken and the spatial approach determined. It is also important to be clear</p>	29 Apr 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>whether the area specific policies apply within the existing urban areas identified, or whether they will include adjoining areas capable of accommodating growth at that location. For example, will greenfield sites adjoining existing settlements be covered by the area specific policies for the areas they adjoin, or the rural area policies?</p>	
<p>Vistry Group - Land at Yew Tree Farm</p>	<p>SECTION 8 PLANNING POLICIES:</p> <p>Some Policy Headings have been proposed under three categories – Strategy, Non-Strategic and Area Specific. We do not have specific comments on these at this time, however we reserve the right to comment further on the detailed wording at a later stage. Any policies with prescriptive wording or that place onerous requirements on development need to be very carefully considered and a clear evidence base, including viability testing, be provided. Policy wording needs to be precise and detailed to be meaningful and the evidence base underpinning the policy requirement needs to be transparent, clearly setting out the reasoned justification for the requirement. Where there are clear national directions on policy then it will be overwhelmingly preferable that this approach is followed, and that there are not additional policy requirements imposed on development via planning, when matters are covered by other areas of regulation.</p> <p>PROPOSED AREA SPECIFIC POLICIES:</p> <p>The approach to including specific policies for growth areas is welcomed. However, it is early in the Plan process to be determining the scope of settlements/particular areas that will need specific policies. It could be predetermination to have identified working policy areas before the Building Blocks process has been undertaken and the spatial approach determined. It is also important to be clear whether the area specific policies apply within the existing urban areas identified, or whether they will include adjoining areas capable of accommodating growth at that location. For example, will greenfield sites adjoining existing settlements be covered by the area specific policies for the areas they adjoin, or the rural area policies?</p>	<p>29 Apr 2021</p>
<p>Waddeton Park Ltd - Land at Hicks Common Road</p>	<p>62. Waddeton Park Ltd broadly supports the range and scope of policies that are presented, but in the context of the submissions above, there is a need for policies on Climate Change to recognise the role the Spatial Strategy will play in addressing the declared emergency.</p> <p>63. We would like to raise concerns about the complexity and prescriptive nature of some policies that could have a counter-productive effect on innovation and choice for the development industry and construction techniques.</p> <p>64. It is also important that each of the policies are underpinned by a clear evidence base, do not give rise to duplication and form part of a whole Plan viability appraisal to ensure they support positive growth delivery.</p>	<p>17 May 2021</p>
<p>William Howell</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>23 Feb 2021</p>
<p>William Sharpe-</p>	<p>Do not agree to develop new housing at the land to the west of Thornbury Castle</p>	<p>28 Feb</p>

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Neal	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 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.	2021

Report run at 4 Feb 2022 10:41:08. Total records: 140